

Official Journal

of the

European Communities

No 1-260

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1980-1981 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 15 to 19 September 1980

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Monday, 15 September 1980	1
Resumption, p. 2 — Committees, p. 2 — Parliamentary immunity of a Member, p. 2 — Petitions, p. 2 — Documents, p. 3 — Texts of treaties, p. 3 — Authorization of reports — Reference to committee, p. 3 — Statement on motions for resolutions, p. 3 — Urgent procedure, p. 3 — Order of business, p. 3 — Speaking time, p. 4 — Tabling of amendments, p. 6 — Action taken on Parliament's opinions, p. 7 — Question Time, p. 8 — Urgent procedure, p. 24 — Next sitting, p. 24 — Annex, p. 25	
Tuesday, 16 September 1980	46
Minutes, p. 46 — Urgent procedure, p. 47 — Hunger, p. 52 — Committees, p. 78 — Hunger (contd), p. 79 — Urgent procedure, p. 107 — Withdrawal of a motion for a resolution, p. 107 — Next sitting, p. 107	
Wednesday, 17 September 1980	108
Minutes, p. 109 — Documents, p. 110 — Urgent procedure, p. 110 — Welcome, p. 116 — Structural problems of the UK — Financial mechanism, p. 116 — Human rights in Poland, p. 138 — Tabling of amendments, p. 142 — Human rights in Poland (contd), p. 142 — Situation in Turkey, p. 152 — Urgent procedure, p. 161 — Question Time, p. 161 — Next sitting, p. 175 — Annex, p. 177	
Thursday, 18 September 1980	183
Minutes, p. 184 — Documents, p. 184 — Urgent procedure, p. 184 — Hunger (contd), p. 187 — Membership of Parliament, p. 218 — Votes, p. 219 — Credentials, p. 227 — Regional development, p. 228 — Speaking-time, p. 233 — Dates of sittings, p. 233 — Regional development (contd), p. 233 — Agenda, p. 245 — Alternative energy sources, p. 245 — Urgent procedure, p. 252 — Motor-vehicle engines, p. 252 — Safety-belts and interior fittings, p. 253 — Insurance contracts, p. 255 — Appropriations within Section III of the budget, p. 264 — European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training, p. 265 — Next sitting, p. 268 — Annex, p. 269	

(Continued overleaf)

NOTE TO READER

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

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

Contents (continued)

Friday, 19 September 1980	305
Minutes, p. 307 — Documents, p. 307 — Committees, p. 307 — Consultative Assembly ACP-EEC, p. 307 — Urgent procedure, p. 308 — Flax and hemp, p. 310 — Martinique and Guadeloupe, p. 311 — Fisheries, p. 314 — Votes, p. 320 — Fisheries (contd), p. 327 — Bahais in Iran, p. 331 — Bolivia, p. 334 — Tyre, p. 337 — Mrs Macciocchi, p. 338 — Iron and steel, p. 344 — Kim Dae Jung, p. 346 — Adams, p. 346 — Petition No 1/79, p. 347 — Next sittings, p. 347 — Minutes, p. 347 — Adjournment, p. 347	

SITTING OF MONDAY, 15 SEPTEMBER 1980

1. Resumption of the session	2	<i>Point of order: Miss Brookes</i>	9
2. Membership of committees	2	<i>Question No 1 by Mr Moreland: Transfer of football players:</i>	
3. Request for the waiving of parliamentary immunity of a Member:		<i>Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission; Mr Moreland; Mr Davignon; Mr von der Vring; Mr Davignon; Mr Berkhouwer; Mr Davignon</i>	9
<i>Mr Almirante</i>	2	<i>Question No 2 by Miss Hooper: Mechanism for communicating Parliament proposals to the Council:</i>	
4. Petitions	2	<i>Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission; Miss Hooper; Mr Natali</i>	10
5. Documents received	3	<i>Question No 4 by Mrs Martin: Export of fresh meat to the UK market, and Question No 12 by Mrs Le Roux: Free circulation of milk within the EEC:</i>	
6. Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council	3	<i>Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission; Mrs Martin; Mr Gundelach; Mr Cottrell; Mr Gundelach; Mr Provan; Mr Gundelach; Mr Marshall; Mr Gundelach; Mr Paisley; Mr Gundelach</i>	10
7. Authorization of reports — Referral to committee	3	<i>Question No 5 by Mr Donnez: Restructuring of the iron and steel industry at Bagnoli, and Question No 57 by Mr Deleau: Loan to Italsider to finance the Bagnoli steel complex:</i>	
8. Statement on various motions for resolutions	3	<i>Mr Davignon; Mr Donnez; Mr Davignon; Mr Deleau; Mr Barbi; Mr Davignon; Mr Bonaccini; Mr Davignon; Mr Didò; Mr Davignon; Mrs De March; Mr Davignon; Mrs Vayssade; Mr Davignon</i>	12
9. Urgent procedure	3	<i>Question No 7 by Mrs Ewing: Plutonium accident tests off the Scottish coast:</i>	
10. Order of business:		<i>Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission; Mrs Ewing; Mr Vredeling; Mr Seligman; Mr Vredeling; Mr Collins; Mr Vredeling; Mr Enright; Mr Vredeling</i>	14
<i>Mr Klepsch, EPP; Mr Pannella</i>	3	<i>Question No 8 by Mr Seal: Problems of the textile industry resulting from enlargement:</i>	
<i>Point of order: Mr Capanna</i>	4	<i>Mr Davignon; Mr Seal; Mr Davignon; Mr Welsb; Mr Davignon; Mr Paisley; Mr Davignon; Miss Brookes; Mr Davignon; Mrs</i>	
11. Speaking time:			
<i>Mr Cohen; Mr Bangemann; Mr Cohen; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Klepsch, EPP; Mr Pannella; Mrs Kellett-Bowman</i>	5		
12. Deadline for tabling amendments	6		
13. Action taken by the Commission on the opinions and proposals of Parliament:			
<i>Mr de Ferranti; Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission; Mr Marshall; Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Moreland; Mr Natali; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Natali; Mr Moreland; Mr Davignon; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Natali</i>	7		
<i>Procedural motion: Sir Fred Warner</i>	8		
14. Question Time (Doc. 1-366/80)			
<i>Questions to the Commission of the European Communities:</i>			

<i>Kellett-Bowman; Mr Davignon; Mr Enright; Mr Davignon</i>	15	<i>Mr Davignon; Mr Seligman; Mr Davignon</i>	20
<i>Question No 9 by Sir Fred Warner: 1982 UN Assembly on the Elderly:</i>		<i>Question No 16 by Mr Christopher Jackson: Application of Community regulations relating to inspection or control of agricultural or fishing products:</i>	
<i>Mr Vredeling; Sir Fred Warner; Mr Vredeling</i>	17	<i>Mr Gundelach; Mr C. Jackson; Mr Gundelach; Mr Patterson; Mr Gundelach; Mr Provan; Mr Gundelach</i>	21
<i>Question No 10 by Mr Tyrrell: Trade agreement between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union:</i>		<i>Question No 18 by Mr Michel: Inadequacy of Community regulations concerning the siting of thermal or nuclear power stations in border areas:</i>	
<i>Mr Gundelach; Mr Tyrell; Mr Gundelach</i>	18	<i>Mr Davignon; Mr Michel; Mr Davignon; Mrs Weber; Mr Davignon; Mrs Vayssade; Mr Davignon</i>	22
<i>Question No 14 by Mr Boyes: Employment opportunities for women within the Commission:</i>		15. <i>Urgent procedure</i>	24
<i>Mr Vredeling; Mr Boyes; Mr Vredeling; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Vredeling; Mr Welsh; Mr Vredeling; Mrs Clwyd; Mr Vredeling; Mr Marshall; Mr Vredeling</i>	18	16. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i>	24
<i>Question No 15 by Mr Seligman: Direct broadcasting in the Community:</i>		Annex	25

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

(The sitting was opened at 5.05 p.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Resumption of the session*

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 11 July 1980.

2. *Membership of committees*

President. — I have received from the European Democratic Group a request that Sir Peter Vanneck be appointed member of the Committee on Energy and Research to replace Mr Moreland.

Are there any objections?

This appointment is ratified.

3. *Request for the waiving of parliamentary immunity of a Member*

President. — I have received from the competent authorities of the Italian Republic a request that Mr Almirante's parliamentary immunity be waived.

Pursuant to Rule 51 (2) of the Rules of Procedure this request has been referred to the committee responsible, which in this case is the Legal Affairs Committee.

I call Mr Almirante.

Mr Almirante. — Madam President, thank you for allowing me to speak. I just wanted to say that I have noted the statement about me and, in the context of your functions and of the parliamentary Rules of Procedure, I should be grateful if you would see to it that this action proceeds as quickly as possible. If a vote has to be taken on the matter in committee or in the Chamber, I would ask you, and I say this on behalf of my colleagues too, for authorization to be granted for the proceedings to go ahead because I want to be judged by the laws of my own country.

4. *Petitions*

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

President

These petitions have been entered under Nos 44 to 49/80 on the register provided for in Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedure and referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

You will also find in the minutes of this sitting various decisions with regard to these petitions.

5. Documents received

President. — Since the adjournment of the session I have received from the Council, the Commission, the parliamentary committees and Members of Parliament various documents, a list of which you will find in the minutes of this sitting.

6. Text of treaties forwarded by the Council

President. — I have received from the Council a certified true copy of an agreement, the title of which you will find in the minutes of this sitting. This document will be deposited in the archives of the European Parliament.

7. Authorization of reports — Referral to committee

President. — Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Rules of Procedure I have authorized certain committees to draw up reports. You will find a list of these authorizations in the minutes of this sitting.

8. Statement on various motions for resolutions

President. — In the minutes of this sitting you will find the decisions taken by the Political Affairs Committee on a number of motions for resolutions.

9. Urgent procedure

President. — I have received from the Council a request for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, in respect of two proposals for resolutions on the flax and hemp sector (Doc. 1-134/80).

This request is justified by the deadlines for entry into force of these regulations.

I have also received six motions for resolutions with request for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure:

- from Mr Clément and others, on EEC emergency aid for Martinique, which has been devastated by Hurricane Allen (Doc. 1-362/80);
- from Mr Sablé and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, and Mr d'Ormesson and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on Community aid to the Departments of Martinique and Guadeloupe devastated by Hurricane Allen (Doc. 1-377/80);
- from Mr Lalor and Mr Israël, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, and Mr Scott-Hopkins, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the persecution of the members of the Baha'i community in Iran (Doc. 1-372/80/rev.);
- from Mrs Castle and Mr Lomas, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the violation of human rights in Chile (Doc. 1-378/80);
- from Mr Glinne and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the political situation in Poland (Doc. 1-379/80);
- from Mr Glinne and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, and Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), on the events in Bolivia (Doc. 1-381/80).

The reasons supporting these requests are contained in the documents themselves.

I shall consult Parliament on these requests for urgent procedure at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

10. Order of business

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

At its meeting of 10 July 1980 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has been distributed to you (PE 66.811/rev.).

I have received from the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members a request, pursuant to Rule 12 of the Rules of Procedure, that Mr Ferrero's report on world hunger (Doc. 1-341/80) be withdrawn from the agenda.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Madam President, this Parliament has carefully prepared its debate on world hunger. The report by the committee responsible and the opinion of the other committees which have been consulted have now been submitted. The political groups have had time enough to prepare themselves

Klepsch

for this discussion. We have had to face some pressure and a good deal of time — close on nine months — has elapsed before we could hold a fundamental debate following our initial or general debate. My Group therefore considers that it would be intolerable for this debate not to go ahead as planned. We are all ready for it and we want the debate to be held tomorrow.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*I*) Madam President, our proposal may indeed seem rather strange. We have waited for ten months rather than nine. We have frequently protested against the delays imposed on us by the majority in this House. Last Friday, the United Nations had not reached a definitive position; that is why we felt that it would have been wise to leave sufficient time for this report to be discussed in the light of the events at the United Nations and after opening contacts with that body. Having said that, Madam President, we are nevertheless pleased that the matter is now being made the subject of a debate; we therefore withdraw our request for this item to be removed from the agenda.

President. — I call Mr Capanna on a point of order.

Mr Capanna. — (*I*) Madam President, as you well know, Rule 12 of the Rules of Procedure accords the President of this Parliament, even before the political groups, the right to propose amendments to the agenda.

Referring to the specific events in Turkey, I am of the opinion that it would be a politically sensitive gesture to include the consideration of this objectively important item on our agenda.

I am well aware that various proposals from the political groups are currently being considered by the Bureau, but I would remind you that our Rules of Procedure specifically grant the President the right to propose changes or, in this particular instance, the inclusion of a new item on our agenda.

President. — I do not think that it would be a good thing for the President to take any initiative in this matter on her own authority. We had envisaged a meeting of the EEC-Turkey delegation, at which proposals would be made. The political groups, which will have an opportunity this evening to discuss this complex question, can also table motions for resolutions. We shall return to this point in a moment.

At their meeting this morning the chairmen of the political groups proposed that in the light of the events

of the summer the draft agenda should be amended as follows:

Tuesday, 16 September 1980

The debate on world hunger will be held on Tuesday from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. and 3 p.m. to 7 p.m. and continued on Thursday from 10 a.m. to 12 noon, the vote being taken at the conclusion of the debate.

Wednesday, 17 September 1980

The Dankert report on the convergence of the economies (Doc. 1-373/80) will not be distributed until this evening. In view of its importance, however, the chairmen of the political groups propose that it be kept on Wednesday's agenda but that the deadline for tabling amendments be changed.

The Penders report on human rights in Poland (Doc. 1-219/80) also remains on the agenda on the understanding that, in accordance with a procedure already used, if urgency should be decided for other motions for resolutions on the situation in Poland, they would be debated jointly with this report.

It has also been agreed that if urgency is decided for motions for resolutions on the situation in Turkey, they will be also included on the agenda for Wednesday, when the President-in-Office of the Council will be present.

Thursday, 18 September 1980

As it has not been adopted in committee, Mr Beumer's report on the fixing of book prices has been withdrawn from the agenda.

The other items will be considered after the voting which will be held at 3 p.m.

Friday, 19 September 1980

All the motions for resolutions in respect of which urgency will be decided will be considered on Friday.

Are there any comments?

The order of business is therefore fixed.¹

11. *Speaking time*

President. — I call Mr Cohen.

¹ See minutes of this sitting.

Mr Cohen. — (NL) Madam President, I have no objection to the proposals that you have just made, particularly as regards the debate on world hunger which, as I understand it, is now to take place tomorrow and on Thursday morning. But I have now had an opportunity to see how the speaking time in this debate on hunger has been allocated; this morning the Bureau proposed that each of the 'sub-rapporteurs' should be allowed to speak for 5 minutes. That proposal had never been discussed by the Committee on Development. We had always assumed that the sole spokesman in this debate would be Mr Ferrero as the general rapporteur and that the sub-rapporteurs would not be given an opportunity to explain their reports. But, if I have understood you correctly, they are now to be allowed 5 minutes each; that time is so short that there is little purpose in according it at all. I therefore propose that the 5 minute speaking time granted to them by the Bureau should be rescinded and granted instead to the draftsmen of opinions to give them an opportunity to explain their opinions at somewhat greater length.

President. — Without prejudice to the suggestion that has just been made by Mr Cohen — and I see that Mr Bangemann also wants to speak on this matter — this is the allocation of speaking time that has been proposed pursuant to Rules 28 and 36A of the Rules of Procedure:

Debate on world hunger:

Rapporteur (introduction and conclusion):	20 minutes
Commission:	40 minutes in all
Draftsmen and authors of working documents:	45 minutes (9 × 5)
Members:	480 minutes
Socialist Group:	122 minutes
Group of the European People's Party (CD Group):	116 minutes
European Democratic Group:	72 minutes
Communist and Allies Group:	51 minutes
Liberal and Democratic Group:	47 minutes
Group of European Progressive Democrats:	28 minutes
Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members:	16 minutes
Non-attached Members:	28 minutes

I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Madam President, I believe that in the case of reports such as that by Mr Ferrero, it is logical to grant the draftsmen, on behalf of the committees asked for their opinions, time to speak, which must of course be considerably shorter than the time granted to the main rapporteur. Why is this so? The committee responsible, namely the Committee on Development and Cooperation, has compiled this

report in very close cooperation with the other committees and it is more than a mere gesture of politeness to allow the other committees a possibility of explaining their views; it is in the nature of the subject that this should be so. After all, this topic touches on the terms of reference of the Committee on External Economic Relations and on those of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and the Committee on Agriculture; I therefore believe that we should be reasonable enough to enable the spokesmen of those committees to explain their opinions briefly. If we do not do so the main rapporteur and the committee responsible will very seldom be able to count on active participation by other committees.

I therefore consider that this allocation of speaking time is appropriate. It is also equitable because the main rapporteur is being granted considerably more time than the sub-rapporteurs. Madam President, I hope you will stand by these arrangements.

President. — Mr Cohen, do you wish to insist?

Mr Cohen. — (NL) Madam President, it is not so much a matter of insisting, but I think that Mr Bangemann did not really understand my proposal! I suggested that the draftsmen of opinions for the other committees should be allowed more time, but by cutting the time allocated to the sub-rapporteurs for the Committee on Development. I do not think that there is really any difference of opinion between Mr Bangemann and myself on this point.

President. — It was the chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation that wanted authors of working documents, who have done a great deal of work, to be given some speaking time.

I call Sir Fred Catherwood.

Sir Fred Catherwood. — Madam President, my own committee spent a great deal of time in giving its opinion. We also spent three hours voting on it. I think the draftsman should have at least ten minutes and this should not be taken out of group time. I most strongly urge that we give reasonable time to someone who is speaking on behalf of a committee which has taken a great deal of time on this.

President. — I do not think that anyone is objecting to speaking time being given to the draftsmen of the opinions.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Madam President, my Group too appointed one of these sub-rapporteurs, but we believe

Klepsch

it is sensible to follow the proposals made by Mr Cohen and Sir Fred Catherwood. Our sub-rapporteur, Mr Vergeer, will waive his 5 minutes; he will in any case be speaking on behalf of his political group. We should allow each of the draftsmen of opinions 10 minutes. I could agree to that proposal.

President. — I propose therefore that the draftsmen for the opinions of the other committees should have 10 minutes each, but that the speaking time originally allocated to them should be taken from the authors of working documents.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

Wednesday, 17 September 1980

Rapporteurs:	20 minutes (2 × 10)
Commission:	20 minutes (2 × 10)
Council:	20 minutes (2 × 10)
Members:	300 minutes
Socialist Group:	74 minutes
Group of the European People's Party (CD Group):	70 minutes
European Democratic Group:	44 minutes
Communist and Allies Group:	32 minutes
Liberal and Democratic Group:	30 minutes
Group of European Progressive Democrats:	19 minutes
Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members:	11 minutes
Non-attached Members:	20 minutes
Question Time	90 minutes

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Madam President, it is likely that we shall be discussing the situation in Poland and Turkey on Wednesday, following the decisions taken this morning. I therefore consider that it is perfectly unreasonable to grant our Group — and the same goes for the other political groups — only 11 minutes to speak about Poland, Turkey and the other topic to which we have just referred; I would ask the Assembly to consider my views on this. As you well know, our Rules of Procedure allow Rule 27 to be applied to the various items on the agenda rather than to the whole day's sitting. I therefore ask for the speaking time to be allocated for a particular item on the agenda on Wednesday. If we have urgent debates it will of course be necessary to find a different time to discuss these topics of such great importance.

President. — In allocating speaking time for Wednesday the whole day was taken into account, and I do not see how we could fit in any further hours. The hour only lasts 60 minutes, and nobody has yet found any way to make it last longer! Besides, Question

Time begins on that day at 5.30 p.m., so there is nothing that can be done. Each group will simply have to divide up its speaking time as best it can between the different items down for debate.

I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — Madam President, did I hear you give time for the draftsman of the opinion on the Dankert report as you did on Tuesday for the other report? It is the normal custom.

President. — Yes, in fact. Both draftsmen of opinions will each have five minutes.

Thursday, 18 September 1980

Rapporteurs:	35 minutes (7 × 5)
Commission:	35 minutes
Members:	300 minutes
Socialist Group:	74 minutes
Group of the European People's Party (CD Group):	70 minutes
European Democratic Group:	44 minutes
Communist and Allies Group:	32 minutes
Liberal and Democratic Group:	30 minutes
Group of European Progressive Democrats:	19 minutes
Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members:	11 minutes
Non-attached Members:	20 minutes

Are there any comments?

That is agreed.

12. *Deadline for tabling amendments*

President. — I propose that the deadlines for tabling amendments during this part-session be fixed as set out in the draft agenda.

In the case of the reports by Mr Dankert (Doc. 1-378/80) and Mr Penders (Doc. 1-219/80) I propose that the deadline for tabling amendments be fixed at 3 p.m. on Tuesday, 16 September.

Are there any comments?

That is agreed.¹

¹ See minutes of this sitting.

13. *Action taken by the Commission on the opinions and proposals of Parliament*

President. — The next item is the communication from the Commission on the action taken by it on the opinions and proposals of the European Parliament.¹

I call Mr de Ferranti.

Mr de Ferranti. — I welcome the fact that the Commission, having rejected in principle Parliament's recommendation on fork-lift trucks, powered industrial trucks, has very ingeniously left the door open by saying, in the English translation: 'It may consider Parliament's desired alterations later, according as matters proceed'. Will, then, the Commission remember, as matters proceed, that it will not, I hope, be the intention of this Parliament to let either the Commission or the Council off the democratic hook.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) My reply is: yes.

President. — I call Mr Marshall.

Mr Marshall. — At the last part-session, this House debated a report on the Horn of Africa. May I congratulate the Commission on deciding within a few days of that debate to increase aid to that very troubled part of Africa, and may I ask them to bear in mind that from November on there will once again be a great deal of hunger and hardship in that part of the world?

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) Madam President, as the honourable Member has pointed out, the Commission decided in response to Parliament's resolution to grant emergency aid of two million units of account to Ethiopia; on 8 August a decision was taken to provide further emergency aid of five million units of account to Somalia. This brings the total aid received by Somalia in 1980, including food aid, to 25 million units of account. We know perfectly well that the need may arise in future — although we hope that it will not — to respond to similar situations, and the Commission will be ready to comply with the wishes expressed by Parliament.

President. — I call Mr Moreland.

Mr Moreland. — I wish to draw attention to item 3 of the document, which refers to reports on which Parliament did not request formal amendment, and ask whether it is right to place here the report by Mr von Wogau, because if Members look at the document produced for them they will see that a number of amendments were put forward, including a precise one to Article 4 (2) of the proposal on three-wheeled vehicles. I therefore suggest to the Commission that this is the wrong place for this item. Certainly as I understood it, the Commission accepted the amendment that was in my name.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) Madam President, paragraph 3 refers to formal amendments. We discussed this point at our last part-session; the report by Mr von Wogau expressed certain wishes but did not contain formal amendments on the basis of Article 149 (2) of the Treaty. In paragraph 4 of our document we specifically mention those items on which reference has been made to Article 149 (2). But that was not the case for the topic which we are now discussing.

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — There seems to be a little problem here, Madam President. I do not want to make heavy weather of it, and perhaps one ought to study it in conjunction with Commissioner Natali at a later stage, but he will be more than aware of what happened in July concerning the Kirk report and of the exchange of correspondence between the President of the Commission and you, Madam President. There there was a clear indication that even though it was not a formal amendment, it should be accepted in those terms following the spirit of the Treaty. This is exactly the kind of problem we have got here. I am not happy; I am not satisfied with what the Commissioner, Mr Natali, has said, and we really must get this quite clear so there is no question of a mistake in the future. President Jenkins had, I thought, made it quite clear, but as I do not want to go on with this now, perhaps we can get together with Commissioner Natali during this week.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) Madam President, you will recall that at the beginning of my answer I pointed out that this matter had already been dealt with; I added that, as things stand

¹ See Annex.

Natali

at present, we maintained our previous interpretation. I am well aware that contacts are in progress at present between the President of Parliament and the President of the Commission with a view to seeking a common interpretation of this article and a joint definition of the manner in which amendments should be presented.

President. — I have received a letter from Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission, on this matter. The enlarged Bureau will be informed of the points he makes and can discuss them at greater length next week in Luxembourg. Mr Natali will also be present at this meeting.

I call Mr Moreland.

Mr Moreland. — Madam President, I am only coming back on this because I think that, regardless of the argument we have just had, we did in fact propose a precise amendment to Article 4 (2) and, therefore, even so the Commission should have commented. It is particularly important, because this directive has failed to achieve agreement within the Council and we are hoping that the Commission is still pushing it.

President. — I call Mr Davignon.

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) Madam President, I just want to say to Mr Moreland that there is no problem of substance here. As I pointed out during the debate, we have taken account of the consideration given to the text and I confirm that point. If no formal confirmation is given, that is because of the discussion to which my colleague Mr Natali referred just now. But there is no problem of substance here.

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Mr Gauthiers's report on fishing in the Faroese, Swedish, Norwegian and Greenland waters was adopted by Parliament, if you remember.

The Commission then explained why it wished to retain the proposals. That is quite understandable and perfectly in order. What I want to be quite assured of is that Parliament's rejection and a statement of the reasons for it have gone along with the Commission's proposals to the Council of Ministers so that the Council is fully aware that Parliament rejected the proposals put forward by the Commission. This is an important point of principle, Madam President.

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-president of the Commission. — I can assure Mr Scott-Hopkins that the views of Parliament have been put by myself clearly before the Council of Ministers. In some cases in actual fact the Commission has tried to follow some of the suggestions which were made here by the European parliament, but in no case was the Council of Ministers not fully aware of every single proposal and amendment made by Parliament.

President. — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, I am, of course, more than satisfied with what Vice-President Gundelach has said concerning this, but could it not be put into the report to Parliament? It is a damn nuisance my having to get up and say this, and if he would only put it in the report, or I suppose Mr Natali could, it would save all this trouble. Could he do that in future?

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr. Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) I agree.

President. — I call Sir Fred Warner.

Sir Fred Warner. — Madam President, before we move on to Question Time, would it be proper for me to draw attention to this memo which has been circulated on the establishment of a new telephone exchange? Perhaps because of this, it has been impossible to have any telephonic communication with London since early this afternoon, and I should be most grateful if the administration section of the secretariat could assure us that we shall soon be able to speak to our offices and our loved ones at home.

(Laughter)

President. — The administration is also very concerned about the operation of the telephone system and is following up the matter. It will be some hours before communications are fully restored. The real reason for extending the telephone exchange was in order to have telephones in the new offices, but the disruptions of communication, which were inevitable, will certainly be of very short duration.

14. Question Time

President. — The next item is Question Time (Doc. 1-366/80).

President

Today we shall take the questions to the Commission.

I call Miss Brookes to speak on a point of order.

Miss Brookes. — Madam President, under Rule 47A (2) I submitted a question in writing to you, Madam, and I find to my despair that it is not down on the agenda. May I ask the reason why, please?

President. — The secretariat tells me that your question did not arrive.

Miss Brookes. — Madam President, it was sent by mail on Tuesday, 2 September 1980, and it was sent to the secretariat. May I have your assurance that it was not barred under Annex II, page 51 of the Rules of Procedure?

President. — If your question had been withdrawn, you would have been informed immediately. Your question, therefore, did not arrive. The secretariat will look into the matter.

Question No 1 by Mr Moreland (H-233/80):

What action is to follow from the Commission's recent discussions with the European Football Association (UEFA) and the Player's Associations on the problems of the transfer of football players between clubs within the Community?

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) The Commission will now provide information additional to that already given in answer to written questions. I shall confine myself initially to pointing out that the action taken by the Commission has centred on the removal of barriers to free movement in this area; we have now received an assurance from all the football federations in the European Community that the previous absolute limits have given way to a transitional system under which it will be possible to progress towards total freedom of movement for players in the Community without any upheaval in the professional situation of the various teams. This of course applies only to the professional football teams.

Mr Moreland. — Would the Commissioner take a look, in the context of the free movement of labour, at the effect of the transfer fee situation in Europe on the movement of players between clubs in the Community? We seem to have different systems for different countries as well as different fees. In certain countries the public is very concerned about the very high level of transfer fees. After all, I would not like it to be said that it was transfer fees that stopped the winner of the UEFA Cup this year being Stoke City.

Mr Davignon. — (F) I leave it to the honourable Member to decide whether the results of a particular football match might have been different if the circumstances surrounding it had been different — that is really a matter for the participants in football pools which have nothing to do with the question; however, it does seem to me that there is discrimination in the matter of transfer procedures. The opinion of our legal experts is that the discrimination is not such as to allow the Commission to take action on its own initiative. It would therefore be necessary to see to what extent the players themselves are willing to invoke Articles 48 and 52 of the Treaty and themselves report such discrimination. The Commission could then act.

Mr von der Vring. — (D) Could the Commission say whether it considers the transfer of football players to be a problem of freedom of movement of workers or one of the movement of goods within the European Community?

(Laughter)

Mr Davignon. — (F) The Commission did not invent the transfer system; let there be no mistake about that. I therefore said that the Commission was endeavoring to allow all Community citizens the same opportunity of playing in any team in their own country or in a different Member State. We have given priority to this aspect because we are concerned here with individual citizens.

Mr Berkhouwer. — (NL) Madam President, without seeking to criticize the Commission in any way, it seems to me that there is a trade in football players in Europe today rather reminiscent of the trade in gladiators in Ancient Rome; could Commissioner Davignon therefore tell us whether the Commission is prepared to submit a document to this Parliament indicating exactly how that trade in players is effected? We should like to know how much of the astronomical transfer fees are received by the players themselves, and to what extent real freedom of movement is enjoyed by these individuals? Are they not rather obliged to accept certain changes or movements and so forth? Well, I see Mr Davignon is shaking his head, but these matters are of interest to the citizens of Europe who would like to know what is going on here. Is the Commission willing and able to compile a document showing how the European transfer market for footballers works, and indicating to what extent all this accords with the freedom of movement which Community workers are supposed to enjoy.

Mr Davignon. — (F) There are two aspects to Mr Berkhouwer's question. First of all individuals must be allowed to move freely in order to use their talents to the best of their ability anywhere in the Community.

Davignon

That is the privilege of any individual who has a certain talent, in the field of sports or indeed in any other.

Secondly, there is the matter of protecting individual rights under a professional contract by which they are bound. Here we have made initial progress by guaranteeing respect for individual rights. Somebody may sign a contract when he or she is very young and be bound by that contract for a long period of time. Then he may in fact be in a situation such as you have described. Things have now changed, however, and contracts must not be concluded for an indefinite period. As to the second aspect, i.e. the rights of individuals in the context of a professional contract, the Commission will examine the situation in the different Community countries.

President. — Question No 2 by Miss Hooper (H-255/80):

What is the mechanism for forwarding proposals and amendments passed by the Parliament to the Council, and what steps are taken to ensure that the Council receives these proposals and amendments in good time for meetings at which they are to be considered?

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission — (I) I think it is for Parliament to agree with the Council on the necessary administrative arrangements to ensure that its views are notified in good time.

The Commission for its part makes every effort to adopt a position on all the amendments and proposals put forward by Parliament, involving, where necessary, changes to draft texts under Article 149 (2) of the Treaty, in good time for the discussion in Council.

Miss Hooper. — I do think we have a problem here. I wonder if the Commissioner could suggest some sort of mechanism so that we do not have a situation where Parliament is amending draft proposals from the Commission at the same time as the Council of Ministers' working party is already looking at a substantially altered document.

This happened over the major hazards proposals which we debated in committee in June and also here in Parliament. It seems to me that it is a complete waste of time for this Parliament to be amending an out-of-date document, as we did then. It was only by accident I discovered that the Council of Ministers was already looking at a very different document. Could there not be some sort of mechanism whereby we could be made aware that the document we are discussing is out-of-date?

Mr Natali. — (I) I can only say that the Commission tries to do everything possible to take account of amendments and forward them in good time. The subject of relations between Parliament and the Council has really nothing to do with the Commission.

President. — Since its author is absent, Question No 3 will be answered in writing.¹

As they are both on the same subject, I shall call the next two questions together.

Question No 4 by Mrs Martin (H-274/80):

What action does the Commission intend to take to put an end to the discriminatory measures which prevent the other eight Member States from exporting fresh milk to the UK market?

and Question No 12 by Mrs Le Roux (H-242/80):

Does the Commission not consider that the United Kingdom is blocking the import of liquid milk by an unwarranted health regulation which forms an insuperable non-tariff barrier thereby infringing the principle of the free movement of goods within the EEC, and that the rules applying in France to milk for consumption provide sufficient protection for the consumer — does the Commission not consider it a matter of urgency to eliminate this irregularity, and what measures does it intend to take to this end?

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DK) The Commission has already initiated proceedings under Article 169 of the Treaty against the United Kingdom on the grounds of the restrictions imposed in that country on the marketing of imported UHT milk or milk treated at ultra-high temperatures. In taking this action, the Commission has been guided by the consideration that the British provisions governing imports of that type of milk have no legal basis. The same applies to sterilized milk, although the situation is different in the case of unprocessed milk straight from the cow and other types of fresh milk, even though in these cases there can be no guarantee that the necessary safeguards in terms of human or animal health actually exist. In this connexion, I would draw your attention to the fact that the adoption by the Council of the Commission's proposal for the harmonization of trade in this sector (I refer to the proposal requiring the health and veterinary controls applicable to unprocessed full-cream milk to be extended to heat-treated milk, and the proposal for the regulation of health problems connected with the production and marketing of heat-treated milk) is essential in order to remove all the obstacles which still exist in this sector and which explain why we have

¹ See Annex.

Gundelach

initiated the proceedings to which I referred above, the aim being to achieve free movement for heat-treated milk and the abolition of national regulations.

Mrs Martin. — (F) Does the Commissioner not find it rather paradoxical that a country should be creating barriers to the entry of dairy products onto its own market while at the same time criticizing Community exports to countries such as the U.S.S.R.?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) As the honourable Member will have gathered from my reply, the Commission is of the opinion that UHT milk should not be the subject of import control measures; it is this particular kind of milk which is the most important in this context. To that extent I agree with the honourable Member.

Mr Cottrell. — This House is well aware that this question is not so much about milk as about other matters. I should like to ask the Commissioner if he will, within the original context of Mrs Martin's question, report on current progress by the Commission to put an end to the discriminatory measures which prevent the United Kingdom from exporting fresh lamb to France.

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of Members of this Parliament will agree with me that we have already devoted an extraordinary amount of time to the discussion of free trade in mutton and lamb which must of course be achieved to comply with the rules laid down in the Treaty. But this evening we are discussing the trade in milk.

Mr Provan. — I think this question by Mrs Martin highlights one of the failings of the common agricultural policy, inasmuch as we are trying to put standard pricing on an uneven base. Would the Commissioner accept, therefore, that if standards applied to milk production in Denmark were applied throughout the Community, 50 % of the milk produced in the Federal Republic of Germany would be unacceptable for Community intervention?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) I am firmly convinced that acceptable conditions already exist for free trade in milk treated by the UHT method. This will not affect the common price policy, but will on the contrary facilitate the freedom of movement of goods between Member States.

In the case of other types of milk, certain norms must be complied with to ensure that satisfactory health standards, applicable both to human beings and to animals, are respected. None of these provisions is so

costly as to significantly influence the consumption of milk in the Community.

Mr Marshall. — Would the Commissioner accept that the British system of doorstep delivery is the major reason why per capita liquid milk consumption is higher in Britain than in any other Member State of the Community, and can he give us a guarantee that he will take no action to undermine the doorstep delivery system which is so vital for the dairy industry in the United Kingdom? Can he also give us a guarantee that countries which expect to export milk to the United Kingdom must at the same time adhere to decisions of the European Court of Justice regarding that other liquid, Scotch whisky, and remove the fiscal and other discrimination against it?

(Laughter)

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) I agree entirely with the honourable member that the system of fresh milk deliveries used in the United Kingdom has a favorable influence on the consumption of fresh milk which in the present situation is surely in our general interest.

This was one of the reasons for which the Community was able, not without some reticence, to agree to the continued existence of the milk marketing boards in the United Kingdom. That being so, there is no reason why the system of doorstep milk deliveries should be endangered by free imports of milk which we are discussing now. As regards Scotch whisky, I would remind you, as I did when the subject of mutton was raised, that this is not the topic of our discussion.

Mr Paisley. — Is the Commissioner aware that although Northern Ireland is part of the United Kingdom, it is also affected by these restrictions, so much so that 80 % of milk in Northern Ireland has to be turned to the manufacturing trade and only 18 % is used as liquid milk? Is he also aware that because of these restrictions the Northern Ireland farmers are receiving 5 p. less per gallon than their colleagues in the rest of the United Kingdom?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) As regards differences in the price of milk in various parts of the United Kingdom, in so far as these prices fall within the province of the milk marketing boards, they are a matter for the United Kingdom government and not for the Community authorities.

For the rest I would remind the honourable member that Northern Ireland is vitally dependent on markets for its agricultural products in the rest of Europe; trade cannot be one-way traffic and a system of trade can only function properly if there is movement in all

Gundelach

directions. In the broader context, a solution to this problem is therefore vitally important to Northern Ireland as well.

President. — Mrs Kellett-Bowman, I cannot give you the floor. Five Members have already spoken on this question, in the order in which they caught my eye and that of the officials of the secretariat who are assisting me, and that is enough.

As they are on the same subject, I shall call the next two questions together.

Question No 5 by Mr Donnez (H-283/80):

Could the Commission indicate why it financed the construction at Bagnoli of a semi-continuous wide strip mill with a capacity of three million tonnes when the Community sheet-steel market is already saturated and the plant at Denain is operating at only 40 % of its capacity?

and Question No 57 by Mr Deleau (H-390/80):

Will the Commission confirm or deny reports that a large Community loan (50 % of total investment) to finance an extension to the Bagnoli complex is imminent, stating why this loan is being granted despite the many reservations that have been expressed about a project that will create overcapacity in a sector already heavily in surplus?

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) In examining the documents submitted to it on the subject of the restructuring of the steelworks in Bagnoli, the Commission had to take account of two factors. In the present situation, we had to proceed with great caution as is now always the case in dealing with proposals to increase capacity. Our discussions with the Italian undertaking revealed that, in conjunction with other restructuring operations and changes in activities of the companies concerned, the Bagnoli project would not lead to an increase in steel production capacity in the Community. On the other hand there is an increase in capacity in respect of the particular product which is to be manufactured here, namely broad hot-rolled strip.

We therefore opened discussions to determine how to arrange the programme of the Naples undertaking in such a way as to permit the essential restructuring of the old works while at the same time ensuring that the increase in production between now and 1984 would not affect the balance of output of this particular product within the Community.

On that basis we were able to deliver a favourable opinion of principle, provided that the conditions to which I have just referred could be met, i.e. a reduction of certain other production capacities in other plants belonging to the Italsider company and control over the increase in production of one particular product.

Mr Donnez. — (F) I am not satisfied with Mr Davignon's statement. Even when this project was in its early stages it was already the subject of keen controversy. Given the developments which are now expected, I think this project will be the subject of unanimous opposition from both employers and employees in the steel industry because it seems to me to be perfectly illogical. It is illogical to advocate restructuring of the European steel industry — through a reduction in production levels accompanied by an increase in unemployment now that it has been found that steel production exceeds our needs — while at the same time restructuring the Bagnoli works which will only aggravate the present situation. I would therefore like to know whether this project is included in the integrated operation concerning the Naples region. And if this project were to be completed and further restructuring in the European steel industry subsequently became necessary, how could we then avoid the conclusion that the Bagnoli works must be required to take the first steps in any subsequent restructuring before turning to other European works and, if I may say so, before thinking of Usinor?

Mr Davignon. — (F) There is at present a crude steel production facility in Bagnoli. As is the case elsewhere in the Community the infrastructures here are not adapted to the current situation. The percentage of production in Bagnoli forms part of the overall Community system. This plant is required to respect a quota just like everybody else. Is it reasonable to suggest that it should not improve its production capacity within the limits of that capacity? The answer is no. The problem which confronts us here is not that of steel but of the change in the type of product manufactured in the plant, leading to an increase in the production of coils. Is it possible to integrate this increase in coil production which is becoming a raw material, into the whole restructuring programme? Should it be postponed so as not to affect the situation existing in the other Member States? That has been our objective, and we think that we have attained it.

Mr Deleau. — (F) I, like Mr Donnez, am not at all satisfied with Mr Davignon's answer and I fully share the fears which have been expressed. I also consider Mr Davignon's answer to Mr Donnez's comments to be dangerous. We fully share the views of Mr Donnez and are convinced that restructuring at Bagnoli will only lead to a deterioration in the present situation of the European steel industry.

Mr Barbi. — (I) Does the Commissioner not think it appropriate to point out that this restructuring operation in Bagnoli will not only lead, as you rightly said to no increase in Italsider's steel production capacity in Italy but has also involved the abandoning by Italsider of its plan to create a new steel production centre in

Barbi

Calabria? The Bagnoli plant employs about 7 000 persons. It is technically obsolete and unless it is restructured and modernized 7 000 workers would be made redundant in the Naples area which is already experiencing the highest concentration of unemployment of the whole Community. There are 150 000 unemployed persons in the Naples area, a level which exceeds that of any other urban area in the Community.

President. — I would remind Members that they must ask questions and not make speeches.

Mr Davignon. — (*F*) I can only confirm that, taking the programme for the restructuring of the Italian steel industry as a whole, the cancellation of the fifth Bagnoli plant and the other changes which have been made will lead to a reduction of some 4 million tonnes in the envisaged production level.

Mr Bonaccini. — (*I*) I should be grateful if Commissioner Davignon could confirm that in the course of the negotiations with the Italian government and in the work of the *ad hoc* study group, measures were taken to phase certain consequences which this restructuring may well have.

Mr Davignon. — (*F*) The situation is as I have described it. We now have a basis for our work to continue. We must verify how these various conditions can be complied with by all parties to ensure that the restructuring is effective and brings greater security to all those involved in a difficult process of restructuring or adjustment.

Mr Dido. — (*I*) I share your views, Commissioner. However, it seems to me that the further verification of the conditions for implementation of the restructuring operation at Bagnoli has already taken place. I should therefore like to know when the Commission intends to deliver its final opinion so as to ensure that no more time is lost in implementing this project at Bagnoli which has already been approved by the Community.

Mr Davignon. — (*F*) I said that the Commission had delivered its opinion of principle in late May or early June. We are now verifying the implementing measures and not the principle; this involves no delay.

Mrs De March. — (*F*) In Denain and elsewhere, Commissioner, the Community's steel policy has always led to reductions in production capacity and we are now faced with an intolerable increase in unemployment. Does the Commission still think that a programmed reduction in employment and in produc-

tion capacity, accompanied by a policy of economic stagnation in each Member State, is a logical solution at a time when, in France for example, we are obliged to import increasing quantities of steel to meet our needs, with disastrous consequences for our balance of payments which is in deficit?

Mr Davignon. — (*F*) If the Commission's programme really were as Mrs De March has described it, I should of course be opposed to it. But that is not the case and I would remind you that the precise purpose of restructuring is to restore satisfactory production conditions. Action to ensure social solidarity is also essential if the conversion is to take place under the best possible conditions.

The entire range of action taken by the Commission is designed to restore the conditions for economic development and thus eliminate the cause of the difficulties now facing us.

Mrs Vayssade. — (*F*) I should like to return to another point in connexion with the restructuring operation in Italy: I refer to the Community's quota policy. During a hearing before the Committee on Social Affairs, I already asked you whether this policy was not leading to a kind of division of labour in the European steel industry, thus placing the French, and no doubt also the British, steel industry in a particularly difficult position.

I should like to know what plans there are in this area, because in France even modernized and restructured plants are being closed — I have in mind the Thionville blast furnaces and some facilities in Longwy; the underlying problem here was the quota policy. I should therefore like to know how this policy is being pursued between the Member States and how the wish of each Member State to have a steel industry to cover its own needs can be respected; this is certainly no longer the case in France where we are having to import steel.

Mr Davignon. — (*F*) It is obviously difficult to give a comprehensive answer during question time. I shall therefore concentrate on three essential points and apologize for not being able to speak at greater length.

The basic principle of our system is that, taking account of Community consumption and consumption in third countries, each Member State, i.e. groups of undertakings within the countries, retains its share of production as it was when the steel industry was functioning at full capacity. The French share, as it is calculated today, is in fact rather above average in comparison with the shares of other countries. The principles of solidarity and equity have therefore been directly and correctly applied.

Davignon

Secondly, it is not the Commission which determines the attitude of consortia or countries in relation to particular production sites. It is up to the industrialists, with or without state intervention, depending on the system under which these undertakings operate in the various countries, to define their best industrial strategy having regard to the general framework within which they have to operate and which provides them with certain safeguards.

Finally, imports into the Community have been regularly falling since 1977 when we introduced our system and since the balance of intra-community trade allows for respect for this system by all parties, we are now in a situation where trade in steel products should become more stable despite the difficult situation facing us today.

President. — As its author is absent, Question No 6 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 7 by Mrs Ewing (H-21/80):

Is the Commission aware that tests are being carried out to ascertain if simulated nuclear fuel containers can be recovered from the sea-bed in case of accident in connection with proposed carriage of plutonium from Caithness to Cumbria and will the Commission give its views of the risks involved to the environment and to public safety?

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) The Commission has not been informed of tests conducted to determine how simulated containers of fissile material dropped on to the sea-bed during the transport of plutonium from Caithness to Cumbria, can be raised again. With existing technical equipment such as caissons and miniature underwater vessels, it is already possible to raise containers used in the transport of plutonium from considerable depths. Even if a container were to remain on the sea-bed for an extended period, the environmental risk would be very small because the plutonium discharged into the sea water would be distributed over an extremely large volume of water and the resulting dilution would be such as to eliminate any possible damage to health.

Mrs Ewing. — I would like to inform the Commission that such tests did take place but did not succeed in recovering the simulated containers. Is the Commissioner aware how relevant the question of risks has become this last week in my constituency at Dounreay?

It has come to light that successive governments in the UK, from the period 1977 to 1980, have hidden from the public the fact that there were two explosions there and that two nuclear fuel rods have been, and still are,

missing. Does the Commission not think that Member States should not hide or misrepresent the facts to the citizenry? Would not the Commission therefore criticize any Member State such as the UK which has, through a government agency, hidden such vital information from the public over this period of three years? Is this not the very way in which public concern will be aroused if they know that the facts are being misrepresented?

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) It is clearly very difficult for the Commission to give a reasoned opinion, on the basis of the information which we have only just received, on the subject of attempts to raise containers of fissile material from great depth; we have no information as to whether such trials have failed as you suggest. I have already said that we have not been informed of this matter. I can only give the same answer to your second point about the concealment by the British government of information from the public. Were that the case the Commission would not approve. I can, however, say no more than that. I cannot comment on the substance of the question as to whether these events have actually taken place. Perhaps the Commission will be able to obtain more information.

President. — No, Mrs Ewing, I cannot give you the floor again.

Mr Seligman. — I think Mrs Ewing is referring to a very alarmist broadcast on British television last Monday, which blew up this incident on a much greater scale than is warranted by the disappearance of two small rods which weigh almost nothing and represent no particular danger because they contain impure plutonium.

(Cries from certain quarters on the left)

This was a biased broadcast and should not be pursued by this Parliament at the present juncture until it has been clarified. Is it not clear evidence of the enormous care that has been taken by the British Atomic Energy Authority that all these minute transactions are recorded and pursued? Is it not also true that they are taking great steps to simulate the remote possibility that a ship going on the short journey from Dounreay to Workington could capsize?

President. — I would remind Members once again that they must confine themselves to asking questions; otherwise I really do not see how the Commission can answer.

¹ See Annex.

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) I listened with great interest to the discussion between the two Members. However, you are quite right, Madam President, no questions were put to the Commission.

Mr Collins. — The first thing that occurs to me is that, although this is Question Time and normally the Commission would be expected to answer the questions, here we have the unprecedented spectacle of the Commission actually asking them. Is the Commission aware that I have written to them in the last week raising the question of Dounreay? I find it incredible that they should come along here today saying they know nothing at all about the incident. There is no doubt at all that public disquiet is due in no small measure to the fact that people seem either to be uninformed or else unwilling to give us an answer. In view of this public disquiet, Madam President, I wonder whether the Commission will tell us if they are satisfied with the procedures for keeping them informed on all aspects of plant safety, with the standards of the Euratom Inspectorate and with the relationship that they have with national nuclear agencies.

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) Unfortunately, I am not able to give a satisfactory reply to the Member's suggestion that his letter has not been answered and that he has already informed the Commission of this. I have heard mention of a television broadcast last Monday but I do not know if it was on the same matter that the honourable Member wrote to us. I am not in a position to answer. I hope that his letter has already reached the Commission, but I do not know. I cannot open every letter myself. Moreover, as you know, I am dealing here with a matter which does not really fall within my terms of reference and this complicates matters still further, especially as regards the transmission of letters.

As to the other point, the Euratom inspectors do indeed exercise control in this area. Up to now we have received no criticisms of their work in the Commission.

Safety at the place of work is of course another affair and it is not a matter for the Euratom inspectors. The necessary supervision is effected firstly by the national authorities. The national authorities have primary responsibility for industrial safety. The Council has adopted a programme on the basis of which certain areas will be covered by Community directives. In the Euratom context there is provision for control over safety at the workplace. Here too the Commission is responsible for supervisory measures, but in the specific instance to which the honourable Member referred we have received no complaints.

Mr Enright. — In view of the last answer given to us, is the Commission satisfied that during the absence of

Mr Brunner on an election campaign in West Germany serious matters like this are being properly attended to in the Commission. From the replies that we have received, it certainly does not seem so.

(Applause from certain quarters)

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) This matter was in fact referred to me in the absence of my colleague, Mr Brunner. I see Mr Davignon gesturing his impatience: yes, he is primarily responsible for Mr Brunner's portfolio. However, I would like to say this: this particular matter was only made public last Monday and you cannot now expect a clear answer from us. Moreover it seems to me that the matter which the honourable Member has raised is primarily one of supervision by the national authorities and we have received no information on this, at least not in my department for which I am responsible.

President. — Question No 8 by Mr Seal (H-142/80):

Has the Commission made any estimates of the likely effects on the United Kingdom textile industry of the entry of Portugal and Spain into the Community and what safeguard measures does the Commission intend to propose to protect U.K. textile industry from the likely disruptive effects of textiles from these countries?

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission — (F) Madam President, as the honourable Member knows we have a textile arrangement with Greece and we also have self-limitation agreements in respect of textile exports from Spain and Portugal. The situation regarding textile trade in this area is therefore perfectly clear for the present.

Once Portugal and Spain join the Community following the conclusion of the negotiations on their accession, we shall find ourselves in a transitional period which will be covered by a safeguard clause of the kind already incorporated into the Treaty of Accession with Greece. Article 130 enables the necessary measures to be taken if abnormal difficulties arise. The honourable Member will readily understand that the studies conducted by the Commission relate to the Community as a whole and not simply to the United Kingdom. The Commission's work covers the entire territory of the Community and the whole Common Market.

Mr Seal. — It always amazes me that when the Commissioner speaks in a global context he is obviously speaking of some overall plan, although we are constantly told that the Commission has no plan for textiles. I don't know how they can negotiate

Seal

accession treaties, or how they will be able to negotiate the next multifibre agreement, without some kind of overall plan. I would therefore ask the Commission whether they could organize some kind of European meeting, which would involve not only the trade unions and employers but representatives from Member State governments, in order to draw up some plan for trade in textiles for the EEC as a whole. I agree with the Commissioner: he has got to think in global terms for the whole EEC. Such a plan should incorporate guarantees for minimum levels of activity, minimum home markets for each Member State. I feel the situation now in the United Kingdom is such that if the industry there contracts any more, it will cease to be a viable industry at all.

Mr Davignon. — (*F*) It is wrong to claim that the Community and Commission lack an overall view. The honourable Member is confusing two different things: on one hand the definition of planning rules at national and regional level for the entire Community textile industry; clearly the Commission does not have the ability to do that and it would in any case not be a good method. Secondly, the definition in general terms of the Community's overall contribution to the balance of trade in the textile sector, i.e. to a balance between the developing and developed countries and balanced sacrifices by the industrialized countries. On this we do have a policy which is submitted to the Council of Ministers and discussed with all our partners; this removes the need for further conferences additional to the instruments already at our disposal to deal with these questions.

Finally, I must remind the honourable Member that the idea of preparing a programme to guarantee national producers a quota of each national market is by definition contrary to the idea of an integrated market embodied in the Rome Treaty and to that of the Customs Union.

Mr Welsh. — The Commissioner will no doubt be aware that in a fine example of inter-institutional cooperation the Commission accepted Parliament's amendments to their proposal for assistance to small and medium-sized businesses in Portugal. He will also know that one of those amendments was that the Commission should not seek to encourage industries in Portugal in which there was already an excess capacity in the Community as it exists.

Can the Commissioner now confirm that that provision which Parliament suggested will be honoured by the Commission in their accession negotiations and that they will not encourage small-business assistance in Portugal to be given to firms in the textile industry?

Mr Davignon. — (*F*) I would say that one aspect of our industrial consultations with the applicant coun-

tries — for which I am personally responsible — relates to the complementarity of their economies with ours. We do not want an even more difficult situation than that which exists at present to develop. I am quite sure the honourable Member was not implying that we should, as a matter of principle, prevent countries like Portugal and Spain from developing a fully competitive industry at their own level — simply to allow an industry which has ceased to be competitive in our countries to survive.

Mr Paisley. — As the Commissioner is well aware, the textile industry in Northern Ireland is reeling at the present time. His fellow-Commissioner visited the province and saw a factory that once employed 2 000 people and now only employs 350. In view of that, can he give any assurance to the remainder of the textile industry in Northern Ireland that he will cushion the blow that undoubtedly will fall when Spain and Portugal join the market?

Mr Davignon. — (*F*) The aim of the negotiations is to ensure that there is no such blow; we are now in the last quarter of 1980 and the date of accession still cannot be clearly defined: in any case it cannot be before the end of 1983 and then there will be an transitional period. The whole of our policy is designed to make use of this period to ensure that the development of industry in those countries does not come as a blow to the original members of the Community; we also want action to be taken in each country, region and industry to ensure that the necessary adjustments can take place — and this is perfectly feasible — without any increased risk and insecurity.

Miss Brookes. — As this question includes the question of protection, may I ask the Commissioner what plans he has to protect the production of acetate yarn in the United Kingdom from the US penetration of this product into EEC markets?

Mr Davignon. — (*F*) The honourable Member will agree that the subject of imports of man-made fibers from the United States has no bearing on our discussion of relations with the applicant countries. Having said that, I may add that in July we began discussions with the United States in order to determine quite clearly what the trade rules are which enable American industry to achieve such a high degree of penetration in Europe, particularly for the product to which he referred. At all events we were already able to establish in August that the situation is irregular. We have introduced provisional anti-dumping duties because there were distortions of trade. We are still holding talks with the Americans on the same products with a view to eliminating the cause of this problem and if that cause cannot be removed, and if our studies show

Davignon

that there are distortions, we shall then take the measures which we are allowed to take under the GATT rules.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — The Commissioner said that it is their job to decide what sacrifices must be made by the developed countries for the underdeveloped countries. — Yes, he did, and those are his precise words: I took them down. — Would he not consider that the massive redundancies that have already occurred in the European textile industry and the 70 000 workers, that are on short time in the textile industry in the UK alone are sufficient sacrifices, and will he make sure that if and when Portugal and Spain join the EEC they will take their fair share of imports from the underdeveloped countries under the Multi-Fibre Agreement, and that quotas are drawn up with this in mind and are also related to the size of the home market by means of a growth-recession clause in the MFA and bilaterals?

Mr Davignon. — (F) The next international multi-fibre arrangement has not yet been negotiated and we therefore do not know what clauses it will contain. Since the Community is itself party to the multi-fibre arrangement, the applicant countries will be subject to all the provisions of that arrangement as soon as they join the Community. They will therefore be placed on exactly the same footing as the other Community countries.

When I said that the Commission did have a specific position on textile policy, I simply meant that we should have to determine in the general context the balance of trade between the industrialized and developing countries. I made no judgement as to whether the present situation was satisfactory or unsatisfactory. This was merely one factor on our assessment of the situation.

Mr Enright. — Is it not true nevertheless that unless we have, as Mr Seal suggested, a coherent strategy for textiles within the Community, both Batley and Bangladesh will suffer because they cannot be certain of what plans we have? And is it not also the case that we bumble around for a year, because it is a year since we — Mr Seal and Mr Megahy and myself in a written question — brought up the whole question of the USA and energy, and that it has taken a full year to do this, whereas in the case of the Philippines it took a mere six weeks of threats?

Mr Davignon. — (F) I am being asked two questions. The first concerned the actual need for a multi-fibre arrangement and rules on such an arrangement to enable the developing countries to know what share they will have in potential exports to the Community. My answer is that we do need this. The second ques-

tion concerns the importance or otherwise of provisions in a multi-fibre arrangement enabling some of the least developed countries to gain access to our market, the idea being that the whole market should not be reserved for countries with a higher level of industrialization. My answer is again in the affirmative. The Community has therefore concluded a whole series of bilateral textile agreements — 56 or 58 I cannot remember the exact figure — to settle this matter and Bangladesh is included.

I totally reject the comparison drawn between the Philippines and the United States, implying that the Commission is brave in dealing with the weak and weak in dealing with the strong. The reason why the situation with the United States is so complex in the textile sphere is that the American manufacturers of synthetic fibres have access to the necessary raw material, i.e. oil and gas; this is a discriminatory situation because for 24 years there has been a double pricing system in the United States against which we began to protest one year ago for the first time. This question is extraordinarily difficult and complex because, as I understand it, there are 450 different regulations in the United States which have to be scrutinized if we are to determine whether competition is being distorted. That is why the negotiations are taking so long. The delay's due to the complexity and not to a lack of resolve to settle these problems.

President. — Question No 9 by Sir Fred Warner (H-320/80) (formerly 0-27/80):

Has the Commission been asked to attend either as participant or as observer? If not, would it not be advisable for the Commission to approach the U.N. authorities?

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) My answer to the question is no, for the simple reason that the United Nations Conference on the Elderly has indeed already been announced, but its secretariat has not yet been appointed. According to our information this will be done in the first half of 1981. Until then there can be no question of invitations. I am therefore unable to say whether we shall receive an invitation but I expect we shall.

Sir Fred Warner. — I realize the Commissioner's embarrassment, but I had hoped for some indication of his enthusiasm. We give a lot of consideration in this Parliament to youth, but, alas, we are all getting older, though some of us, if I may say so, like you, Madam President, do not show it. The fact remains that the average age of the population of Europe is increasing steadily and the care of the aged will become one of the major problems in our Europe in the very near future. Given the fact that we wish to see the members of the Community working towards a

Warner

common policy on social matters and common standards of support for the socially unfortunate, I very much hope that the Commission will keep its eyes on this question, and I should be grateful for the Commissioner's assurance that he will watch this matter and will seek to obtain an invitation for the Commission.

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) I too hope that the Commission will be invited to this conference as is the normal United Nations practice.

President. — Question No 10 by Mr Tyrrell (H-221/80):

What is the legality of the trade agreement between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in the light of the Council Decision of December 1973 on the Community's competence for trade agreements between Member States and a third state?

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DK) The agreement to which the honourable Member refers is defined as a cooperation agreement and not as a trade agreement. It is therefore based on the Council Decision of 22 July 1974 and not, as indicated in the question, on the Council Decision of December 1973.

The July 1974 decision stipulates, in a manner compatible with the 1973 decisions on the common commercial policy, that Member States may continue to conclude cooperation agreements which are defined as agreements to cooperate in the industrial and commercial sectors, through the exchange of patents, in transport etc. without specific commercial policy concessions or counterpart facilities.

To ensure continued respect for the Community's terms of reference in the matter of commercial policy and in other areas, the July 1974 decision stipulates that these cooperation agreements must be notified to the Commission and Council and may be made the subject of an inquiry or of consultations precisely in order to ensure that the agreements remain fully within the framework that I have tried to describe briefly and that was already outlined in more detail to Parliament in the written answer of 24 October 1979 to which I would refer you back, because the distinction between a cooperation agreement and a trade agreement may be rather vague in certain cases. The particular agreement to which the honourable Member referred in his question has been notified to the Community and was the subject of an inquiry conducted by the Community authorities; it was found to contain no provisions which conflicted with the terms of reference of the Community.

Mr Tyrrell. — I am surprised to hear the Commissioner say that the agreement has no implications for trade policy in view of the Council Decision of July 1974, which specifically provides that there should be notification and consultation in the case of such agreements, in particular those which may affect trade. So may I ask him whether he is satisfied that the consultation procedure was in fact fully complied with in this case and, if so, whether he has any proposals to make which would have the effect of deterring one Member State from taking unilateral action in economic, as distinct from trade, matters with the Soviet Union, thus undermining the Community's overall negotiating position?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) As I said in my introductory answer, this agreement was notified to the Community institutions for investigation by the Commission and Council to enable the Commission and the Member States to ensure that the agreement contained no specific provisions on trade or other matters which might conflict with the common commercial policy of the Community. The inquiry procedure has been completed and it was found that the agreement contained nothing which conflicted with Community commercial policy.

President. — Since their authors are absent, Questions Nos 11 and 13 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 14 by Mr Boyes (H-252/80):

Will the Commission state the grade of the highest placed woman within the Commission/Council/Parliament? Does the Commission think this is a satisfactory situation and is the Commission convinced that women are given equal opportunity with men within the framework of the present staff selection/advancement programme?

Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission. — (NL) The most senior position now occupied by a woman in the Commission is in Grade A 2. There are three women who hold that grade; two officials and one temporary servant. Unfortunately the Commission does not have information of this kind for the Council or Parliament. In the case of Parliament, I would imagine that the honourable Member can easily obtain the information for himself.

A good number of questions have already been asked on this subject in the past and on previous occasions we already expressed a hope that the situation which I have no hesitation in describing as unsatisfactory could be improved. I would refer you to my answer to Question No 1947/79 by Lady Elles: Mrs Dahlerup also put a similar question when she was a Member of Parliament and we answered it. I would refer you to Questions 750/78 and 3/79 for full documentation.

¹ See Annex.

Vredeling

The Commission is convinced that the procedure which it applies for the recruitment and promotion of staff does in itself guarantee completely equal chances for men and women. However, because of the unsatisfactory situation to which I referred a moment ago, we are now arranging for a report to be compiled by an internal working party which will investigate the whole problem of equal treatment of men and women in the Commission secretariat. The Commission will then determine whether changes are called for in the light of that report, for example in relation to the publicity given to notices of general competition. The matter is therefore in hand at present.

Mr Boyes. — It is some consolation that the Commissioner at least says that some members of his staff are working on the problem. But there is little consolation in an EEC that cannot satisfactorily solve the biggest problem facing it, namely, growing unemployment. It is a fact of life that, amongst the unemployed, one of the groups that is suffering most, and always continues to do so, are women. The fact that the Commission is looking into it and aware of the problems is not sufficient.

I think they have to expedite some reports. They have got to come forward quickly with some solutions not only to the problem of unemployment amongst women but to the problem of unemployment as a whole. However, with regard to unemployment among women my specific question is; is the Commission, in drawing up this report, considering positive discrimination in favour of women during the selection processes?

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) My answer to that is in the affirmative. I recall that we have discussed the question of age limits in the Commission. In certain cases the age limit may in effect be discriminatory against women, especially when it is set at about 30. This matter too has been referred to our working party and I shall say no more now. Their report will deal too with the subject of positive discrimination.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (I) I was unable to be in the Chamber when my question was being discussed because I was tabling amendments at the time. However, this question by Mr Boyes gives me an opportunity to make my point: does the Commission not think that there is extremely serious discrimination when female participants in competitions or persons who have passed such competitions are subjected to questioning in order to determine whether they are married or engaged to be married? It may then happen — as in a case to which I shall shortly draw your attention — that women who have passed a competition and have had their names placed on the reserve list are advised not to say that they are married or, if they are married, to state that they intend to divorce. I

consider that this procedure constitutes a serious infringement of the principle of equality and above all a serious attack on the dignity of women. Can Commissioner Vredeling tell us whether he is aware of this discrimination in the Commission's departments?

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) I am astonished by what the honourable Member has just said. I know nothing whatever about this. If there is any truth in her assertions I should like the cases to be brought to my attention because they are quite unacceptable. Candidates must not be asked questions of this kind and if they are, then I would hope that the honourable Member will inform me.

Mr Welsh. — Would the Commissioner accept that positive discrimination in terms of jobs for women is not necessarily in the best interests of the Community, because what we want is, surely, for the Commission to be staffed by people who are best able to do the job in question, irrespective of sex, religion, race, or anything else. The idea of having a quota for women is just about as ridiculous as having a quota for people with red hair! Could we perhaps forget these questions of positive discrimination and concentrate on getting an effective bureaucracy?

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) I agree completely with that, Madam President. There is a great difference between positive discrimination and fixing a particular quota. By positive discrimination I understand discrimination adapted to the special position of women. I referred just now to the age limit. If you say that a person over the age of 30 or 28, for example, cannot be recruited this does not constitute discrimination in the legal sense, but does amount to de facto discrimination because women around the age of 28 often have to remain at home to bring up their children. I should therefore not have any objection to positive discrimination in the sense of allowing women over the age of 30 to participate in competitions. There is no question of fixing a quota and the comparison with the quota for people with red hair is totally groundless. There seems to be some kind of fear that men will suffer if we try to put an end to discrimination against women in the unfavourable sense of the term.

Mrs Clwyd. — Perhaps the Commissioner would like to look into what is clearly a case of discrimination in the current issue of the Official Journal, in which there is a job description for an English-language interpreter. I counted at least 20 'he s' and not one mention of 'she'. Quite clearly, that job description only applies to men, and no women are intended to apply for the job. Perhaps he could look into that particular case which appears in the current issue of the Official Journal?

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) I am perfectly prepared to look into that matter carefully. If something is wrong it will have to be put right.

Mr Marshall. — As many women who go out to work want to do part-time rather than full-time work and as many private employers find it very convenient to employ such ladies on a part-time basis, would the Commission be willing to consider employing more part-time rather than full-time staff?

Mr Vredeling. — (NL) Relatively speaking, the Commission is already doing a great deal in this respect. Many women are employed on a part-time basis at the Commission. I would imagine that there are more than in the case of an average employer. But there are of course limits and it is not always possible to meet requests of this kind. I would refer you to a study which we have conducted on the subject of part-time work and which will shortly be examined by the standing Committee on Employment. This study will also be forwarded to Parliament so that we can discuss the matter in rather more detail on the basis of a document. For women too part-time work is sometimes a two-edged sword. I do not wish to go into this further because question time is not the right occasion to do so, but it is a fact that part-time work may also be against the interests of women.

President. — Question No 15 by Mr Seligmann (H-260/80):

What steps is the Commission taking to ensure that Member States are linked into the French and German national programmes for direct broadcasting spacecraft and the L-SAT programme of the European Space Agency, so that European space interests are not divided on the world scene and in the world market?

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) I should like to make three remarks. Firstly, we must be clear on one point: the convention setting up the space agency stipulated that the text applied to cooperation between European countries. Therefore the Community has no powers in the space sector. This sector was obviously not included in the Treaty of Rome because at the time when the Treaty was drafted, activities of this kind did not exist. Subsequently the countries created a structure outside the European Community, probably in order to cover a larger number of states because at the time the Community only had six members. That is a fact which must be born in mind.

My second point is this: the relationship which exists between space activities and industrial cooperation is clearly such that the Community, and in particular the Commission, is responsible for ensuring firstly that the resources of the Community are utilized to the best possible effect and secondly that the Community is not

placed at a disadvantage in terms of technology, the marketing of technologies and competition at world level. That is why the Commission has devoted a substantial part of its document on technologies of the future to this particular subject.

That brings me to my third and last remark: we are at present in what may be described as a pre-operational situation. The projects which now exist do not yet have any immediate and direct commercial spin-off. The countries which are developing these projects, either the space project or the bilateral Franco-German project, are doing so to gain a mastery over the relevant technologies and not yet to implement those technologies. But when we do reach the stage of implementation, a whole range of juridical and technical problems will arise and here standardization at European level will obviously be of interest. It will be essential if we want a sufficient market to exist for these technologies; we shall have to start with a domestic market in order to be in a position to propose these technologies to other countries later on.

Mr Seligman. — I thank the Commissioner for that very interesting reply. He says that the Community has no power to intervene in space matters. But if a satellite is used for TV broadcasts it will be handling cultural and advertising material, thereby making it a commercial matter. I think it is most important that the Community should get involved as soon as possible. Would it not be possible for the German and French satellites to be beamed to the rest of the Community so that we can share the cultural value of these broadcasts? If not, can we have a start on a Community satellite to provide European coverage for this sort of cultural and commercial material?

Mr Davignon. — (F) It is not possible to give specific answers to that question because the possible coverage of broadcasts of this kind depend on the technology which is used. Of course that is not the fundamental point made in Mr Seligman's question. He is interested rather in knowing whether we consider it necessary to conduct a series of exploratory conversations with industrialists and national authorities to prepare ourselves for a situation which will arise in the future. I can confirm to the honourable Member that this is what we are trying to do from the industrial angle, i.e. from the angle of the creation of an adequate basic industrial infrastructure and from that of further infrastructures at user level: all this is very important if we are to gain full control over these technologies. Secondly, we are surveying all the problems which will arise once the new technologies are brought into use so as to obtain, for both juridical and cultural reasons, a clearly defined situation within the Community and so as to be able to put forward ideas for further consideration by the interested parties — it is our intention to work on those lines.

President. — Question No 16 by Mr Christopher Jackson (H-358/80, formerly 0-33/80):

When Community regulations relating to inspection or control of agricultural or fishing products are being applied by Member States, does the Commission have a duty to check

1. that such regulations are being properly applied and
2. that the application is fair and equal as between the different Member States?

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DK) Article 155 of the Treaty stipulates that the Commission has a duty to make sure that the provisions of the Treaty are applied. It follows from that stipulation that the controlling function of the Commission includes a duty to examine whether rules or provisions laid down by the Community are uniformly applied in all the Member States. These rules naturally apply in full to the regulations concerning inspection and control of agricultural and fishery products, i.e. the two domains to which the honourable Member's question refers. The budgetary and personnel resources available to the Commission for this purpose are limited and we have to decide on priorities in effecting our controls; the list of priorities is headed by the areas which are of greatest economic or budgetary importance to the Community. However, this implies that certain sectors which are not without importance cannot always be controlled as rapidly as the Commission might feel desirable. I hope that this state of affairs will be remedied in future through a joint effort by the Community institutions, including the Parliament.

Mr C. Jackson. — I am grateful to the Commissioner for the tone of his reply which indicates the possibility of progress in a really very important matter. Clearly the Parliament has do its part in relation to the budget, but is the Commissioner aware that considerable anti-Community feeling is generated when our citizens feel, as they do all too often, that one country or another gains an unfair advantage through different, lax or improper application of Community rules? Following from this, would the Commissioner agree that it is the positive duty of the Commission to institute checks even beyond those which his currently limited budgetary powers permit? To give one specific example, I would like the Commission to investigate the reports that some countries are permitting under-sized herrings to be landed, some say disguised as mackerel. If this is true, would the Commission agree to investigate it, as it could ruin the vital efforts to allow North Sea herring stocks to recover?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) I agree entirely with the general position of the honourable Member. There is a very important task for the Commission here. The functioning of the Community depends on confidence being felt in all the Member States that the Community

rules are applied completely uniformly by its institutions in all the Member States. This is not always easy and frequently raises considerable problems, as is apparent from the difficulty in developing the Community further in various directions. The Commission acts within the limit of its possibilities. I could mention a report which we are at present preparing for the Parliament and Council about the different ways in which the Member States apply the rules relating to poultry — obviously an extremely important economic sector.

(Laughter)

But I am most grateful to the honourable Member for highlighting the fishery situation. The fact is that one of the problems which are making the conclusion of a common fisheries policy by the end of this year difficult, is that the rules which have already been adopted or the rules laid down on the basis of a gentlemen's agreement are in practice not applied uniformly by the different Member States. Some countries continue to catch greater quantities of fish than it had been agreed they should, while the rules for the protection of fish on which agreement has been reached — and let us not forget that decisions have already been taken on a whole series of fishery problems — are not implemented uniformly.

Against the background of these divergencies, the Commission has sought to introduce a better system of reporting by the Member States so that we can intervene if irregularities occur and to ensure respect for the rules which will result from the adoption of a common fishery policy by the end of the year.

Mr Patterson. — I wonder if I might join my colleague from Kent in bringing to the Commission's attention another example. Is the Commission satisfied with existing controls on the marketing of apples in the Community? To what extent is he aware that apples below Grade 2 are on sale in the Community, thus contributing to the problems of surpluses and the cost of intervention? I noted that the Commissioner emphasized his shortage of staff, but he also said they were concentrating on essential matters. Does he view the market in apples as one of these essential areas?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) Yes, we did consider that apples were a matter for priority in the spring of this year when there were temporary problems on the apple market. As we have seen in our earlier discussions this evening there are many difficulties facing us but, in the entire fruit and vegetables sector, an essential condition for the maintenance of market balance is respect for quality standards and I willingly agree that quality standards for fruit and vegetables should be made a matter of priority.

Mr Provan. — I think the Commissioner is trying to be very helpful this afternoon on this subject. I am sure he realizes that in the United Kingdom at the moment we have a severe complication in the beef market where grading and acceptance standards seem to be extremely high compared with other Community Member States. Can he offer any assistance in securing rationalization within the Community to achieve convergence of grading and acceptance standards for intervention?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) I have good reason to give an affirmative answer to that question. In my opinion one defect of the European meat market has been the extremely wide difference in quality standards including the quality standards applied by the intervention agencies. Last May the Council decided, on a proposal from the Commission and in connection with the agricultural prices for 1980-81, to draw up Community quality standards which should be implemented in time for the next production year and the work which followed from that decision is proceeding according to the plan.

President. — As its author is absent, Question No 17 will be answered in writing.¹

Question No 18 by Mr Michel (H-289/80):

In view of the provisions of Article 37 of the Euratom Treaty in conjunction with the European Parliament's resolution (Doc. 145/77) on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 506/76) for a regulation concerning the introduction of a Community consultation procedure in respect of power stations likely to affect the territory of another Member State, and in view of the requirements set out by the European Parliament in the own-initiative report (Doc. 392/75) on the conditions for a Community policy on the siting of nuclear power stations, taking account of their acceptability for the population, together with the statement by Commissioner Brunner to the European Parliament on 16 March 1979 in answer to the oral question by Mr Vandewiele, Mr Bertrand, Mr Dewulf, Mr Noé and others (Doc. 657/78), can the Commission of the European Communities explain why it is no longer in any way involved in the siting and monitoring of nuclear and other power stations in border areas within the Community?

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) I hope that the honourable Member will not mind me saying that his view that the Commission is no longer taking any action in this sector is exaggerated and incorrect. Let me remind you of the true situation: as long ago as 1976 we made proposals on this subject because when you consider the nature of Community problems, it is apparent that problems at internal frontiers assume particular importance. We found that the

Council has deprived our proposal of some of its substance: we proposed Community consultations and in November 1978, two years later, the Council merely accepted an exchange of information. We have nevertheless used this as a basis and held a whole series of meetings with experts appointed by the Member States and we shall be submitting to the Council, and thus to Parliament, before the end of this year, the report compiled after all these contacts with all these experts. On a matter of this importance and sometimes with a lack of goodwill on the part of the Member States, you must understand that the time taken over this is not excessive.

To begin with, the Council did not even wish to discuss the second part of the Commission's proposal concerning a Community consultation procedure for the siting of nuclear power stations liable to affect the territory of a different Member State. We returned to the attack on 17 May 1979 with a new explanatory memorandum and, since early this year, this matter has been entered on the agenda of all the meetings of the Council's technical bodies: there is due to be a further such meeting in the Council tomorrow. As regards the desirability of submitting a further proposal at this stage, I should like to say that the Commission is not ready to do so and I do not think it would be a good idea. Why? Because it is self-evident that if we submit to the Council a further proposal it will have an additional alibi for not looking into the matter and will immediately suspend its consideration of the matters now under examination over which it is experiencing such great difficulty.

In this context too the Presidency has put forward proposals concerning the forms of consultation. That is the exact position at present. The Commission is initiating action, as it is required to do, with stubborn persistence.

Mr Michel. — (F) If I have understood his answer correctly, Commissioner Davignon is referring us to the Council and to the various representations made by the Commission to that body on this extremely important matter. It seems to me then that this question should be addressed to the Council rather than to the Commission since the answer we heard a moment ago had already been given previously to other Members of the Parliament who put questions to the Commission on this important matter.

Has the Commission been informed of the results of the public inquiry which has been held in certain frontier regions, more specifically the inquiries arranged by the French authorities in the Franco-Belgian frontier regions of Chooz and Givet? If so what does the Commission think of this information? If not, does it intend to ask for further details and bring them to the attention of Parliament?

¹ See Annex.

Mr Davignon. — (*F*) The Commission is not looking for an escape route in this affair. I have simply reported on the action which we are taking to prevent any ambiguity about our objectives. Since we are not the legislative body in this situation, I can only report on our proposal while at the same time indicating the importance we attach to it and the persistence of our efforts: the decision is taken by other authorities.

As regards notification of the public inquiry about nuclear power stations to be established on the frontier we are holding discussions with the French authorities on this matter. In the light of the papers which I have in front of me, I would hesitate to say that we have been informed of the results of the public inquiry in the same way as the French authorities: I do not think that is so. We are discussing the substance of the matter and to the extent that we are not satisfied by the information given to us, we shall use the possibilities afforded to us by the Treaty to ask for further details. In the general report which we shall prepare and to which I alluded in the first part of my reply, we shall mention this aspect and Parliament will be informed. It is not for us to divulge internal reports in public if the authorities of the country concerned do not agree; that consideration does not apply to the information contained in this report.

Mrs Weber. — (*D*) I should like to put two questions to the Commission. We all agree how difficult the consultation procedure is. We have already discussed the matter in Parliament and our predecessors discussed it too without making progress. I think that Mr Michel's question referred specifically to the following point: why does the Commission not make use of the possibilities open to it under Article 37 of the Euratom Treaty. When the Member States set up industrial plants or power stations they are required to inform the Commission, and the Commission has an obligation to obtain such information. Last week in an answer to a written question the Commission stated that the French government had not complied with this requirement to supply information in the case of the nuclear power station at Cattenom.

My second question is as follows: does the Commission not also feel that these problems of trans-frontier cooperation are the focal points of European construction by which the population can determine whether cooperation within the European Communities functioning effectively?

Mr Davignon. — (*F*) I shall answer those two questions very briefly. On the first, it is self-evident that if the Commission feels that the information received by it is not sufficient in relation to its obligations, it will then do all that is necessary to apply the treaty provisions since the Commission itself is responsible for implementation of the Treaty. There can be no doubt about that. The point really is to determine — and this

is a subjective point which creates real difficulties — whether this information, without being precise, is sufficient for us to be able to judge whether the siting of a particular nuclear facility is liable to create more difficulties than alternative sites. That is the heart of the discussion — which also takes place in Parliament about the procedures for this inter-state cooperation.

We therefore agree on the principles. As to the determination of what exactly must be made known, we shall take steps to see that the provisions are applied. It must, however, be realized that there is no jurisprudence in this area and no precise rules; this complicates matters. It does not make the situation impossible but does render it less clear than in other areas.

Secondly, does the possibility or impossibility of cooperating in this area influence the way in which public opinion perceives such cooperation at European level? It does, and that is why the Commission is continuing its efforts to create the necessary cooperation and to lead us out of a situation of mutual distrust which characterizes cooperation in this area today.

Mrs Vayssade. — (*F*) I come from Lorraine and wanted to put the question about Cattenom which has in fact just been put. I should simply like more precise indications now about the countries which are at present preventing genuine policy coordination and trans-frontier cooperation within the Council.

Mr Davignon. — (*F*) The situation in the Council is not simple and I cannot say that the whole problem is held up by one particular country only.

There was some dispute initially as to whether the Commission should give opinions on the repercussions of the installation of a nuclear facility in one place rather than another against the background of trans-frontier cooperation, because there are no uniform norms or rules within the Community on this as yet. We seem to be in the middle of a ping-pong game at present when it comes to European cooperation; we hear it said that since there are no norms there can be no cooperation, and since there is no cooperation no norms can be defined. That game can go on for a long time but it seems to me rather sterile. This then is an initial difficulty on which several delegations have commented.

There is a second position which results from the first and consists in saying that in the absence of Community-level cooperation, the emphasis should shift to bilateral cooperation between the states concerned by the construction of a nuclear power station and between those states only, with or without the possibility of appealing to the Community if those bilateral consultations do not bring results. The discussions in the Council are continuing around those two ideas and some delegations are more enthusiastic than

Davignon

others. Among the less enthusiastic delegations there is one which speaks the language in which you put your question to me and in which I have answered you.

(Laughter)

President. — The first part of Question Time is closed.¹

15. *Urgent procedure*

President. — I have received three motions for resolutions with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure:

- from Mr Glinne and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the crisis in the European fishing industry (Doc. 1-382/80 rev.)
- from Mr Vergès and others, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on Community aid

¹ See Annex.

measures to the departments of Guadeloupe and Martinique, victims of Hurricane Allen (Doc. 1-384/80),

- from Mr Fanti and others, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the relationship between the EEC and the new regime in power in Bolivia (Doc. 1-385/80).

The reasons supporting these requests are contained in the documents themselves.

I shall consult Parliament on these requests for urgent debate at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

16. *Agenda for next sitting*

President. — The next sitting will be held tomorrow Tuesday, 16 September at 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. with the following agenda:

- Decisions on urgent procedure
- Ferrero report on world hunger.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 7.35 p.m.)

ANNEX

Commission action on opinions delivered by the European Parliament at the July part-Session

1. As agreed with the Bureau, the Commission informs Members at the beginning of each part-Session of the action it has taken on opinions adopted by Parliament in response to consultation at the previous part-Session.
2. At its July part-Session Parliament delivered 9 opinions in response to Council requests for consultation.
3. At the same part-Session it debated the following 4 reports on which it gave opinions in favour or did not request formal amendments:
 - report by Mr Giumarra on a proposal with reference to the importation of fresh lemons;
 - report by Mrs Hoff on a proposal for a Decision on contributions to the ECSC from the General Budget;
 - report by Mr von Wogau on five proposals for approximation of laws, on rear-view mirrors, building-site equipment, textile names, electrical mining equipment and monitoring of biodegradability;
 - proposal for temporary abandonment and permanent abandonment premiums in respect of certain wine-growing areas and premiums for not replanting.
4. In 4 cases it called on the Commission to alter its proposal pursuant to Article 149/2 of the Treaty and passed amendments; in one case it threw out a proposal.

At the debates on the

- report by Mr Buttafuoco on a proposal for support for transport infrastructure projects of Community interest,
- report by Mr Gautier on four proposals with reference to fishing in Faroese, Swedish, Norwegian and Greenland waters,

the Commission explained to the House its reasons for wishing to leave the proposals as they stood.

On the following proposals the state of play is as follows:

- report by Mr Colleselli on a proposal for statistical surveys on wine-growing areas:
 - the Commission incorporated Parliament's suggested amendment and the proposal was adopted by the Council in July;
- report by Mr von Wogau on a proposal for special Community certification procedure for manufactures from third countries:
 - the Commission will be submitting the amendments accepted by it in the documents under discussion in the Council;
- report by Mr de Ferranti on a proposal for the approximation of laws on motorized handling trucks:
 - as the Commission has explained, it prefers to stick to its proposal, but bearing in mind that it and Parliament have the same ends in view it may consider Parliament's desired alterations later, according as matters proceed.

*

* *

The Commission takes this opportunity to inform Parliament of the following disaster aid it has provided:

- (a) emergency aid of 800 000 EUA was granted to Belgium on 3 September 1980 for the victims of the flooding on 20 July in several parts of the country;
- (b) at its meeting on 10 September the decision was taken to grant France emergency aid of 700 000 EUA for the victims of Hurricane Allen in Martinique and Guadeloupe;

(e) in response to applications for aid from States also hit by Hurricane Allen the Commission has granted

300 000 EUA to Jamaica,
 300 000 EUA to St Lucia,
 300 000 EUA to St Vincent and the Grenadines,
 300 000 EUA to Dominica,
 50 000 EUA to Barbados.
 and 400 000 EUA for Haiti.

Fuller particulars have been given to Parliament regarding the budget headings to which the sums so furnished are chargeable.

Questions which could not be answered during Question Time, with written answers

Question No 3, by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-266/80)

Subject: Discrimination against women in competitions organized by the EEC

Can the Commission explain what criteria are used for recruiting Community officials from reserve lists for competitions, as successful female candidates are often surreptitiously discriminated against, in flagrant violation of the directive on equality?

Answer

After a competition has been held, a list of candidates suitable for appointment is drawn up by the Commission's secretariat. This list remains valid for a specific period which can be extended and the Commission's departments choose candidates from the list in accordance with their needs for new staff and the vacancies which they have to fill. The Commission is not aware of any discrimination by its secretariat against women candidates but, if the Honourable Member has evidence of any specific cases of discrimination, I am perfectly prepared to look into them.

*

* *

Question No 6, by Mr Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berleburg (H-336/80) (formerly O-25/80)

Subject: Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea

- having regard to the efforts made by the Commission to establish in good time and by the normal procedure the Community's position on those aspects of the international law of the sea which fall within its competence, and given their failure;
- regretting the continued inadequate progress made by the Commission in fostering coordination among the Member States of the European Community with regard to the exploitation of the sea, and likewise emphasizing that the extended national sovereign rights to the sea can be safeguarded only if Community law is fully implemented;
- concerned at the lack of efforts by the Commission to keep under constant review the negotiations and agreements of the Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea, establishing international law, from the point of view of their economic implications and of all aspects having a bearing on the common policies, and to draw conclusions from them for Community policy;

I request the Commission to answer the following questions:

1. What benefit does the Commission intend to derive, for a Community resources policy, from the extension — based on agreements of the Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea and already to be regarded as a law of custom in international law — of national sovereign territory to the sea?

2. What is preventing the Commission now from treating the seas of the European Community in the same way as the mainland — in particular as regards the application of the right of establishment not only to the common fisheries policy, but beyond that to the exploration and exploitation of the mineral resources of the continental shelf?

Answer

1. There are considerable benefits for the Community from the extension of territorial waters. Since its resolution of 3 November 1976, the Council of the European Communities has accepted the extension of Member States' fishing limits to 200 miles from their coasts in the North Sea and North Atlantic. The creation of these fishing zones by the Member States has allowed a number of agreements to be negotiated between the Community and non-member States which have increased the benefits to Member States of the Community from marine activities in areas which would otherwise fall within the sovereignty of all the States in the international community. The 200-mile zone is also being studied in research and development programmes in the raw materials field.

This extension of sovereignty to 200 miles from the coasts of Member States of the Community will clearly assist the implementation of a common policy for Community supplies.

2. The Commission wishes to point out once more that it regards the Member States' right to exercise sovereignty in relation to the exploration and exploitation of the mineral resources of the continental shelf as subject to the provisions of the Treaty. Various provisions of Community law, such as directives and regulations, apply to this sphere.

*

* *

Question No 11, by Mr Remilly (H-237/80)

Subject: Recycling of old paper and cardboard

Having recently proposed measures to encourage the recycling of used paper and cardboard, how does the Commission intend to ensure the implementation of these recommendations within its own services?

Answer

I would refer the Honourable Member to the Commission's reply to Question No 1268/79 by Mr Adam. Some 35 % of the printing and writing paper used by the Commission is recycled paper. The Commission has a contract with a specialized firm which collects waste paper and board and sends it for recycling.

*

* *

Question No 13, by Mr van Aerssen (H-246/80)

Subject: Chair in transfrontier law studies at the Twente Technical University

Is the Commission prepared to cooperate with the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany in creating a chair in transfrontier law studies at the Twente Technical University as a model for research at European level?

Answer

The Commission welcomes initiatives such as that referred to by the Honourable Member to create a chair in transfrontier law studies at the Twente Technical University.

As part of its action programme in the field of education, the Commission is seeking to develop in cooperation with the Committee on Education links between establishments of higher education in the Member States to encourage common courses of study which would allow for greater mobility

among students and schoolchildren. To this end the Commission has set up a programme of grants for which all institutes of higher education in the Community are eligible to assist the implementation of common courses of study.

On an extremely modest scale, the Commission is also able to provide subsidies to European institutes of higher education wishing to add a European dimension to their activities. As the funds allocated for this purpose are severely limited they would not be sufficient to endow a chair with the recurrent expenditure which this implies but the Commission might possibly be able to make a small one-off contribution to this project. In this way the Community could express its support for such an extension of European law studies.

The Commission is, however, unable either as part of its education action programme or by making use of other appropriations in the Community budget to organize the endowment of a chair in the manner which the Honourable Member proposes.

*

* *

Question No 17, by Mrs Lizin (H-284/80)

Subject: Aid to the Belgian Iron and Steel Industry

Can the Commission say how the loans granted under Article 54 to the Belgian iron and steel industry, totalling 11 000 million have been allocated to the various undertakings, and can it give the reasons for this apportionment?

Answer

During the last few months, a number of firms in the Belgian iron and steel industry have notified the Commission under Article 54 of investments for major programmes and requested loans in relation to a number of these.

In the majority of cases, the firms concerned have been given a reasoned opinion pursuant to Article 54 within the framework of the general objectives of the steel industry and these opinions have been brought to the attention of the Belgian Government.

The Commission has taken account of a wide range of both financial and economic considerations in each case. When considering these programmes in terms of the general objectives, the Commission has attached particular importance to their contribution towards a lasting return to competitiveness and better balance between production and envisaged demand.

In the case of some projects, the Commissions decided that it was unable to deliver an opinion without additional information which the firms concerned have been asked to supply.

*

* *

Question No 19, by Miss Quin (H-293/80)

Subject: Regional Development Fund and Social Fund

Can the Commission confirm reports that there have been insufficient applications for suitable schemes from Member States to warrant a significant increase in commitments under the ERDF and Social Fund?

Answer

Over the past five years the number of applications for aid from the Social Fund and the Regional Fund have not been such as to suggest that an increase in commitment appropriations was necessary. In the case of the Social Fund the amount of aid requested was considerably higher than the available appropriations i.e. approximately 80 % higher in 1980 as against 60 % in 1979. The applications for aid from the Regional Fund exceeded the quotas of the Member States; one Member State with a

small quota formed an exception to this. However, since the system of quotas enables the Member States to know *a priori* what their share will be, the gap between the amount of aid requested and the appropriations available was much less than in the case of the Social Fund.

*
* *

Question No 20, by Mr Balfé (H-295/80)

Subject: Food aid to Somalia

In the Autumn of 1979 it was decided to grant food aid to Somalia. It has recently been reported in Britain that this food aid has not yet been distributed.

In view of the continuing starvation and deprivation in this country, can the Commission make an urgent statement on the current position, and give an assurance that this food aid will be speedily distributed?

Answer

From the end of 1979, long before the refugee problem assumed its present dimension and following appeals from the Government and a number of international organizations, the Community allocated and delivered large quantities of food aid to Somalia.

Deliveries began at the end of 1979 and have continued at regular intervals in 1980.

From the end of 1979, 12 609 tonnes of cereals, 2 530 tonnes of skimmed milk powder and 800 tonnes of butteroil have been delivered and distributed to the refugees and the local population; 20 309 tonnes of cereals, 3 780 tonnes of skimmed milk powder and 1 675 tonnes of butteroil are in the process of being delivered or are scheduled to be delivered and distributed towards the end of the year.

Delivery times have been fixed, where possible, in accordance with the dates requested by the beneficiaries and the arrival of aid from other donors.

The services of the Commission recently sent a fact-finding visit to look into the use being made of our food aid.

During that visit it was found that our aid actually reached the stricken population and made a major contribution in saving the refugees from starving.

However, it became clear that better coordination of international aid was needed. To this end, the UNHCR and the WFP, which are responsible for coordinating all refugee aid in Somalia with the cooperation of local authorities, recently reorganized and increased their staff on the spot.

In addition to food aid, the Community has decided to grant special aid amounting to 12·4 m EUA (10 m EUA of which would be channelled through the UNHCR) to cover other refugee needs.

*
* *

Question No 21, by Mr Davern (H-298/80)

Subject: Export refunds for Irish beef

Can the Commission state what progress was made at the EEC's Beef Management meeting of 20 June 1980 which was due to discuss the arrangements for exporting beef to the US under GATT rules and in particular the low level of export refunds applied on shipments to the US?

Answer

I can inform the honourable Member that at the request of the Irish delegation on the Management Committee for Beef the Commission decided in June to increase from 1 month to 2 months the period between the slaughtering of the animals and clearance of the beef through customs for export¹ to the USA.

The result of this amendment, which removed a serious barrier to exports, together with the improved market situation in the USA, is that applications have been received for export licences for quantities in excess of that for which the refund of 107 ECU/kg is applicable.

*

* *

Question No 22, by Mr Bocklet (H-302/80)

Subject: Compulsory origin marking of textiles and clothing

Does the Commission agree that French Regulation No 79-750 of 29 August 1979 on the introduction of compulsory origin marking for certain textile and clothing products and the implementing administrative provisions of 3 June 1980 represent a major obstacle to the free movement of goods, thereby infringing Article 30 of the EEC Treaty? What steps does the Commission intend to take to secure the withdrawal of this requirement by the French Government?

Answer

As it indicated in reply to written questions (577/79 by Mr Glinne, 116/79 by Mr Sassano and Mr Lima and 1451/79 by Mr De Clercq) the Commission has instituted the procedure provided for in Article 169 of the EEC Treaty for infringements of Articles 30 et seq. of the Treaty.

At the COREPER meeting of 24. 7. 1980, the Commission announced its intention of presenting a proposal for a directive on origin marking for textile products to the Council before 30. 9. 1980; this would obviate the necessity for national measures.

*

* *

Question No 23, by Mr Gautier (H-304/80)

Subject: Industrial use of micro-organisms which have been changed by genetic engineering

The provisions currently applicable to work on recombinant DNA in the Community Member States specify a maximum container volume of 10 litres. Progress in this discipline has been such that the large-scale application in industry or agriculture of micro-organisms which have undergone genetic engineering appears imminent. What steps does the Commission intend to take to ensure that safety regulations in industry and agriculture prevent any risk to human health and the environment, and to block investments in Member States with the least stringent safety requirements?

Answer

There are two aspects to the Honourable Member's question, namely the hypothetical risk from organisms which have been changed by genetic engineering and secondly the relatively widespread use of these organisms in industry and agriculture.

As far as the risk is concerned, recent scientific work has shown that this is non-existent or negligible and that at all events it has been greatly over-estimated in recent years. Monitoring and safety measures are increasingly proving satisfactory in the majority of Western countries. The Commission has nonetheless proposed that the Council adopt a common position on the registration of work in this field and this proposal will shortly be discussed in committee by the European Parliament.

¹ Regulation No 2077/80, OJ L 202 2. 8. 1980, p. 22

The question also refers to the use of modified organisms in industry and agriculture. In this respect too it has been shown that the rigorous controls introduced by the undertakings provide sufficient safeguards at the present time. Nevertheless, as this is a rapidly expanding field, the Commission has included in its proposal for a biotechnology programme a reference to the assessment of the risks involved in large-scale applications of biomolecular engineering which could lead to the formulation of specific safety standards should the need for these arise. This proposal for a programme is also shortly to be discussed in committee by the European Parliament.

*

* *

Question No 24, by Mr Battersby (H-305/80)

Subject: The Community's relations with the People's Republic of China

A report in the Financial Times of 27 June 1980 indicated that French and British oil companies, in which both Governments have a stake, have concluded agreements with China's Petroleum Corporation on offshore oil exploration but with different terms. What consultations, if any, has the Commission undertaken with the Government of China, within the meaning of Article 5 of the Trade Agreement, in order to agree standard terms for contracts between Chinese enterprises and Community firms, in various industrial sectors, in order to obviate such competition, which might be to the advantage of the Community's competitors elsewhere?

Answer

At a period when Chinese commercial law is in the process of evolving, and is in many cases not yet published, the Commission has on various occasions underlined to the Chinese authorities the advantages of clear laws and regulations particularly with regard to the operation of European companies on the China market, whether engaged in trading or direct investments in joint venture.

To date the Commission has however not sought consultations with the Chinese authorities to agree on standard terms for contracts between Chinese enterprises and Community firms since this is an area which does not come under Community competence.

In addition the attention of the Honourable Member is drawn to the fact that Article 5 of the EEC-China Trade Agreement refers to commercial problems. It does not cover exploration and development questions.

*

* *

Question No 25, by Mr Cottrell (H-306/80)

Subject: Tachographs

Difficulties are arising in the United Kingdom with regard to implementation of the tachograph regulations as applied to owners of horse-boxes reserved entirely for private use. The cost of installing the tachograph outweighs the leisure benefit of maintaining the vehicle and therefore seriously threatens the leisure enjoyment of — for example — families who keep a horse or pony. Where, as in this case, no question of hire or reward is involved and where no person is retained or employed to drive the vehicle, will the Commission recommend to the Council an exemption from the tachograph regulations?

Answer

Under the Community's social legislation on transport a tachograph need only be installed in goods vehicles with a total weight of more than 3½ metric tons. This means that two ponies can easily be transported without this maximum permissible weight being exceeded. Community legislation need probably only apply when two large horses, three or more horses or especially valuable (sic) animals are being carried.

In general, the lower limit of 3½ tonnes gross weight for goods vehicles and of 9 persons including the driver for passenger vehicles (with a possible derogation up to a maximum of 15 persons for domestic transport) is sufficiently high to ensure that the transport needs of most families are not subject to the regulations.

*

* *

Question No 26, by Mr Flanagan (H-314/80)

Subject: EEC Growth Rate

In view of the deteriorating economic outlook for the second half of 1980, does the Commission still believe that its forecast of an average growth rate of 2 %¹ is still possible?

Answer

1. The forecasts as regards the economic situation of the Community have been revised twice since the publication of the 1979-1980 annual economic report: in February and June 1980². These forecasts indicate a growth rate in the gross domestic product of the Community for 1980 of about 1.5 %, which means an appreciable slackening in economic activity in the second half of this year.

2. Most recent facts and figures which may give rise to a revision of the forecasts will be taken into account by the Commission when reviewing the economic situation of the Community with a view to the drawing up of the 1980-1981 annual economic report. This will be forwarded to the European Parliament in October for its opinion.

*

* *

Question No 27, by Mr Lalor (H-315/80)

Subject: Venice meeting of Leaders of Western industrial world

Will the Commission give an account of its role at the Venice meeting of leaders of the Western industrial world and how it represented the needs of the smaller nations of the EEC, particularly Ireland?

Answer

As at the previous three Summits, the Community was represented at the Venice Summit — for matters falling within its sphere of activities — by the President-in-Office of the Council and the President of the Commission. Their tasks and responsibilities consisted in ensuring that the interests of the Community as a whole would be protected and taken into consideration. In this connection, the European Council meeting that immediately preceded the Summit was particularly useful.

As for the conduct of the Summit itself, the attention of the Honourable Member is drawn to the statement issued at the close of the proceedings. The Commission does not believe that it would serve any useful purpose to draw a distinction between the role played by the President of the Council and that played by the President of the Commission in influencing the Summit's final outcome.

Although it was their duty to look after the interests of the Community as a whole, the President of the Council and the President of the Commission must clearly have wished to give particular attention to the requirements of those Member States not directly represented at the Summit. The Commission hopes that those states, including Ireland, will have noted subsequently that their interests as member countries of the Community were indeed sufficiently protected.

*

* *

¹ Annual Economic Report 1979-80.

² See 'European Economy', Nos 5 and 6.

Question No 28, by Mr Fanton (H-316/80)

Subject: Stimulating new investment

In view of the inadequate rate of investment in all the countries of the Community, what does the Commission intend to do to stimulate new investment which is essential to deal with unemployment and avoid jeopardizing the future of our economies?

Answer

One of the Commission's main objectives is to encourage investment to assist economic revival and reduce unemployment.

At the macro-economic level, the Commission is chiefly seeking to stimulate the propensity to invest by restoring confidence among undertakings, by improving the competitive position of the Community's economy and reducing financing costs. A slower rate of increase of prices and costs is clearly an essential factor in encouraging investments and improving job prospects.

More specifically, the Commission is giving priority to investment in the allocation of the funds at its disposal. This is particularly true of the Regional Fund and the EAGGF Guidance Section which are granting subsidies on an increasingly wide scale; the Social Fund is subsidizing investments in the field of vocational training, particularly for young people. Ever greater loans are being made available by the EIB, ECSC, NCI or Euratom in some cases as aid towards the payment of interest. The Commission is increasingly using its industrial, scientific, commercial and competition policies to encourage new and sound investments particularly by promoting integration on the internal market, improving investment conditions for SMUs, promoting innovation and applying new technology.

* *

* *

Question No 30, by Mr Ansquer (H-326/80)

Subject: Meetings of the parliamentary committees

Since it would be easier and make for greater efficiency if Members of the European Parliament held their committee meetings at the same place as part-sessions, would the Commission not agree that it would be far more sensible to arrange for the 13 Commissioners to attend committee meetings in Strasbourg instead of requiring Members of Parliament to shuttle constantly back and forth between Strasbourg and Brussels?

Answer

The draft agendas for meetings of parliamentary committees sent out by Parliament indicate the place in which the committee meeting will take place.

The Commission has always sent officials from its departments to meetings of the committees wherever their meeting place might be. By the same token Members of the Commission have in response to appropriate contacts beforehand always shown their readiness to participate in the work of the committees.

*

* *

Question No 31, by Mr Buchou (H-327/80)

Subject: Negotiations on imports of manioc into the Community

In order to make quite certain that there is no increase in imports of manioc from Thailand and any other supplier countries, does the Commission intend to apply more strictly the voluntary restraint agreement with Thailand and to take a firm stand within GATT on the need to unbind the 6 % duty currently applicable to Community imports of manioc?

Answer

Following my talks with the Thai Government in Bangkok last year Thailand agreed that the volume of its exports to the Community in 1979 would not exceed that of 1978. In 1980 exports from Thailand may once again be expected to be lower than in 1978.

This does not however mean that the problem of tapioca imports has been solved. I have therefore just arranged with the Thai Minister of Trade that we will attempt to reach a five-year voluntary restraint agreement for Thailand's exports of tapioca to the Community during a visit to Bangkok in October.

In order to safeguard Thailand's interests within such a voluntary restraint agreement the Commission has already submitted a proposal to the Council a year ago for the duty on tapioca established under the GATT to be unbound. It has not however so far proved possible to reach agreement on this within the Council. A speedy decision by the Council to open negotiations within the GATT will make it easier for the Community to reach a voluntary restraint agreement with Thailand.

*

* *

Question No 33, by Mr Hord (H-330/80)

Subject: Sales to Iran

Will the Commission confirm that sales of surplus Community agricultural commodities have been made in 1979 and 1980 to Iran and if so would the Commission indicate the commodities concerned, the quantities involved, the dates of the transactions and the amount of the EEC subsidy given?

Answer

The Commission can confirm that in 1979 and 1980 the Community sold a variety of agricultural products to Iran. In its answer to Written Question No 408/80 by Mr Dankert on the same subject the Commission gave a detailed breakdown of the commodities and quantities involved in the 1979 calendar year. It regretted however that it was impossible to provide more detailed information on individual sales or the amount of the subsidies as the Member States had omitted that information from their monthly reports to the Commission. That is still the case.

*

* *

Question No 34, by Sir Brandon Rhys Williams (H-339/80)

Subject: Exchange controls and capital movements

When will the Commission hold its next regular examination of the authorizations granted to Member States to maintain Exchange Controls?

Answer

The Commission is continuing to examine exchange control in the Member States and remains in close touch with the competent national authorities. The Commission is naturally informed of developments in this field. The most recent of these were in the United Kingdom where exchange control was abolished and France where it was considerably relaxed.

*

* *

Question No 35, by Mrs Schleicher (H-341/80)

Subject: Protection of the Franconian 'Bocksbeutel'

Is the Commission prepared to protect the right to use the 'Bocksbeutel' bottle of the Franconian wine-growing region at Community level?

Answer

The Commission is willing to seek an equitable solution to protect the 'Bocksbeutel' which takes account as far as possible of the legitimate interest of other users of this type of bottle.

Nevertheless, given the concern among Franconian wine growers for specific protection in relation to the Portuguese bottle known as 'Cantil' which resembles the 'Bocksbeutel', the Commission considers that it should first await the outcome of bilateral negotiations currently taking place on this subject between the Federal Republic of Germany and Portugal.

*

* *

Question No 36, by Mr Schmid (H-343/80)

Subject: Reactor safety in the Community

Why is the report which the Commission has instructed a group of independent experts to compile on reactor safety in the Community only likely to be published in the autumn of 1980, i.e. one year after the planned date?

Answer

The original mandate given to the group of experts stipulated that the report that they were to draw up should be ready by 31 December 1979.

Since the formation of the group was delayed until the end of December 1979 because of practical difficulties, the group's mandate was extended to 31 May 1980. Its work is now finished and the Commission has already given its initial consideration to the report which will be forwarded to the European Parliament and published as soon as it has been translated into the Community languages.

*

* *

Question No 37, by Mr van Miert (H-344/80)

Subject: EC-Comecon talks

Does the Commission think it appropriate to reappraise the talks with the Comecon countries now that, according to the final communiqué issued after the 34th meeting of the Comecon Executive Committee, Afghanistan has become an observer in Comecon?

Answer

The Commission is aware that according to the communiqué issued after the 34th meeting of the Council for Mutual Economic Aid (Comecon) a delegation from Afghanistan and five other Asian and African countries attended this meeting as observers. Afghanistan is, however, not a member of Comecon. Nor does it belong to the countries in this organization which have announced their intention of acceding to the EC-Comecon agreement. The Commission therefore sees no reason to change its decision taken in consultation with the Council to continue negotiations on this agreement.

*

* *

Question No 38, by Mr Martinet (H-350/80)

Subject: US anti-dumping proceedings

What is the present position of the US anti-dumping proceedings in the steel sector?

Answer

The International Trade Commission which began its inquiry in April 1979, decided on 1 May that there were reasonable grounds to assume that Community imports were seriously damaging American industry and therefore requested the Department of Trade to continue the inquiry into prices. The Department has until 16 October to establish whether there is prima facie evidence of dumping.

The Commission which has strictly observed GATT rules of procedure has repeatedly drawn the attention of the United States' Government to the need to avoid the dangers which emanate from continuing with these proceedings.

*

* *

Question No 39, by Mr Collins (H-351/80)

Subject: Nuclear waste

Could the Commission provide information as to whether it has taken part in discussions with relevant authorities regarding the disposal of nuclear waste on or under the seabed and does the Commission plan to take action as a result of the discussions at the First European Conference on Radio Active Waste Management and Disposal?

Answer

Preliminary scientific studies regarding the disposal of nuclear waste on or under the seabed are at present in progress in certain countries.

Thus, the matter is still at the research stage; the Commission is in contact with the main research institutes of the member countries concerned and has made provision for a corresponding research project, of a limited nature at present, as part of its Second R and D programme — 'Radio-active Waste Management and Disposal' (1980-1984). This is a new stage in the development of the Community's activities set forth at the First European Conference.

*

* *

Question No 40, by Mr Normanton (H-357/80)

Subject: EEC Draft Directive for Commercial Agents

In view of the important part played within the European economy by Commercial Agents and the wide diversity of national legislation on this subject, what progress is being achieved to establish a Community Directive?

Answer

On 17 December 1976 the Commission forwarded to the Council its proposal for a directive on harmonization of laws, based on Article 57 (2) and Article 100 (OJ C 13 of 18. 1. 1977).

Economic and Social Committee delivered its opinion on 23 November 1977 (OJ C 59 of

To take account of Parliament's opinion, delivered on 12 September 1978 (OJ.C 239 of 9.10.1978), the Commission submitted an *amended proposal* to the Council on 29 January 1979 (OJ C 56 of 2.3.1979).

A Council group of experts (on economic questions) has begun its study of this proposal.

Some points have already been examined, in particular the chapters relating to the scope of application of the directive, the rights and duties of the parties and remuneration and reimbursement of the agent's expenses. The chapters still to be considered deal with the *del credere* agreement, making of the contract and cessation of the contract, in particular the articles dealing with the goodwill indemnity and the clause on restriction of competition, and lastly the chapter containing the general and final provisions.

*

* *

Question No 42, by Mr Marshall (H-360/80)

Subject: Scotch whisky

Which Member Governments have altered their fiscal or other policies to accord with the recent decisions of the European Court?

Question No 46, by Lord Bethell (H-369/80)

Subject: Imported spirits

What progress has the Commission made in implementing the European Court of Justice's decision of February 1980 that various Danish, Irish, Italian and French discriminatory taxes on imported spirits were illegal under the Treaty of Rome?

Joint Answer

Following the decisions of the Court of Justice of 27 February 1980 concerning the discriminatory systems of taxation applied by Italy, France, Ireland and Denmark to spirituous beverages, the Commission promptly requested the governments of these countries to ensure that the relevant decisions were immediately implemented.

At present, the Commission is able to provide the Honourable Members with the following information:

By decree of 3 July 1980, replaced by Decree No 31 of August 1980 *Italy* changed the official state prices for strong spirits by fixing the same price for cereal-based, wine-based and marc-based spirits.

The Commission is now waiting for the decree of 31 August 1980 to be placed on the Statute Book, the procedure for which is already under way in the Italian Parliament.

France has announced that it will take steps to abolish the illegal practice condemned by the Court within the framework of the 'loi de finances', whose adoption is scheduled before the end of the current year.

The relevant draft law, which has already been submitted to the Assembly, provides for the same level of taxation — based on alcoholic strength — to be applied to both cereal-based and wine-based spirits.

Ireland has also informed the Commission that it intends to implement the Court's ruling with effect from 1 January 1981.

Finally, by Law No 153 of 6 May 1980, *Denmark* modified its arrangements for the taxation of spirits by introducing a system combining a fixed rate of taxation with an *ad valorem* tax. This law is currently being examined by the Commission.

*

* *

Question No 43, by Mr Scott-Hopkins (H-363/80)

Subject: Import quotas on tufted carpet

Will the Commission now impose import quotas on tufted carpet imported from third countries in particular from North America, on the grounds of:

1. Severe distortion of the home market. Sales of US tufted carpet have risen by 300 % in 1978-80 amounting to 6 million square metres.
2. Subsidization of the North American feed stock of crude oil leading to unfair competition in the EEC markets?

Answer

In accordance with Council Regulation No 926/79, import quotas may be imposed only where a product is imported in such greatly increased quantities and in such conditions as to cause, or threaten to cause, substantial injury to Community producers.

Although the Commission is aware of the increase in imports of tufted carpet in 1980, it considers that there is little evidence to show that this increase is the sole cause of the difficulties experienced in the British carpet industry. It is, however, keeping a constant watch on developments.

The abovementioned regulation contains no provisions on the subsidization of the North American feed stock of crude oil. Under GATT, the existence of regulations providing for double prices does not allow for the application of unilateral protective measures but only the possibility of initiating the GATT consultation procedures.

The Commission has started discussions with the US authorities in view of the worsening situation in the man-made fibres sector (the raw material used in the manufacture of tufted carpets). These discussions are still in progress.

*

* *

Question No 44, by Miss Forster (H-364/80)

Subject: Aid for the man-made fibres sector

Under the Council Regulation No 2914/79 of 20 December 1979 the Commission had to submit a report to the Parliament and the Council on the application of this Regulation and also covering the aspect of reduction of production capacity. The Regulation stated that the Commission should report before 1 July 1980. No report has been received by the Parliament. Can the Commission explain the reason for this omission?

Answer

In accordance with Council Regulation No 2914/79 of 20 December 1979 the Commission has produced a report on the application of this regulation.

This report was forwarded to Parliament on 6 August 1980 and also to the Council.

*

* *

Question No 45, by Mrs Fuillet (H-368/80)

Subject: Implementation of the Commission's activity programme for 1980 — consumers

What steps has the Commission taken to implement the measures contained in its annual programme for 1980 with regard to the protection of the economic interests, health and safety of consumers?

Answer

In its consumer programme for 1980 the Commission announced that it would be forwarding a proposal for a directive on the safety of toys to the Council during the first half of the year. This proposal was submitted on 3 July 1980. The programme also provided for the adoption, under the procedure for adaptation to technical progress, of two directives on the criteria and methods of monitoring the bacteriological purity of cosmetic products.

The Commission considers that these two directives can be adopted by the year provided that the technical discussions have reached a favourable conclusion by that time. Furthermore the Commission repeats its undertaking to forward all the other proposals announced in the supplementary memorandum to the Council by the end of the year.

*

* *

Question No 47, by Mr Pininfarina (H-370/80)

Subject: Conditions under which a person may be permitted to make a customs declaration

Consideration is currently being given to a proposal for a regulation defining the conditions under which a person may be permitted to make a customs declaration. With a view to eliminating unacceptable differences between the relevant provisions of the Member States, would the Commission not agree that it is necessary to propose that the regulation in question should provide unreservedly that no professional qualification is required of an employee as a condition under which he may be permitted to make a customs declaration for and on behalf of his employer?

Answer

It is generally conceded that any one making a customs declaration in his own name on his own behalf is not required to provide the customs authorities with evidence of an appropriate professional qualification. This is the case particularly with employers or legal representatives of a company although they very often lack specialist expertise in relation to these operations on behalf of their company. One might therefore ask whether there is any need to demand such a qualification from salaried employees who make customs declarations for and on behalf of their employer. Indeed, apart from cases of personal negligence, the salaried employees are not responsible to the customs authorities for the operations which they conduct for and on behalf of their employer. It is therefore up to the latter to ensure that his employees possess the necessary expertise without there being any need for administrative provisions in this respect.

The majority of Member States have not considered such provisions necessary. Without wishing to belittle the importance of such a qualification for both the customs authorities and firms, nor to pre-empt discussion of this problem in the Council, it would in fact appear that such a solution would create more problems than it would solve. From the point of view of harmonization which is the aim of this proposal for a regulation one might ask in relation to each Member State concerned, who should recognize this qualification, what level of qualification would be required and whether a qualification recognized in one Member State would be equally valid in the others?

Therefore the Commission does not consider it necessary at the present time to regulate this matter at Community level.

*

* *

Question No 48, by Mrs Desmond (H-371/80)

Subject: Development of Cork Airport

In view of the importance of Cork Airport to the economic development of the south of Ireland, will the Commission state what means are at its disposal towards the promotion and development of this airport and to what extent the Irish authorities have availed themselves of such aid?

Answer

The Commission is fully alive to the importance of Cork Airport to the economic development of the south of Ireland. It would at the same time point out that aid from the ERDF is only dispensed at the request of the Member State.

Up to the present no application for aid whatever has been submitted by the Irish authorities for this project.

*
* * *

Question No 49, by Mr Lomas (H-373/80)

Subject: Corruption by Indonesian Officials

What steps have the Commission taken to investigate the consistent reports from East Timor of corruption by the Indonesian military of humanitarian aid supplied by the EEC and by its Member Governments to the people of East Timor?

Answer

1. In response to an appeal from the International Committee of the Red Cross, the Community, provided early in 1980 emergency food aid in the form of 130 tonnes of skimmed milk powder containing added vitamins as part of a joint ICRC/Indonesian Red Cross operation, to assist 60 000 people in East Timor. The distribution of the aid in the area concerned is being supervised by ICRC delegates. According to ICRC sources, it is proceeding satisfactorily. A report on the distribution will be submitted to the Commission by ICRC at the end of the operation.

2. The Community also decided on 19 December 1979, to make available through the intermediary of OXFAM Belgium emergency aid amounting to 50 000 EUA from Article 950 of the budget.

3. It is not for the Commission to supervise the manner in which the aid provided by Member States is used.

*
* * *

Question No 50, by Mr Debré (H-378/80)

Subject: Community measures for the car industry

Does not the Commission consider that it runs the risk of making the same mistake with regard to the car industry as it made with the iron and steel industry by failing to react immediately to the magnitude of international competition; what specific reason is there to prevent the introduction of a protective customs tariff?

Answer

One can hardly attribute the difficulties faced by the European iron and steel industry to a Commission 'mistake'.

In the automobile sector, the Commission has none of the legal and constitutional powers which it possesses in relation to the iron and steel industry.

The Commission is perfectly well aware of the scale of the problem posed by international competition to the car industry and it has had the opportunity of expressing its view on this topic on a number of occasions, in particular in its reply to a previous question by Mr Debré, namely Written Question No 11664/79.

it intends to submit a document to Parliament on the situation of the Community car

As far as future trade policy is concerned, the Commission wishes to stress:

- the importance of external markets for the Community car industry which is currently producing 15 % more cars than it consumes and exporting 25 % of its production to markets in third countries.

*

* * *

Question No 51, by Mr Beazley (H-379/80)

Subject: Harmonization of energy costs in horticulture

Would the Commission indicate the outcome of its representations to the Dutch Government to complete the harmonization of energy costs in horticulture earlier than that Government's declared aim of October 1981?

Answer

This subject was discussed by the Council in July, after which the Commission brought the matter up with the Dutch Government in an attempt to find a solution to the problem raised by the honourable Member, but as the discussions have not yet been completed, it is still too early to draw any conclusions. I can however assure the honourable Member that the Commission is determined to find a solution acceptable to all concerned as quickly as possible.

*

* * *

Question No 52, by Mr Pisani (H-380/80)

Subject: Lomé Convention and international commodity agreements

In view of the extreme importance of trade between the European Economic Community and the ACP in foodstuffs such as cocoa, could the Commission state how the provisions of the Lomé Convention (STABEX) tie up with international commodity agreements, and how they are likely to do so in the future?

Answer

This question is basically concerned with the reciprocal implications of the STABEX provisions in the Lomé Convention and international agreements affecting Stabex products.

As far as the System for the Stabilization of Export Earnings (Stabex) is concerned, it is important to note that the aim of this system is to stabilize fluctuations in the value of exports resulting from fluctuations in prices and/or quantities. As such Stabex in no way competes with international agreements designed to stabilize the price of basic commodities. On the contrary, the two complement each other to the extent to which global agreements by effectively reducing price fluctuations lead to a reduction in the claims made by the ACP States on Stabex which is chiefly designed to counteract fluctuations in export earnings due to variations in the volume of exports.

In the Commission's experience, quantity has at least as profound an effect on export earnings as price. It therefore follows that despite international agreements on individual products, there will always be a need for action to stabilize export earnings from the products concerned in order to protect the exporting countries against the vagaries of production which no organization of markets however well-designed can eliminate.

Question No 53, by Mr Pöttering (H-381/80)

Subject: Statement by the person accompanying a visiting party of 50 officials from the Federal Republic of Germany

How does the Commission view the following statement by the person accompanying a visiting party of 50 officials from the Federal Republic of Germany:

'Our coach arrived at the border around 10 a.m. on Monday, 16 June 1980, and was due to reach the offices of the City of Strasbourg administration about 10.30 a.m. Unfortunately, we were still at the border at 10.45 a.m. The driver had had to refuel in Bruchsal and as of that very morning duty had to be paid on quantities of diesel fuel over 75 litres.

We saw the driver scurry from door to door of the customs building and finally disappear in the direction of Strasbourg where, as he explained later, he had to buy French francs in order to pay the customs duty. An impressive demonstration of European cooperation, which was precisely what we had come to see on our fact-finding visit: The Strasbourg city officials who met us were unaware of this procedure. They did, however, say that the same thing happened on the German side of the border. French lorries and coaches also had to pay charges at the border, possibly, they thought, for the use of German roads.'

What does the Commission intend to do to prevent the recurrence of such incidents, which conflict with the policy of European unification.

Answer

The solution to the problems associated with taxes on fuel carried in the normal tanks of commercial vehicles registered in one Member State crossing the border to another Member State is linked to the level of Community duty-free allowances.

On 2 August 1974 the Commission submitted to the Council a proposal amending Council Directive 68/297/EEC of 19 July 1968 raising the duty-free allowance from 50 to 100 litres.

Even such a modest proposal encountered strong opposition from one Member State and was not adopted.

The duty-free allowance of 100 litres has just been re-submitted as part of a proposal for a taxation directive specifying the area of application of Article 14 (1d) of Directive 77/388/EEC on vat exemption for certain specific imports which the Commission submitted to the Council on 2 June 1980.

The European Parliament will be asked to deliver an opinion on this proposal in the near future.

*

* *

Question No 54, by Mr Newton-Dunn (H-382/80)

Subject: Fishing

Are all nine Member States now sending up-to-date and full information concerning monthly fish landings to the Commission and if not, which States are defaulting?

Answer

As provided for in Council Regulation No 753/80 of 26 March 1980, Member States notify to the Commission regularly the quantities of species subject to total allowable catches landed in their ports by all fishermen or landed outside the Community or transshipped by their fishermen. Reports covering up to and including the month of July have been received from Belgium, Denmark, Germany and the United Kingdom; reports from other Member States concerned are not yet similarly up-to-date.

*

* *

Question No 55, by Mr Israël (H-384/80)

Subject: Creation of a demilitarized zone between Kampuchea and Thailand

In view of the adoption by the Foreign Ministers of the three countries of Indochina (Kampuchea, Laos, Vietnam) following a meeting in Vientiane on 18 July 1980 of a plan to create 'a demilitarized zone' on the border between Kampuchea and Thailand, does the Commission of the European Communities intend to modify the position expressed by the Commissioner for Development in Strasbourg on 11 July 1980 during the discussion of the draft resolution (I-301/80) of 8 July 1980 advocating the creation of a neutral zone on the border between Kampuchea and Thailand?

Answer

The problem raised by the Honourable Member falls within the sphere of political cooperation so that it is incumbent upon the governments of the nine Member States to define a position which takes account of statements by the various parties involved.

The remark by Mr Cheysson during the debate by the European Parliament on 10 July 1980 does not refer to the expediency of creating a neutral zone (which certain people regard as eminently desirable).

On the contrary, he was expressing his doubts as to the possibility of an inter-governmental conference making rapid progress in this respect given that those in control of Kampuchea could not be admitted to such talks at this stage as they have as yet not been recognized either by the United Nations or by the governments of the Member States of the Community.

This is why the Commission is still convinced that its greatest scope for positive action is to continue humanitarian aid from the Community via non-governmental organizations.

*

* * *

Question No 56, by Mrs Hammerich (H-387/80)

Subject: Community guidelines for the entire public sectors of the individual Member States

A Commission Communication to the Council of 5 March 1980 (COM(80) 101 final) on the improvement of the coordination of economic policies states that the Member States have agreed to extend the field of application of budgetary guidelines on an experimental basis, so as to cover 'the entire public sector'. It is also proposed in that document that the implications of the labour market, taxation, and social rules and regulations should be jointly considered. Will the Commission state the short- and long-term objectives of these plans, what progress has been made on them and when they are intended to take effect?

Answer

The field of application of budgetary guidelines to the entire public sector, as mentioned in the communication to which the Honourable Member refers, was first extended in 1979 and again in 1980. This measure, which is still regarded as experimental, has yielded positive results.

As regards integration, in joint deliberations on the conduct of short-term policies, of certain indicators of the micro-economic implications of such policies (such as the operation of the labour market, taxation, social provisions etc.), this Commission communication refers to a number of questions which need to be analysed in greater detail. This more detailed analysis is in progress and shows the Commission's concern, particularly in the context of the fifth programme for medium-term economic policy which will be referred to Parliament at the beginning of 1981, to establish a closer link between policies regulating demand and policies regulating supply which is necessary to improve economic convergence and consolidate the European Monetary System.

*

* * *

Question No 58, by Mr Kavanagh (H-391/80)

Subject: Continuation of Community measures relating to the transition of young people from education to working life

What proposals will the Commission make towards the continuation and further development, after 31 December 1980, of its programme arising from the Council Resolution of 13 December 1976 concerning measures to be taken to improve the preparation of young people for work and to facilitate their transition from education to working life?

Answer

In accordance with the programme arising from the Council resolution of 13 December 1976 the Commission is now conducting a pilot project on the transition from education to working life. The term of this pilot project was extended by one year by the Council and the Ministers at the beginning of this year.

The assessment studies on this will be continued until the end of 1982. A provisional report on the programme will be published in October 1980. The final report will become available in the course of 1983.

The Commission is considering new initiatives on a number of individual aspects of this programme, viz. in the field of the education and training of girls and their preparation for work. The Commission has also done some work in the field of alternating training for young people. Finally the Commission has made a start on activities directed towards handicapped young people and the children of migrant workers.

*

* *

Question No 59, by Mrs Castle (H-393/80)

Subject: European Regional Development Fund

To ask the Commission whether under Article 3 of the ERDF Regulation the fact that an area in a Member State is receiving regional aid from its own government only in the form of a grant towards the clearance of derelict land will not disbar that area from receiving help towards the cost of infrastructure works necessary for industrial development under the quota and non-quota sections of the ERDF respectively?

Answer

1. Article 3 of the Fund Regulation¹ provides that aid from the quota section of the Fund may be granted on condition that the projects for which assistance is requested are carried out in the development areas designated as such by Member States in applying their systems of regional aid ('assisted areas' in the case of the United Kingdom). The fact that aid has been granted for a project — such as that referred to by the Honourable Member — that is not a specifically regional project is not in itself sufficient to qualify the region concerned for assistance from the Fund.

Furthermore, the aid to which the Honourable Member refers involves the transfer of funds from one public authority to another and does not, therefore, correspond to the definition of the type of aid that may qualify for Fund assistance.

2. As regards the non-quota section, assistance from the Fund may be granted — outside the areas of development in question — provided that the area concerned is the subject of an implementing regulation drawn up within the meaning of Article 13 of the Fund Regulation (specific Community regional development projects).

*

* *

¹ Council Regulation (EEC) No 724/75 of 18 March 1975, as amended by Regulation (EEC) No 214/79.

Question No 61, by Mr Bettiza (H-396/80)

Subject: State of ratification of the EEC-Yugoslavia Cooperation Agreement

Will the Commission indicate the state of ratification in the nine Member States of the EEC-Yugoslavia Cooperation Agreement signed in April 1980 in Belgrade, and does it think it will be possible for the agreement to come into force by 1 January 1981?

Answer

The EEC-Yugoslavia Cooperation Agreement is currently in the process of ratification by the various Member States.

As yet the procedure is nowhere complete. While it cannot be ruled out that the aforesaid agreement could enter into force on 1 January 1981, experience of the time required for such a procedure would indicate that it is more likely to enter into force at a later date.

The Commission would, however, point out that the trade and financial provisions of the agreement have been in force since 1 July 1980 on the basis of interim agreement concluded between the Community and Yugoslavia.

*

* *

Question No 62, by Mr Purvis (H-397/80)

Subject: Pricing of Petrochemical Feedstocks – USA

What discussions did the Commissioner for Industrial Affairs have on his recent trip to the USA regarding the pricing of petrochemical feedstocks and what steps are being taken to eliminate unfair competition in this industry?

Answer

On a recent trip to the United States, Mr Davignon broached the problem of oil and gas prices with the American authorities.

Discussions will continue in the near future on the basis of a more detailed analysis at present being carried out by the services of the Commission.

SITTING OF TUESDAY, 16 SEPTEMBER 1980

1. Approval of minutes: Mr Pannella	47	Mr C. Jackson; Mr Nielsen; Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul; Mrs Squarcialupi: draftsmen of opinions Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission; Mr Brandt (S); Mr Vergeer (EPP); Sir Fred Warner (ED); Mr Pajetta (COM)	54
2. Decision on urgency	47	Procedural motions: Mr Pearce; Miss Brookes	78
Procedural motion: Mr Scott-Hopkins	47	4. Membership of committees	78
Mr Clément; Mr Vergès; Mr Lalor; Mr Klepsch; Mr Lalor; Mr Glinne; Mr Pannella; Mr Glinne (S); Mr Pranchère; Mr Klepsch; Mr Glinne; Mr Scott-Hopkins	47	5. Hunger in the world (continuation): Mr Poniatowski (L); Mr Debré (EPD); Mr Pannella; Mrs Dekker; Mr Cohen; Mr Bersani; Mr Simmonds; Mr Gremetz; Mr Sablé; Mrs Dienesch; Mr Coppieters; Mr Romualdi; Mr Jaquet; Mr Michel; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Denis; Mr Irmer; Mrs Weiss; Mr Skovmand Mrs Focke	79
Procedural motion: Mr Pannella	50	Procedural motion: Mr Poniatowski	107
Mr Marshall; Mr Fanti (COM)	50	6. Urgent procedure	107
Procedural motion: Mr de la Malène	50	7. Withdrawal of a motion for a resolution	107
Mr Glinne (S)	50	8. Agenda for next sitting	107
Procedural motions: Lady Elles; Mr Pelikan Mrs Le Roux; Mrs Vayssade (S); Mr Harris (ED); Mr Bangemann (L); Mr Klepsch (EPP); Mr de la Malène (EPD)	51		
3. Hunger in the world — Report by Mr Ferrero, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation (Doc. 1-341/80): Mr Ferrero, rapporteur	52		

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (F) Madam President, it says on page 21 of the Minutes that 'Mr Pannella withdrew his request for a change in the agenda'.

In actual fact, Madam President, I first spoke, on the same basis as Mr Klepsch, and so I would prefer the Minutes to read 'Mr Pannella spoke. He then withdrew, at the suggestion of the President, his proposal to amend the agenda', because that is what actually happened.

President. — Your comments have been noted, Mr Pannella.

Are there any other comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. Decision on urgency

President. — The next item is the decision on the adoption of urgent procedure for a proposal for a Council regulation and nine motions for resolutions.

We begin with the *proposal for a regulation (Doc. 1-134/80): Market in flax and hemp*.

I put the request to the vote.

Urgent procedure is adopted.

This item will be entered on the agenda for Friday, 19 September.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider three motions for resolutions on *emergency aid for Guadeloupe and Martinique devastated by hurricane Allen*:

- (Doc. 1-362/80) by Mr Clément and others
- (Doc. 1-377/80) by Mr Sablé and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and Mr d'Ormesson and others on behalf of the European People's Party (C-D Group):
- (Doc. 1-384/80) by Mr Vergès and others on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins on a point of order.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, I do not wish to hold up proceedings this morning, but I must point out to you and to the House, that many of these requests for urgency were not available in the different languages until this morning. Could we make quite certain that the texts to be voted on at 9 a.m. are avail-

able the night before. It really is impossible for Groups to make up their minds exactly, before seeing the texts, how they wish to vote. Will you please see to it that only those texts which are available the night before are voted on the following morning at 9? Otherwise the situation is quite intolerable.

President. — I think that all the motions for resolutions have been distributed by now. As they all deal with the same matter, it is logical to put them to the vote jointly. For this reason, I propose to put them to a single vote.

I call Mr Clément.

Mr Clément. — (F) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, urgency is necessary in this case because of the severity of the damage caused to the French Départements of Martinique and Guadeloupe and, unfortunately, to persons and property. A year ago, incidentally, the Assembly decided to adopt the urgent procedure in the same circumstances. I therefore maintain my request for urgent debate.

President. — I call Mr Vergès.

Mr Vergès. — (F) Madam President, Martinique has, for a second time, experienced what, in the Caribbean area, is acknowledged to be one of the most devastating cyclones in history.

Another known feature of the history of our islands in the Antilles and La Réunion is the period when they were hit by a succession of cyclones which affected their economy for several decades. We are afraid that, if considerable aid is not quickly forthcoming, the Antilles will have to face a very gloomy future particularly since the people concerned are still waiting for the aid decided by the French Government, after the last cyclone, to be distributed.

President. — I put the request to the vote.

Urgent procedure is adopted.

The three motions for resolutions will be entered on the agenda for Friday, 19 September 1980.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mr Lalor and Mr Israël, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, and Mr Scott-Hopkins, on behalf of the European Democratic Group (Doc. 1-372/80/rev.): Persecution of the members of the Baha'i community in Iran*.

President

I call Mr Lalor.

Mr Lalor. — Madam President, this resolution also speaks for itself. It is quite obvious that the Baha'i community in Iran have been undergoing very serious torture, and it is necessary that Parliament should discuss the problem at the earliest opportunity.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Madam President, I should like to make a proposal regarding the procedure for the motions for resolutions on the persecution of the Baha'i community, Bolivia and Poland. Discussions are being held among the political groups, and we can take it that joint texts on all three subjects will be available tomorrow, on the urgency of which we can then vote.

My Group has, for example, refrained from tabling its own motions for resolutions, because these discussions are going on. I have spoken to the chairmen of the European Democratic Group, the Socialist Group and the Liberal and Democratic Group. I apologize to Mr Lalor for not being able to discuss the matter with him. I would ask that we do not vote on these three matters now, but postpone them until tomorrow morning, when the joint texts on the Baha'i, Poland and Bolivia will be available. I hope the House will agree to this proposal.

(Applause)

President. — Mr Lalor, in view of what Mr Klepsch has just said, would you be prepared to withdraw your motion for a resolution for the moment on the understanding that, should a joint proposal not be put forward, your request can again be tabled tomorrow morning?

Mr Lalor. — That is acceptable to me, Madam President.

President. — Mr Scott-Hopkins' proposal is also covered by Mr Klepsch's request.

These requests for urgent debate are suspended: we shall return to the matter tomorrow morning.

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (F) I would like to add to Mr Klepsch's list the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Castle (Doc. 1-378/80). This document, incidentally, has already been amended by the author and is to be the subject of intergroup discussion.

President — All the motions for resolutions on the persecution of the members of the Baha'i community, the violation of human rights in Chile and the political situation in Poland are therefore suspended.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (F) Madam President, I would just like to make it clear that, as far as we are concerned, it is not true to say that we are going to associate ourselves with the motion for a resolution from other Groups on these subjects.

I also find it strange, on the second day of our deliberations, that so far no Group has tabled anything on Turkey. We ourselves cannot do anything because of the Rules of Procedure, but we are truly astonished that not a word has yet been said in this Assembly at a time when the parliamentary institutions and democracy in Turkey are being trampled to death.

President. — Mr Pannella, the deliberations of a parliament are also to be judged by the way in which it reaches agreement and by the time spent drawing up its documents.

For the moment we are concerned with the motions for resolutions on the persecution of members of the Baha'i community, the political situation in Poland and the violation of human rights in Chile.

It should be noted that, if agreement is not reached, all the motions for resolutions withdrawn this morning will automatically be considered tomorrow, so that they can still be entered in the agenda for the present part-session.

I call Mr Glinne.

*

* *

Mr Glinne. — (F) Yes, consultation among the Groups on the political situation in Poland is almost concluded and we shall definitely be able to table a proposal on behalf of several groups today.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the two motions for resolutions on *the situation in Bolivia*:

- (Doc. 1-381/80) by Mr Glinne and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, and Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the European People's Party (C-D Group).
- (Doc. 1-335/80) by Mr Fanti, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

President

Mr Glinne, do you wish to withdraw your motion for a resolution?

Mr Glinne. — (F) No, Madam President, I do not think there is any point in suspending the debate until tomorrow because the paper that has been tabled is already the result of consultation.

President. — As both motions for resolutions concern the same topic, I propose, as before, to take a single vote on the requests for urgency.

I call Mr Pranchère.

Mr Pranchère. — (F) A military *putsch* has installed a bloody regime in Bolivia. The horrors of which this regime has been guilty in so short a space of time rightly arouse the feelings of all true democrats. Workers, trade unionists, Communists and everyone with a love of liberty cannot but condemn this regime outright whose complete despotism is only equalled by its ruthless persecution of democrats, trade unionists, political, trade union and religious leaders, and students.

Indescribable atrocities are committed like the massacre of the population of the village of Caracoles, where mine workers have been killed, women raped and men tortured. Today the number of dead in this village is 900. Every day, ghastly and detestable crimes are committed in this country.

In Bolivia, as in Chile and Salvador, the dictatorship has made torture and death an instrument of government. Incidentally — and this has to be said — not one of these regimes, at a time when resistance is becoming organized, could exist without the direct aid, whether they admit it or not, of the United States. Mr Carter sets himself up as the champion of human rights but today he is supporting satellite regimes where men are being killed and freedom destroyed.

Democratically and by universal suffrage, Bolivia elected a legitimate government and a president. The wishes of the nation must be respected.

In view of the seriousness of these events, the Communist and Allies Group asks that the dictatorial regime in Bolivia should not be recognized by the Community. Given the Andean Parliament's indictment of the Bolivian military regime and in view of the fact that the Andean Pact is currently negotiating agreements with the Community, it would be shameful for the EEC — without prejudice to these agreements — to officially recognize any representative of such a regime. The gravity of the situation warrants an urgent debate on this matter and your vote in favour of the urgent procedure.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Madam President, I am somewhat unhappy about the procedure. I included Bolivia just now, because we had asked a number of Groups to sign the motion. My Group has informed me that it is prepared to sign. The impression may now arise that the Socialist Group and we want to walk all over the others. I would therefore suggest that we vote on urgency in the case of Bolivia tomorrow morning. By that time anyone who is so inclined can have added his signature. I feel this would be in the best interests of the House. I ask the Socialists to agree to this.

I should also like to say a word to Mr Pannella while I have the floor, Madam President. I feel he should do his homework a little better. If we decide on urgency tomorrow morning rather than this morning, there will not be any delay, because the subjects we want to debate tomorrow can be debated tomorrow if we adopt the urgency procedure tomorrow morning. I fact, I believe his sole interest was again to hold up the work of this House.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (F) Madam President, I do not think there is much to add. We have tabled a text the spirit of which still needs to be discussed with other Groups in this Parliament that are very worried about events in Bolivia. We have already discussed it with the Group of the European People's Party and we are ready to do the same with other groups. The proposal has been tabled so that a vote can be taken on Friday.

President. — For the moment we are only concerned with the vote on the request for urgent debate. The text itself can still be amended.

I call Mr. Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, could we postpone this vote, as suggested by the leader of the Group of the European People's Party, not only so that we can have proper negotiations concerning the text, but also because these texts were not circulated until this morning. As I am on my feet, this applies not only to the text on Bolivia but particularly to the last one on fishing, which is absolutely crucial: we haven't seen it until this morning in the English version, and I really am not prepared to ask my Group to vote on it until there has been time to consider whether it is urgent or not. I am not talking about the substance: until you see the text, you cannot decide on its urgency, and a quarter of an hour before coming in here is not enough.

Mr Pannella. — (*I*) Madam President, I wish to speak, if you will permit me, on a personal matter, as the rules entitle me to do.

In lieu of the ideas they lack, some 'bigwigs' of this Parliament have been using insults. These 'bigwigs', who are accustomed neither to the life of an elected parliament nor to parliamentary and democratic traditions, but rather to insults and flattery more befitting a monarchic than a parliamentary institution, can only irritate those among us who mean to carry out a discussion of ideas in a rigorous and honest manner.

Since, Madam President, this is the hundredth time that the chairman of the Group of the European People's Party has said that my only intention is to waste time, and since in keeping with the traditional intolerance of this group such accusations have several times been directed at me by the chairman of the Christian-Democrats while I regret the need to protest, in accord with the rules I reject this boorish, violent, and intolerant behaviour.

(Vigorous protests in the House)

President. — Mr Panella, I would draw your attention to the fact that you were the first to pass judgment on the attitude of this House. Everyone here has the right to speak and no one, I believe, has insulted you.

I call Mr Marshall.

Mr Marshall. — That seemed to be one of Mr Pannella's quite fraudulent points of order. Speaking for myself and, I suspect, for nearly everyone else, I should like to say that you have our full support whenever you silence him on these quite illegitimate points of order.

President. — I call Mr Fantì.

Mr Fantì. — (*I*) Madam President, I have heard the protest of Mr Scott-Hopkins. I would like to make it clear however that what is in question here is a vote on the urgency and timeliness of examining the problems of Bolivia together with those of Chile, Poland, and Turkey, as we did at the meeting of the Group chairmen. The Assembly should know that a consultation between Groups is going forward with a view to presenting a common agenda on Turkey. Any charges that could be made against a European Parliament insensitive to events as serious as those taking place in countries like Turkey would thus be rendered irrelevant.

President. — I call Mr de la Malène.

Mr de la Malène. — (*F*) Madam President, I would be grateful to have from you a clarification on a point of procedure. We are trying to organize these urgent debates in the best way possible and precedents seem to vary. I would like to know whether, when urgent procedure is adopted, it is thereafter possible to amend the wording and to add names. In that case, there is absolutely no point in following the procedure we have followed this morning. In the opposite case, we need to continue to follow the procedure we began with this morning. We have to choose between procedure and precedent.

President. — Mr de la Malène, Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure clearly states that when I receive a request for urgent debate I must inform Parliament and the vote must be taken at the next sitting. With regard to the case in point, since the authors have agreed to withdraw the request for urgent debate in view of an agreement amongst the Groups, I am clearly no longer bound by this Rule and the request for urgent procedure is suspended until agreement is reached. I would add, that if agreement is not reached and if, as a result, the requests are maintained, it is still possible, right up until the debate begins, to amend the motions for resolutions and to achieve the same result.

The difference is therefore only psychological: it would mean having from the beginning a motion for a resolution signed by as many political groups or Members as possible, rather than, at the time of voting, having motions for resolutions which had been separated or joined together along the way.

I am therefore proposing that a single vote be taken on the urgency of the two motions for resolutions on Bolivia.

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (*F*) I would like to both clarify and correct what I said a few moments ago.

Following the speeches by Mr Klepsch and Mr Fantì, I do not think there is any reason why we should not repeat for Bolivia the consensus exercise, or at least the effort to reach a consensus, that we have organized on other points. We request that voting be postponed until tomorrow morning.

President. — I call Lady Elles.

Lady Elles. — Madam President, I think, in interpreting Rule 14, it would help if when the President of Parliament receives motions for a resolution for which urgent procedure has been requested, the assumption should be that these have also been circulated to Members of the Parliament. I think this would get

Lady Elles

over the difficulty of your receiving the motions for a resolution one day and immediately tabling them for the next sitting when nobody in the Parliament has actually had a copy. We should then not be in the position we are in today. When you receive a copy of the motion for a resolution, it must be assumed that Parliament also has copy of the text before they can make a decision; then we shall not have this problem of delaying the thing 24 hours and have to go through all these discussions, as we have had to this morning.

President. — As a general rule, we receive them late on Monday and the Secretariat, which is already making a considerable effort, needs time to translate and print them. Perhaps we could decide that we should no longer vote on matters of this sort on Tuesday morning since the requests for urgent debate concern motions for resolutions which have been tabled late. What we have done this morning is not without value, even if we decide to put off the vote until Wednesday. It has enabled us to inform the House of these proposals.

In any event, there is no way of ensuring that the texts are distributed on Monday evening.

I call Mr Pelikan.

Mr Pelikan. — (F) Madam President, I would like to ask for an explanation about a motion for a resolution with request for urgent debate tabled by myself and other Members, not on the subject of South Korea as stated in yesterday's Minutes, but on the subject of the threat of death hanging over Mr Kim, the leader of the democratic opposition.

According to today's French press of various political leanings, he is likely to be sentenced to death this week although he claims to be innocent of any plot against the State.

I cannot understand how a motion for a resolution which truly concerns an urgent matter should have been referred to the Political Affairs Committee and struck off the list of requests for urgent debate.

President. — There has clearly been a procedural error. The secretariat will have to look into the matter. I am informed that the motion for a resolution was not signed.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group (Doc. 1-382/80): Crisis in the European fishing industry.*

I call Mrs Le Roux to speak in favour of the motion.

Mme Le Roux. — (F) Madam President, this summer our country was disturbed by a serious conflict in the sea-fishing industry. Fishermen on the whole of the French coastline rebelled against the conditions in which they are made to work and against the very grave threats to their jobs, and therefore to an important sector of the French economy, arising among other things from the plans to enlarge the Common Market. They had and still have the active support of all the workers in our country. The responsibility of the governments of Member States and that of the policy applied by the Commission are clearly involved.

The French Communists and Allies will therefore vote in favour of urgent debate.

President. — I call Mrs Vayssade to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mme Vayssade. — (F) I would like to support this request for urgent debate on the fishing problem. I shall not go back over the events that lasted all summer in France and showed the scale of the problems faced by all sea fishermen. I believe that the scale of the problem is the same for fishermen in practically all the Community countries.

I feel it is urgently necessary for Parliament to decide on its attitude towards these problems of fishing policy, particularly since the Council of Ministers of the Community is to discuss fishing next week and since it would therefore be advisable, on that occasion, for Parliament's opinion on all the problems arising in the Community countries to be known.

President. — I call Mr Harris to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Harris. — Madam President, we are very happy to support the request for urgent debate, because we are conscious of the plight that many fishermen find themselves in and we do think this is an urgent matter. We must say that the French fishermen have not helped their own cause by inflicting so much unnecessary inconvenience, on so many innocent tourists; but, having said that, we do support the request for urgent debate.

President. — At the moment we are only concerned with the request for urgent debate. Comments on the content can only be made if the motion is debated.

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

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Madam President, I felt that we cannot agree to urgency in this matter — at least I cannot do so on behalf of my Group — because we did not have the text until this morning. Whether or not something is urgent can after all be decided by a democratic group only after it has been discussed. We shall not therefore be voting in favour of urgency.

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

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Madam President, the text is short. We did not have an opportunity to read it until this morning. From the contents of the motion I consider the matter to be urgent, and my Group will be voting in favour of urgency.

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

Mr de la Malène. — (F) Madam President, my Group will also be voting in favour of urgent debate, though naturally not approving the whole of the text tabled by the Socialist Group. It is however quite clear the fishing problem and the need for the Community to study that problem are both extremely urgent.

President. — I put the request to the vote.

The request for urgent debate is approved.

This item will be placed on the agenda for Wednesday, 19 September 1980.

I remind the House that we are required tomorrow, at the beginning of the sitting, to vote on a certain number of requests for urgent debate.

3. World hunger

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Ferrero, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the European Community's contribution to the campaign to eliminate hunger in the world (Doc. 1-341/80).

I call Mr Ferrero.

Mr Ferrero, rapporteur. — (I) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, in the course of the work accomplished these past months by your Committee on Development and Cooperation and by the other

committees concerned with the problem of world hunger, as well as in the course of the preparatory studies made in the *ad hoc* working party set up within the Committee on Development, the goal we set for ourselves was not primarily that of adding another study or another programme of general action to the studies and programmes which are already so numerous. What seemed to us essential in the course of our work, and what we have tried to express in the motion for a resolution now submitted to the vote of Parliament, was a coherent series of proposals which are as precise, as concrete, and as feasible as possible.

We believed that the most rigorous and useful way of contributing, as European Parliament and as European Community, to the fight against the hunger, the malnutrition, and the poverty which prevail in such a large part of the world was precisely to present this series of feasible proposals and then to attempt, through the action and the influence of our Parliament, to direct towards the implementation of these measures the coordinated efforts of the Community as such and of the Member States.

The resolution submitted for your consideration and to the vote of the Parliament should be examined — and I think this aspect should be underlined — in close relation to all the preparatory material, including not only the reports of the competent committees, but also the working documents prepared by the members of the group on world hunger from the Committee on Development.

Madam President, I cannot attempt here, in what is evidently only a few minutes, to give an in-depth analysis of the various aspects of world hunger, or the courses of action that the Community and the Member States should pursue in order to contribute towards a solution to this problem. For this necessary view in depth I refer you not only to the material appended to the report of the Committee on Development but also to the contributions to be made by other colleagues in the course of the debate. I will limit myself here to a rapid survey of the proposals and views contained in the resolution and attempt to clarify the approach which inspired the work of so many months.

I do not believe myself obliged, as an introduction to the debate, to quote the statistics of world hunger: this Parliament is aware of the quantitative dimensions of the problem; what can be said is that these quantitative dimensions are already an indication of the scale of a problem which is an intolerable scandal in the age in which we live.

Not only have the objectives laid down in 1974 by the United Nations World Food Conference with a view to eliminating hunger not been achieved, not only are there more starving people today than there were then, but in all likelihood the situation will deteriorate still further. There is a danger that, in the next few years, a still greater proportion of the population of

Ferrero

the Third World will be condemned to live in increasingly acute conditions of poverty and undernourishment.

This deterioration is strikingly exemplified by the increasingly frequent famines affecting whole regions of Africa, Asia, and Latin America (the case of Uganda is only the latest and most tragic). These emergencies are largely due to natural disasters or are connected with tragic political events. However, they also represent an acute manifestation of a more deep-rooted crisis, of structural trends and imbalances characterizing the present food situation in the underdeveloped areas and in the world in general.

Let us look at a few more statistics. The 1974 Rome Conference — which I believe it important to re-examine after the passage of time because it represented an important step in this regard — called for an annual average growth rate of 4 % in the agricultural and food production of the developing countries with a view to their eventual attainment of self-sufficiency in food. In the past few years this has not been the case. If we take, for example, the whole African continent, we see that *per capita* food production decreased in the period from 1970 to 1978 at the rate of 1.2 % a year, and the same pattern is observable in the other countries considered to be of priority importance in respect of their food deficit. In these countries there is less food today than there was ten years ago.

Food production expressed in relative terms, i.e. with reference to the population, is decreasing in most of the Third World, imports are increasing and there is growing dependence, both industrial and agricultural, on the economically more advanced countries. For many years now the developing countries, which until the middle of the century as a whole enjoyed substantial self-sufficiency in food — if only at the lowest level — have been forced to import massive and growing quantities of cereals and to suffer the consequences to the detriment of their balance of payments and their general economic development.

I think there can be no doubt that this situation clearly results in the first instance from the imbalance in the development of the agriculture and, in general, of the economies of the countries concerned. The fact that many developing countries specialize in the production of only one or very few agricultural raw materials for export has had an adverse effect on the cultivation of products for internal markets and on the extent to which local food requirements can be satisfied. This, Madame President and dear colleagues, is the picture of mass undernourishment in the Third World.

Many views have been expressed and many analyses have been carried out in connection with this problem, its causes and its links with poverty and underdevelopment. The work done by our committee echos some of them. Above all in recent times the alarm has been sounding with increasing urgency throughout world

opinion; there have been many more warnings, appeals, and initiatives. Practical solutions, which are so necessary, have been put forward in various quarters, and those which involve action on the part of the Community are indicated in our report. On many of these there seems to be extremely broad agreement in principle.

In particular, and without repeating here the contents of the resolution, I feel that three points are becoming increasingly clear, and I will now enumerate them.

Firstly, the campaign against poverty and hunger in the world must not be an isolated one, but should rather become an integral part of a new development strategy. Secondly, in order to carry out this task effectively the concept of merely providing assistance must be abandoned and priority given to promoting the complete restructuring of the agricultural production process. The developing countries themselves with policies determined freely and independently must make a massive effort to expand their agricultural production capacity, and their efforts must be supported by appropriate scientific, technical, and financial cooperation with the economically more advanced countries. In this connection, international action is also vital in order to remove those obstacles which place the agriculture of the developing countries — and in particular of the poorest and of those worst hit by hunger — at a disadvantage *vis-à-vis* the protected agricultures of the industrialized countries, and to establish rapidly an effective system of securing world food supplies.

Madam President and colleagues, there is no lack of analyses and proposals. The calls for action are becoming more and more urgent. There are ample and clear indications of what needs to be done and yet very little real progress has been made: there is a yawning discrepancy between the seriousness and urgency of the problems and the measures taken to deal with them.

Indeed, whereas the richer countries are indulging in enormous wastage of resources (it has been calculated that world arms expenditure now totals one million dollars a minute), the level of development aid is falling. The commitment to allocate 0.7 % of the gross national product to development aid has not been met, no concrete projects have been worked out for the coming decade, and aid actually fell from 0.35 % in 1975 to 0.34 % in 1979.

I believe it important to emphasize that aid policy is inadequate not only from a quantitative but also from a qualitative point of view. Aid is necessary and, indeed, should be substantially increased — I refer you to the document prepared by Mrs Focke for precise studies of this problem — but in particular it should be directed more towards structural measures, above all in agriculture and rural development.

Ferrero

The fact nevertheless remains that aid policies have been and are still intrinsically limited by the fact that they form part of, and do not alter in any way, a system of international economic and political relations based on inequality and on domination by the strongest countries. It is this system which must be changed if we are to wage an effective campaign against hunger and poverty in the Third World.

Permit me, Madam President, to draw attention to a general conclusion which, in my opinion, is prompted by all the work which has gone into the preparation of this report. There are specific causes and reasons which explain the continuation and worsening of the food crisis and whose practical aspects must be examined and approached in all their complexity. However, in seeking the true source of the problem, it becomes clear that hunger is merely the most dramatic and explosive manifestation of more fundamental processes and cannot be eliminated without attacking its very roots.

I think everyone agrees that practical and effective solutions are needed to combat hunger, but such solutions can only be found by tackling the problem at its roots.

These roots are to be found in the relations between developed and underdeveloped areas, that is, in the international economic order. The expression 'new economic order' is on everyone's lips, to the point where it has become a ritual expression and too frequently has only rhetorical value. But this call for a new order is not only based on the need for equity and justice felt by the underdeveloped countries; it is in fact an objective necessity, and this for two reasons: first because a decisive and realistic political initiative designed to establish a new basis for international economic relations is the only way of ensuring security and stability in the world and of establishing lasting peace. Secondly, because the crisis which has hit hardest of all the peoples of the Third World is now affecting the industrialized countries and will do so to a greater extent in future, forcing everyone to seek new forms of cooperation. Only a hypocrite and demagogue could believe that emergence from underdevelopment for the peoples of the Third World can coexist with the current production and consumption systems of the industrialized countries.

In addition to changes within the economies and societies of the underdeveloped countries, the solution to the problems of underdevelopment, and first and foremost the problem of hunger, calls for far-reaching social and economic adjustments and major cultural and ideological changes in the more advanced countries.

It is surely evident that the crisis affecting these countries is the same which is striking Europe, and that it cannot be resolved other than through such changes and adjustments, which are essential for a resumption

of a development no longer based on the exploitation and underdevelopment of the vast majority of mankind.

Madam President, this briefly is the significance of the resolution that it is my task to present today. I am certain that the coming debate will constitute an important moment in the life of our Parliament — as has already been proved in the Committee on Development — and that it will be very significant. Nevertheless, in concluding this introduction, it is impossible, I believe, not to repeat forcefully, our profound alarm: we are discussing questions of food and world hunger at a time when only a few hours will see the conclusion of the special session of the United Nations in New York, in which a delegation from our Parliament took part. It is not my task to offer judgments or evaluations. It will be for our colleague, Mr Bersani, who presided over this delegation, to take up this subject. There is no doubt however that what has happened in New York over the last three weeks should be the object of the Parliament's careful consideration as it determines its position on the hunger issue.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Christopher Jackson to speak on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee.

Mr. C. Jackson, draftsman of an opinion. — As I follow the main rapporteur perhaps I could offer to him and to the Members of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, my congratulations for the immense amount of work that has gone into this report, and particularly into the working documents. I venture to say that all of us will have found the working documents immensely valuable and helpful.

As I was listening to Mr Ferrero, it struck me as a terrible reminder of our responsibilities that for each of us sitting here in the Chamber this morning, there are perhaps 2 million people starving in the rest of the world: for each of us 2 million people with truncated, diminished lives. As representatives of one of the world's largest trading blocs, one of the world's richest groupings, our responsibility is even greater than it might at first seem. It is, indeed, a moral imperative for us.

Over six months ago the Political Affairs Committee, for whom I speak, recommended, in view of the weight and scale of the subject, that Parliament should prepare not one, but two, reports; the first one dealing with the simpler, more urgent, issues and leaving for a later report, more complex and difficult matters. It was and remains a sensible proposal. The report in front of us, although for many good reasons seven months late, could have benefited from a 2-stage approach, and I hope we will not be tempted to see this resolu-

Jackson

tion as our last word on the subject for some time to come. Indeed, among the amendments put down in my name but derived from the Political Affairs Committee opinion, are several calling for further study. I very much hope Parliament will support these since they offer the chance of further thought on several important issues. Some of these issues are difficult and emotive but that is no reason for this House not to study them.

The first to which I draw your attention calls on Parliament to study the possibility of aid for family planning and population control. Now I must report that my committee had divided views on this, but in the equation of hunger and food, population growth is a vital variable which the world ignores at its peril. Several other committees refer to this, and it must have a place in our final resolution.

The second matter requiring further study is the encouragement of private investment in developing countries. Again views differ. Some hold that private investment is the most valuable spur to development; others are concerned about the problems which it may bring. But we believe that the Community should ensure greater security for such investment from Community countries and that we should study in greater depth how this should be achieved.

Relations between Member States come up in another proposal in this resolution which calls for Community aid as a proportion of Member States' aid to be increased from the 10 % level at which it stands now. Well this is natural coming from the European Parliament. Of course, we will emotionally favour this. But we must ask ourselves whether this is going to result in more effective aid for those really in need and I suggest that the case is not proven.

Perhaps it is right that more food aid should be channelled through the Community. But I really think further study of whether other aid should be channelled more through the Community is necessary before we leap to a conclusion which, without evidence, will, I suggest, not carry weight with the Member States.

A key question, both for us and for developing countries is the total amount of aid to be provided. The last resolution from this Parliament called for 0.7 % of GNP; now we call for a timetable. But how many Member States will be prepared just like that to go to 0.7 % in the near future, as this would represent an average increase of some 60 %? Very few, I warrant. Furthermore, we believe that the burden should be spread among the richer countries, not just the Community. It will take time to increase aid.

Meanwhile, what should we do? There was strong agreement in my committee on what should be done now. We should place great emphasis on our internal efforts to increase the effectiveness of our aid, includ-

ing technical and educational assistance. This has a dual purpose. We shall not find our citizens willing to agree to large increases in aid unless the suspicions of waste and corruption are dispelled. Unless they are convinced that such aid is thoroughly worth while. Secondly we all want the aid we provide to have the maximum beneficial effect for those in need. For this reason, we urge that greater priority should be given to 'ex-post evaluation'. Ex-post evaluation is a terrible bit of jargon meaning finding out whether the money we have spent really helped to do what we intended. No one likes spending on administration, but it is foolish and woolly thinking to deny the Commission funds it needs to see if it is spending our money to the best effect.

Let me give two quick examples of ex-post evaluation. In Guatemala — a non-Community example — people who live around Lake Atitlan caught small fish, and some enterprising humanitarian came along and filled the lake with big black bass, so that the people would have more and bigger fish to eat. But bass are carnivorous: they ate all the little fish. Moreover, it is difficult to catch them, because they tend to stay at the bottom of the lake. So the result of that humanitarian gesture was, in effect, to cut down the supply of high protein food and reduce the levels of nutrition.

Now let me take a Community example. Some while ago we spent funds on pure water projects in Africa. All would agree at first sight that this should have high priority — artesian wells were drilled, electric pumps were installed, concrete cisterns were built to keep the water pure. But the Community's own ex-post evaluation showed that some of this money could have been much better spent. First of all electric pumps in remote areas break down sometimes and are not repaired. Secondly, since artesian wells are usually some distance from the village and water is heavy, the women of the village not unnaturally prefer to draw water from their local pond when it is full. But thirdly, and worst of all, when everything was working the investigators found that the containers which were used to draw the pure water were so heavily contaminated that the water was contaminated anyway. So the precise aim of this project was bound to fail. Now, that is scientific method teaching us what is really effective. It saves waste and makes aid work. I think we should have the humility to realize that we have to learn how best to give aid. This is of enormous importance. It is something we can do better now, and I hope that Parliament will not only vote for this amendment but will vote the necessary funds that the Commission needs to improve this work.

My committee gave special consideration to issues of human rights. What should the Community do when populations requiring aid have regimes that do not respect human rights? This is, alas, not infrequent. We had an example before us this morning in the care of Bolivia. We can think of Cambodia too. In such unhappy cases we call for aid to be restricted to food

Jackson

and medical aid and perhaps rural development, but with the proviso that it should go directly to those being aided and should be closely monitored.

Finally, Madam President, as the Brandt report makes clear, solving the hunger problem is not just a matter of food, still less food aid, but of wealth. Our primary aim, which we must never forget, is to help developing countries to help themselves to achieve economic self-sufficiency. In Lomé II we have an agreement which is a model of its kind and which the Community is justly proud of. But my committee believes that the Community must in future plan for a more broadly based relationship including other developing countries, based on a strategy of concentrating our limited resources especially on the very poorest regions of the world.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Nielsen to speak on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr Brøndlund Nielsen, draftsman of an opinion. — *(DK)* Madam President, it is my task, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, to say briefly what agriculture can do to counter the problems which world hunger involves. If I speak in very broad terms, the reason is that this can mean both agriculture in the actual countries concerned throughout the Third World, and also agriculture in the Community. Both elements should be included in the overall view.

It is generally true to say that the world's agriculture, both in the poor countries and in the Community, frequently has, in fact, a very considerable productive capacity and is an immensely solid and stabilizing element in society: often, however, the value of an efficient and well-run agricultural industry is perhaps not fully appreciated. It may be that in the Third World people have been overambitious and too eager to modernize manufacturing industry and other new forms of business, and have somewhat neglected the opportunities presented by the more traditional agricultural industry. It may be that in our part of the world there is a scepticism and a hostility towards agriculture in political circles, the effect of which is that the opportunities presented by agriculture are not fully exploited.

I believe it is a very serious mistake in both areas to underestimate the great importance of agriculture to society.

Turning to what must be done in individual areas, we recommend that in the developing countries more emphasis should be placed on development of the agricultural industries and on development in rural areas as a whole, and that efforts should be made to promote a balance between the many factors which can increase these countries' own agricultural production;

there are certainly many opportunities for such support. Expert assistance can be given towards acquiring the technological know-how which enables better use to be made of resources. This is a very difficult and challenging task. I need only mention for example the difficult climatic conditions which exist in many developing countries. Often there is not enough rain, while at other times there is too much. According to the figures, there are some places with the same amount of rain as we have for example here in Western Europe, but it may only fall on a few days in the year. The conditions are therefore completely different. On the other hand, the climate in many places is so warm that there can be several crops in a year.

We must help these countries to make the best use of all these very complex circumstances, and we must ask them to recognize the opportunities which may exist. We must also support the expansion of their own processing industries. We must support their development of local technology, something which they themselves can cope with. It is certainly true, as the draftsman of the Political Affairs Committee said, that we should also beware of giving aid in the form of technology which local people may not understand. I will not go into detail on all these questions, but would refer to my opinion.

Looking at the situation here in the Community, our task is clearly to support these countries from our own resources. Here I would say first and foremost that as far as agriculture in general is concerned, we must play our part in raising the general level of prosperity, so that we have the greatest possible scope for producing surpluses with which to help these countries. Of course we must do this in the right way, as I said in my comments on the developing countries, and in this context I agree that we should recognize that in the past we have often made mistakes in connection with our aid, and would mention that last week Professor Myrdal from Sweden delivered a violent attack on the way in which we give aid. He says that he does so quite sincerely, as he has personally been involved in the organization of Swedish aid, and I believe it is right to reflect that on occasions we may have supported the wrong trends in the developing countries. We should always be looking critically at our own aid.

On the other hand, we can of course help in an entirely practical way with foodstuffs. Here we have great scope, because we have an enormous productive capacity. What is very much in dispute is the extent to which we should give aid in the form of goods which we are especially well-equipped to produce. We in the Committee on Agriculture have stated that of course we do not believe that development aid should merely be, as it were, a function of our own surpluses. But on the other hand, it is just as clear to the great majority of the Committee on Agriculture that we should obviously give aid in the form of goods which we are especially well-equipped to produce, and in this

Brøndlund Nielsen

context I would like to mention milk in particular. It is a fact, which I have also discussed in detail in my opinion, that milk, by virtue of its biological composition, is quite clearly an immensely good and versatile foodstuff, and it is something which we are capable of producing in large quantities. Furthermore the cow, because of its special digestive system, is able to use what are in fact no more than waste products to produce this protein, this foodstuff, which has a very high nutritive value. The cow can produce it from the simplest nitrogen compounds, and this is something for which we have good climatic potential. It is also something for which we have a great tradition. We have farmers in the Community who know how to produce it and we have good processing facilities. Therefore, we should obviously give aid in the form of something which we can produce in such quantity. In doing so we can make far more intensive use of our agricultural areas, and also of land which simply cannot be used for grain growing, for example.

In this context we should also endeavour to increase the opportunities for the people of the developing countries, the hungry people, to make use of this foodstuff. This may be a question of how it is to be applied, and also one of information, for example in order to avoid the mistake, which is actually being made, of allowing powdered milk to be used excessively and in the wrong way as a substitute for breast feeding in the developing countries.

The Community should also support the developing countries through its trade policy, so that they can obtain the food they need. The Community already plays a key role here, as we are of course the world's largest importer of food. We should have an open attitude in this respect. For example, we should look more closely at the possibility of the developing countries increasing production of some of the things which we can reprocess. I have in mind a number of feedstuffs for which there may actually be a greater market than for other items which at present they are trying to produce. We should therefore support and complement each other to a greater extent in terms of worldwide food production. Here I would point out on behalf of the committee that the experience gained from the Lomé Convention is something on which we must build with regard to trade in foodstuffs.

Finally, I would like to say that for myself and for the committee it is essential to state that when agricultural policy and agricultural problems are linked with the question of malnutrition in the world, there is a passive and negative response, an inadequate understanding of the tremendous opportunities which we actually have. If there is an area in which we lack pioneering spirit, it is not in agriculture or amongst those people who are experts in this area, but unfortunately in politics. There is insufficient understanding of how much we can actually do. I can name the products. How many times have we heard complaints here in Parliament that we are producing too much? Yes

indeed, but it is appalling to think that at the same time some places are suffering from malnutrition: I would also mention know-how and information. We possess a vast amount of agricultural know-how. There are many elements which must be combined. But let us use them. Let us put them to use to benefit the starving world. A huge range of knowledge is involved, genetic, ecological, geological and technical knowledge. If all this is put to use part of a truly determined effort to support the improvement of agriculture in the developing countries, then we can make a great contribution to the fight against hunger.

We are faced with a genuine challenge and our efforts can produce great results. My appeal is for our attitude to be marked by this positive pioneering spirit, to enable agriculture to play its part in solving the problem of malnutrition in the world, because it can do so:

(Applause from the right)

President. — I call Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul to speak on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations.

Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul, draftsman of an opinion. — (D) Ladies and gentlemen, the motion for a resolution tabled by the Committee on Development and Cooperation represents, in my view, a short- and medium-term programme of action for the reorientation of a specific area of the Community's and Member States' development policy. It endeavours to provide a uniform concept for the policy of the European Community and its Member States towards such divergent institutions as the UN, GATT and also the IMF. We want to make it more difficult in the future for the Community and its member governments to make grand political speeches, as at the last UN conference, and then to shift the practical consequences to other institutions and do exactly the opposite in the IMF or GATT to what had generally been proclaimed.

The way in which this resolution has been drawn up can also be taken, I feel, as an example for other projects in this Parliament. It proves that only if careful, comprehensive and unsparing efforts are made to take stock of the situation and make the necessary preparations, can the European Parliament be prevented from becoming a stage for inconsequential exchanges and used to exert influence on European policy.

The discussions in the Committee on External Economic Relations were based on a number of fundamental assumptions, one of which I should like to mention here and again make it quite clear what my personal position is. We wish to point out, as Mr Ferrero has done, that the structures in the Third World countries which cause hunger — and the insi-

Wieczorek-Zeul

dious food crisis affects in particular the very poor in certain developing countries — are often a legacy of the colonial period. If we are honest, we must admit that the economic, political and military interests of the industrial countries — including the Community Member States — help to perpetuate these structures.

The colonial legacy which causes hunger includes the agricultural structure of the developing countries and agricultural production geared to exports, with a large proportion of non-foodstuffs. The activities of present-day transnational companies in agricultural production and trade in the developing countries have added to this tendency. In the fight for productive agricultural areas to grow cash crops that can be exported the cultivation of basic foodstuffs always suffers. But the developing countries then find themselves in a vicious circle. Their own inadequate food production forces them to import more foodstuffs. Increases in the prices of these foodstuffs then affect the developing countries, and particularly with the lowest income groups, who in any case have hardly enough money to subsist and must spend most of their income on food.

But at the same time — and here too, I feel, there is a need for greater honesty in our debate — the industrial countries, including the European Community — and in this respect I disagree with the previous rapporteur — pursue a protectionistic agricultural policy. For we are willing to accept the developing countries as suppliers of agricultural products only as long as they do not compete with the products protected by our market organizations and high prices, even if these are the very products the developing countries would be able to supply after satisfying their domestic needs. We are willing to accept them as trading partners only as long as they supply non-processed products. This means that with our policy we are preventing major changes in the production structures of the developing countries. This policy was rightly criticized at the recent FAO conference. A strategy aimed at permanently eliminating hunger in the world therefore requires, in our opinion, integrated impulses geared to the independent development of the developing countries and to satisfying the basic needs of the broad masses in the developing countries. This means giving absolute priority to enabling the indigenous population to feed itself — food first — increasing agricultural production in the developing countries themselves, greater collective self-reliance. But it also means that we must be willing to accept the exploitation by the developing countries of those areas of the world market in which they enjoy particular cost and geographical advantages. This happens to be true of agricultural products. We must also accept that the developing countries want to achieve greater protection for their economies and to go their own way in other areas, in which they are less competitive.

The Committee on External Economic Relations therefore calls for three changes in the orientation of the Community policy on trade, the only aspect we discussed:

Firstly, the collective power of the developing countries in their competition with the industrial countries should be strengthened — a very liberal principle furthermore. Secondly, Community markets should be opened to agricultural products of the developing countries and the same time the markets in the most important foodstuffs should be stabilized. Thirdly, the activities of private firms engaged in agricultural trade should be supervised.

As regards the collective power of the developing countries we would refer explicitly to the UNCTAD proposals for the creation of independent trade structures in these countries. We totally reject the Commission's proposals for what amounts to new instruments of intervention for the Community's export policy . . .

(Applause)

. . . because they are guided by the US or Australian proposals and, in my view, run counter to the long-term goal of increasing food production in the developing countries themselves. All that is being done is to shift the European Community's agricultural problems onto the world market, and this to the detriment of the developing countries.

With regard to the improvement of the developing countries' opportunities for exporting agricultural products, here again, I should like to add, it is remarkable to see how many of those who claim the international division of labour between the North and South, in other words free trade, in the industrial sector to be absolutely essential, also talk of outright mismanagement and the protection of agricultural markets against world market trends. For me this is a most illogical view. It has resulted in trade in non-agricultural products being increasingly liberalized within GATT, while trade in agricultural products has largely been excluded from this trend at the request of the European Community. And if we are honest, we must, if we intend to stick by our demands, press for a reform of the Community's agricultural policy, for the abolition of protectionistic measures and for a more cautious price policy.

The shaping of the sugar policy will, in the opinion of the Committee on External Economic Relations, be a test-case in this respect. The Community must resist attempts to expand production in the Community even further and so add fuel to the fire of competition with the developing countries in the world market. That is exactly the opposite of a practical development policy strategy.

The committee therefore calls on the European Community to make provision for larger quantities

Wieczorek-Zeul

and the inclusion of new agricultural products, whether processed or intended for other areas, in the new form of generalized system of preferences to be used after 1980. And we also call for a long-term strategy for the fight against hunger, to the benefit not only of the associated developing countries, but above all of the non-associated countries, which we feel are deserving of exactly the same care and attention from the European Community.

To conclude, we call on the European Community to develop its own legally binding code of conduct for transnational groups with their headquarters in the Community as a means of making their economic activities more transparent. We are particularly concerned about certain business practices of agricultural groups and specifically the manipulation of transfer prices. We are very worried about the increasing tendency towards vertical concentration and integration among private undertakings engaged in agricultural trade. This results in the developing countries being deprived of some of their production, and we have illustrated this very clearly with figures and other data, taking the banana trade and other areas as examples.

Allow me to conclude by making a personal comment. I find it regrettable that this motion for a resolution does not contain a reaction to the appeal by the developing countries for the reform of the decision-making bodies of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund to enable the developing countries to be more democratically represented. The developing countries placed particular emphasis, rightly I feel, on this demand at the UN Conference which has just ended, since in many respects present IMF conditions stand in the way of the independent development of the developing countries for which our motion for a resolution appeals. If we do not contribute to democratic change in the International Monetary Fund, we shall not witness further development in the North-South relationship or the negotiations in this connection.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mrs Squarcialupi to speak on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.

Mrs Squarcialupi, draftsman of an opinion — (I) Madam President, honourable colleagues, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, too was also determined to set aside the facile rhetoric which often appears in the discussion of the problem of world hunger. We wanted to overcome precisely, the risk of over-generalization, by presenting concrete proposals and precise suggestions to the Commission.

The rapporteur has caught the spirit of our work in various paragraphs of the motion for a resolution, but because our requests are precise and practicable, we have preferred to bring them up again in an amendment, hoping that the rapporteur would accept them so that the executive can put them into effect.

The underdeveloped world is threatened by hunger and diseases, and many of these diseases are a direct consequence of malnutrition. In the majority of cases, however, these diseases cannot be cured by medicinal drugs. The pharmaceutical products which are sent to underdeveloped countries are in general 'our' medicines, meant for the sick of the industrialized countries where hunger is not a mass tragedy. It must also be added that these medicines have been tried out on us, i.e. on people in very different physical and psychological conditions. We can see clearly now the need for a new pharmaceutical policy in regard to the Third World. The shipment of medical supplies to the underdeveloped countries has offered and continues to offer very high profits because medicines there sell for prices ten and even twenty times those current in our own countries, while *per capita* income, as we know, is very much lower. In addition, companies producing medicines — usually multinationals — send to these people what is left over in storage: old or ineffective remedies and even harmful ones which are in any case unsuited to treat their diseases. We are asking that the Commission of the European Community intervene decisively on this matter. Above all, the European Development Fund should take action to help in the training of personnel specialized in pharmaceutical problems, in agreement with the World Health Organization, which has taken a specific interest in the problem. Let it be quite clear that the problem of medicinal drugs must be faced along with all the problems which derive from it, whether it is a question of the supply or the production of these drugs or of the choice that each nation will make regarding certain medicines. There must be a new pharmaceutical policy which is not divided into sectors. The World Health Organization has already prepared a list of basic medicines. These make up only two hundred out of the hundreds of thousands of products now on the market.

The choice of basic medicines is a cultural, scientific, and administrative decision, closely allied to a plan of information and education. Only these two elements can guarantee that the use of medicines constitutes a genuine response to health needs and not merely a part of our export trade or of the budgets of the developing countries. To organize the pharmaceutical sector is to coordinate the various health sectors: technical, medical, educational and administrative. It is true that the experts and the knowledge required to carry out such a policy are lacking both in the underdeveloped and in the industrialized areas where pharmaceuticals is still an object of consumerism and above all a source of profit.

Squarcialupi

A European Economic Community programme should first of all encourage the building of this knowledge, establishing European research centres to develop a common collaboration plan which would include the training of personnel to assume practical responsibility in the various countries of the Third World. It should also finance an exchange program with study grants earmarked for students from those countries. It would then be necessary to fund, in the developing countries, a programme of intensive regional studies — for diseases have a regional development — and also an independent program of information and documentation on the medicines available to help these countries with the procedures of approval and registration. Let us remind the large-scale pharmaceutical producers of their responsibilities; to this end we invite the Commission to make a study, as called for in our resolution, of the present state of the pharmaceutical market in the countries of the Third World, of the prices of products — and these will offer some real surprises — and of the possibility of setting up independent production. We also call for the utilization of the technological potential of the large pharmaceutical producers through *ad hoc* programmes and incentives to promote the study of medicines best suited to treat and overcome diseases, specially the infectious diseases typical of the Third World. And by medicines we also mean methods of birth control, easy-to-use contraceptives for which the women of the Third World would not be passive guinea pigs — as has too often been the case — but active participants.

In our opinion we mentioned the demographical problem, the problem of family planning in the developing countries. The population increase, as Mr Ferrero also noted in his report, is greater than the growth in agricultural production. In many countries young people of under fifteen years of age make up more than 45 % of the whole population. This demographic problem is certainly a very delicate one, but it must be faced in order to prevent a recourse to drastic and inhuman solutions, contrary to civil and human rights, such as obligatory mass sterilization, which some governments have introduced under the pressure of hunger. It is urgent therefore to undertake the study of the various effective contraceptive methods easily accessible to the majority of women, so that, through improved health education, drastic and violent means of family planning aimed at eliminating mouths that cannot be fed, may be avoided. Through health education and medicine, women must be given more dignity and a free choice, and their children must become complete human beings able to enjoy the first of the fundamental rights of all people: that of having enough to eat.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Cheysson.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) Madam President, is it right for a Commissioner to pay tribute to Parliament? I shall be so bold as to do so. Eleven months of work, five committees, ten reports, public hearings: these are, in our opinion, remarkable working methods, although the subject warranted this overall political examination by the most political of the Community's institutions. What national parliament has gone to such trouble? Madam President, the Commission is proud to serve a Parliament such as this.

In taking an interest in this subject, Parliament has also touched on one of those issues which mobilizes our peoples, to whom Mr Ferrero has appealed. The word mobilize is too strong, whatever we say is too weak. Think of the shock we experience when we see on the television those emaciated men, those young people with their empty eyes, some of them blind, those mothers grasping dead babies to their withered breasts. Are we going to put up with this? The children of Uganda are the latest sufferers, there were others before them, there will be others after them.

This emotion must also find expression in this Parliament. It must be expressed so that it can be transformed into thought and into action.

I shall not dwell, Madam President, on all the figures which might illustrate this misery, this suffering of 700 million, perhaps 1 000 million people living in abject poverty. All I will do is recall the shortcomings which some parliamentarians seem to have forgotten.

According to the dreadful prospects which the FAO has outlined for us the cereals deficit of the Third World countries will rise from 40 m tonnes in 1978 to 90 m in 2 000 and the deficit in dairy products from 8 m tonnes to 33 m tonnes in 2 000, while meat, a surplus of which is now produced, will soon be in deficit, and this deficit will reach 200 000 tonnes in the year 2 000.

I will not go on with these figures. As the rapporteur has done in his excellent motion for a resolution, I shall simply confine myself to sounding the alarm about the size of the problem and to proposing that something be done about it as soon as possible. It is a good thing that this Parliament is discussing the problem at the very time the FAO is convening a special meeting to discuss the misery in Africa and the critical situation that is developing there.

This is an enormous problem, Madam President, and it therefore entails many answers, which I shall endeavour to enumerate and discuss. In any case, I owe this to the 57 Members of this Parliament who have put down their names to speak in this debate.

The first objective is obviously to increase production in the developing countries themselves. That may be

Cheyssson

obvious, but it is not easy. Let us not oversimplify this debate by stating that it is enough to provide more money or more technology or more infrastructures. No. The problem is complex, as the rapporteur and others, Mr Vergeer, for example, have very clearly illustrated.

The objective is self-sufficiency, at least overall self-sufficiency in each region, balance in agricultural trade. But what must be produced in the present situation? Cereals, that is obvious. Absolute priority must be given to calorific intake. Third World man at present has an annual calorific intake of only 70 % of that enjoyed by man in industrialized countries. Without this intake nothing is possible. The rest simply cannot be assimilated. I shall come back to this point in a moment.

Mr Leontiev feels that production in the Third World must be tripled, the primary objective being cereals.

There are other deficiencies, as we know, particularly protein deficiency. Here the situation is particularly grave, since protein intake in the Third World is hardly more than half that in the industrialized countries, with all the physiological consequences this has, leading in extreme cases to blindness and rickets. This protein deficiency can be partly overcome with cereals, but there must be systematic development of legumes, particularly soya, and of proteins of animal origin.

I should like to thank those rapporteurs who have stressed the importance of fish and all the forms in which it can be produced. All this, as is excellently stated in the report, entails activity in the rural environment. This is where everything begins. Hence technical aid, research into the improvement of productivity, into the development of more resistant species or types of animal and into energy savings as well. At present 40 % of the imported energy consumed by the Third World in agriculture goes to the production of fertilizers. We should try to find products which consume less energy and at the same time to improve output.

This research must include, wherever possible, the application of traditional methods adapted to the use of more up-to-date materials. Hence the major interest in the development of animal power in farming. 35 % of all energy is at present consumed by agricultural machinery. Hence the major interest in small-scale as against large-scale water engineering and the great importance of all methods of conservation inspired by traditional methods, for example, drying. Research into the use of tools and equipment which have been known for centuries. What place do they have in the general environment: Mrs Squarzialupi has just referred to this, and Mr Ferrero does so at length in his report.

This environment is not only a production environment: it is also a living environment. And the whole of this environment must be tackled along with all the health, education, community life and cooperative development problems wherever this is possible. These societies must be taken as they are and developed as they are, and we must first concentrate on the principal driving forces. In the life of a society, our concern is primarily for women, who in less developed environments have the hardest time. Let us never forget this while we are seeing what can be done.

What we have already done under the Lomé Convention has been mentioned by a number of speakers, and I wish to thank them for this. In overall figures, 1 500 m EUA of EDF monies has so far been invested in rural development projects. We note with interest that the share allocated to rural development is growing constantly as a result of the goodwill of our partner governments. Beginning with 25 %, we have reached 37 % for all forms of rural development under Lomé I, and the present programme tells us that we shall reach 42 % under Lomé II. Our other activities, outside the Lomé Convention, are inspired by the same concern. We have, for example, the special campaign that stemmed from the Avenue Kléber dialogue in respect of the funds which we made available to the countries worst hit by the crisis some years ago.

All this, then, entails integrated action, as I have just said and as Mr Ferrero illustrates brilliantly in his report. During the last debate, in October 1979, I described some of the activities to which we have subscribed, for example, the development of fishing on the River Niger and of dairy production in India. I should like to give a few more examples today. First, we have the action we have taken in regard to the evaluation of fish stocks, the construction of a number of fishing ports and the systematic development of fish breeding, these activities taking place in the Gulf of Guinea, the Pacific Ocean, Lake Tanganyika, the River Niger and the Island of Mauritius.

Let us take an example, one which I recently saw for myself which left a great impression on me and one which you yourself, Madam President, saw during your visit to one of the ACP countries: the programme covering 600 000 hectares in the Bénoué region, which will affect 45 000 people, was begun in 1973 and will continue for another 10 years. The programme concerns the production of food for domestic consumption and of cash crops, because these people need some resources, reforestation, stock-breeding and all the aspects of development, farming, of course, but also health and education, combining bilateral aid, aid from the Community amounting to 9 m EUA and aid from non-governmental organizations.

I have just used the term 'non-governmental organizations'. A number of rapporteurs have stressed the

Cheysson

importance of these organizations. I should also like to pay sincere tribute to them here. The experience we have had for a number of years, thanks to this Parliament, of systematic cooperation with these organizations has proved to be one of the most intelligent and one of the most fruitful we could have had. I pay tribute to them, and I hope to be able to give them regular support.

(Applause)

Madam President, as we are talking about this society and as progress is bound to originate from it, it must also be replaced in its environment. I do not want to dwell too long on what has been said by Mr Ferrero in such excellent fashion about agricultural reform and agricultural credits. But I should like to talk for a moment about price policy. The farmers in developing countries are like our own: they need an incomes policy to encourage them to produce, they need to feel sure about their incomes and the growth of their incomes, they need markets around them which encourage them to produce and encourage them to earn so that they can buy what they need. A very systematic effort is therefore being made in this respect. We are making a not inconsiderable contribution through STABEX. I would point out after five years of this system that two-thirds of STABEX under Lomé I has been used to deal with unforeseen local circumstances — drought, hurricanes, natural difficulties — which would otherwise have affected whole farming communities. This is also why 172 m of the 375 m EUA of the STABEX funds under Lomé I has gone to the Sahel. Work must also be done outside the villages: transport must be made easier, in other words infrastructures improved, along with storage facilities, since 40 % of produce is lost in certain countries as a result of poor storage, and supplies to markets must be ensured.

As I have already said, Madam President, I find the constant criticism of cash crops unreasonable. What do you want certain Third World countries to export if they do not export agricultural products? And if they do not export, are they going to live on public charity? A balance must be struck between cash crops and crops for domestic consumption. This balance has not been struck in the past, particularly during the colonial period. It must be re-established. But this must not be done by eliminating cash crops.

This must be planned strategically. The World Food Conference and the World Food Council have said so often enough. Mr Ferrero's report is explicit in this regard: we must give encouragement to these strategies, we must, in my opinion, make it a condition that strategic plans exist before we grant certain forms of our long-term aid. All this, of course, in the framework of these countries' farming industries.

But whatever we do, Madam President, food aid will continue to be necessary. It will be needed by the least favoured regions, those who will not be able to strike a balance, and there are unfortunately quite a few of them. It will be needed throughout the period of progress in the Third World. It will be needed when disasters occur. We must therefore be careful when discussing this aid, all the more so as we have at present a direct responsibility: Community aid represents a large proportion of world aid. In controlling us this Parliament thus controls an important element at world level.

An argument has been advanced by the rapporteur who has studied this area in some detail, to the effect that it would be preferable to confine the supply of food aid in kind to emergencies and simply to have budgetary appropriations for normal aid. I shall not make a habit of this, but I must disagree with Mrs. Focke in both respects.

There can be no doubt that appropriations are also needed for emergency aid, because some money has to be spent on the spot at the time of disaster. Supplies from Europe would not be enough. On the other hand, normal, ongoing aid must also include products. We must accept our responsibilities in the world-wide production of foodstuffs, which we know are in short supply and of which, we fear, there will be an almost permanent shortage. We must encourage development for the time when, in the medium term, we may be less sure about the use of appropriations. In any case, Mrs Focke does not stress this intentionally provocative point, and I thank her for making it. She then goes on to examine very carefully the various aspects of the aid we grant. In this case, I entirely agree with almost every point she makes.

With regard to emergency aid, the rapporteurs accept that what we are doing is on the whole satisfactory. Action is taken with great speed: I have already said that we were in effect providing assistance in Uganda within one month and in Equatorial Guinea within ten days. When there have been hurricanes, aid has arrived within a fortnight to a month. Ten days after Hurricane Allen the first aid arrived in St Lucia. I would also point out in passing that as a result of Hurricane Allen we have now paid out 1 650 000 EUA outside the Community and we have just allocated 700 000 EUA to the West Indies. Despite this, we must be able to make further improvements by saving time in getting things moving, by agreeing on other procedures that are more speedy and in many cases by agreeing to the on-the-spot purchase of food that it would take too long to transport to the scene.

The range of products must also be increased. Coordination of emergency aid seems satisfactory to us, involving an alarm system for the Nine and the Commission on the one hand, working in very close and friendly cooperation with the United Nations

Cheysson

agencies and the non-governmental organizations on the other. The volume of appropriations is sizeable under the Lomé Convention: under Lomé II we shall have 200 m EUA as against 150 m under Lomé I. They are, as it were, symbolic in the budget you adopt, because it is impossible to forecast disasters, but they do gain in size through subsequent changes: 42 m in 1979, 39 m since the beginning of this year.

I now turn to normal aid. On behalf of the Commission, and this is a solemn commitment to Parliament, I entirely agree with the recommendations made by the rapporteurs. This aid must become part of our development aid. It must be an element, a means of development. But we must greatly improve the opportunities we have. If it is to help development, Madam President, it should be possible for our normal aid to form the subject of multiannual commitments, as the Commission has been requesting since 1974. The Governments allow this from time to time. For example, the London Food Aid Convention on wheat which Mrs Focke rightly welcomes. For example, the help we have given to the dairy product operation in India, 'Flood', but otherwise the need for this is rejected by our Governments year after year. Help us, I beg of you, to convince them of this need.

Similarly, the counterpart funds must be allocated in advance and for a long period, which would be the case if we entered into multiannual commitments to make supplies to projects in preference to projects which we finance otherwise. If we wish to contribute to development with our food aid, we must undoubtedly make sure we have strategic stocks of our own and that they are encouraged to include such stocks in their policies, which at the moment we are forbidden to do. Of course, all this will be linked to the food strategies to which I referred just now, and a condition will be that on no account must the distribution of our aid undermine their own efforts.

Several rapporteurs, Mrs Focke in particular, have raised the question of quantities, and I thank them for their support. You are aware of the Commission's position on this, which is the same as your own. We are pleased that the Governments have at last agreed to an increase in the commitment by the Community of the Nine Member States on wheat to 1 650 000 tonnes, 56 % from the Community. We hope to go even further.

Some people then try to apply the same argument to milk as to cereals. However eminent some of those who advance this argument may be, I would warn against oversimplifying this aspect. Powdered milk is not in fact a product that is easily distributed and used in Third World countries. Powdered milk contains proteins, which, without vitamins, are of no interest, since they do not eliminate the danger of blindness and of rickets to which I have referred. Even powdered milk to which vitamins have been added — which is what we send at present — is useless if the

caloric content is inadequate, because it is not assimilated by the body. I would also add that the powdered milk we send is frequently of poor quality, either because it has been stored too long (we should not imagine that it is enough to increase appropriations to get rid of our intervention stocks) or because of difficulties over the use of powdered milk on the spot. In other words, increasing the supply of powdered milk depends on the installation of satisfactory distribution networks in the countries concerned. That is why we so often act through international and non-governmental organizations and why we at present block requests for very large quantities from countries which have not shown themselves capable of overcoming the problem. The limit has been reached. It would be irresponsible of me to tell you that in the years to come we can substantially increase the quantities of powdered milk sent to the Third World as food aid. The rapporteur is right in this respect. On the other hand, the research into protein intake must — if the Governments so desire and if Parliament so recommends — allow us to make a very substantial increase in our supplies of butter oil, to broaden the range of products we supply as food aid — and this is a proposal we have formally made to the competent institutions, which also covers vegetable oil, other protein elements, sugar and so on.

I should not like to leave unmentioned the very many recommendations and criticisms which have been expressed about the implementation and administration of our aid programmes, although in many respects we plead not guilty. It is true that sharing responsibilities between two general supervisory bodies, between the Commission and the Member States, results in excessive and often incomprehensible delays. It is true that our procedures are intolerably complex. It is true that our checks are still inadequate, checks on where our food aid and the counterpart funds go. Excesses have occurred. We have had to penalize several countries by refusing to send them food aid direct and insisting on going through non-governmental organizations. The checks are inadequate in Europe: they are left entirely to the national intervention agencies, and the Commission must accept its responsibility here. You are right: we must have more careful checks on quality. It is intolerable, it is humiliating that Europe should be called to task eight times in the last few months over supplies of rice which had been attacked by weevils and was no longer fit for consumption. Shame on those companies which have palmed off their waste on us in this way. But we must admit that our checks have been inadequate. All these things must be improved, I recognize that.

We would also like to comply with your request for comprehensive report on the past, for annual reports. But, Madam President, I am obliged to repeat everything that has been said so often here in the past and tell you that with the staff you have given us we cannot even contemplate making any progress what-

Cheysson

soever in this respect. We have at present seven A-grade officials — I repeat, seven — for the administration of normal food aid. Last November you did want to give us two more. But in a last-minute burst of economy you deleted these two posts when you adopted the 1980 budget. While we are on the subject, I would ask Parliament to note the inconsistency between the recommendations and the decisions it makes.

Madam President, this report refers to the transport problem, and once again I admit that the rapporteurs are right. The Commission must become more directly involved. It must first identify the problem better. This can be done by means of the budget that has just been adopted, because it includes a separate budgetary line for transport operations. The Commission will shortly be proposing a regulation. And as I am talking about regulations, I must again refer to the incredible anomaly that has resulted in the proposed regulation on aid administration put forward by the Commission in June 1978 still awaiting consideration. I call on Parliament to do something about this.

I cannot finish this statement on hunger in the world without mentioning international trade. I trust that no one will lose interest, because this is an important aspect. It is a day-dream to suppose that every Third World country will become self-sufficient in all kinds of food products. There are products that cannot be produced in certain areas or in certain climates. These countries, as I have already said, must have resources. So they must sell. They must sell at foreseeable, safe terms. What, then, is the situation on the various markets at the moment? Cocoa has gone from \$ 1.90 to \$ 1.10 per pound in ten months. Coffee rose from \$ 1.25 to \$ 2.13 in four months and then fell back again. With markets like this, how do you expect any country in the world to devise a strategy and to develop. Could any of us do so? Would any of our countries accept similar fluctuations? Agreements on raw materials must therefore be given top priority, as the rapporteurs have rightly said. And this is particularly true of the UNCTAD agreements.

But with all due respect to some Members of this Parliament, these countries must also buy products outside: milk, soft wheat, sugar in some cases. But we find the same anomalies, even more serious perhaps, with regard to the products we sell. In 1974 wheat rose by 50 % in three weeks at the Chicago Exchange. The price of sugar fluctuates in a dreadful manner: it increased fourfold in a year, 1974, then dropped by two-thirds in 1975 and finally tripled in 1980. Are we going to accept this kind of situation? We have the courage to ask the oil-producing countries to ensure a foreseeable, regular, rational development in the price of oil, but, when it comes to other products, we laugh and leave it to market forces, which in certain markets means five people or two people, to fix price levels. The Community should accept its responsibility in this respect and put an end to the inconsistency which

results in its gambling on low cocoa prices, gambling systematically, while at the same time compensating for the decline in export incomes by means of STABEX and encouraging cocoa producers to produce more.

The Community must accept its responsibility in all commercial fields, including buying. The Members of Parliament who have made much of this are right. They are right up to a point. Let us not forget that the Common Market is now the largest market in the world for Third World agricultural produce. We are the largest importer of agricultural produce in the world: 48 % of our agricultural imports come from developing countries — \$ 17 000 m a year. In 1974 it was only 42 %. We import goods from the developing countries to the value of 17 000 m EUA a year, whereas our total agricultural exports to the world as a whole amount to only 13 000 m. 35 % of the Third World's agricultural exports are absorbed by the Community as against 18 % by the United States and less than 10 % by Japan.

In these circumstances, there should be, it seems to me, less criticism about protectionism on our part. 50 % of these products enter duty-free, 45 % at reduced rates for the Third World, 5 % at the full duty rate, but these criticisms persists. They principally concern certain products which in many cases it is absolutely absurd to produce in the Community. I shall mention only petro-tomatoes, because I do not want to dwell on this.

Madam President, the general rapporteur proposes in this motion for a resolution that the Commission should submit a study on the effects of the common agricultural policy on international trade in foodstuffs and on the impact of Community agricultural exports on world markets and the developing countries. If Parliament adopts these two proposals, the Commission will comply as soon as possible. But we must also contribute to the developing countries' security of supply. And here I am talking in particular to one of the speakers who presented an opinion just now. I do not understand the opposition expressed by various Members of Parliament to the idea that Third World countries which must import certain foodstuffs should want to safeguard themselves in the medium and long term. They want security where their supplies are concerned, they want to be able to forecast the prices of the products they buy. If this were not the case, how do we explain that we are now dealing with more than 25 applications from developing countries for long-term contracts? There was the Egyptian contract, which was abandoned, as you know. But they are now coming from all sides: from Africa, from Latin America, from the Middle East. Venezuela is asking us for a contract, as are Syria, Algeria, Zaïre, because they want this security, because they want protection against a strategy which at present is entirely controlled by the multinationals. Are we going to get

Cheysson

involved in this? We already are involved, we the Community, we who have no way of intervening in the medium and long term, no way of enabling our exporters to enter into the firm and foreseeable commitments our customers need, which would include opportunities of granting medium-term credit, interest subsidies, payment in local currency, encouragement of private storage, as so many other countries are able to do, and not only the United States and Australia, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, but also Sweden, Canada and other countries whose relations with the Third World are in no way suspect. This element of our common agricultural policy must be considered. I hope Parliament will spend the necessary time on it. I thus come to the end, Madam President, of a long and complex statement, which has touched on a wide range of subjects, including technical assistance, research, training, financing, aid in kind, access to the market and raw materials, because all these subjects are interdependent, just like those directly concerned, our farmers and their farmers, producers and businessmen. This is what the Brandt report says — rightly so — and I respectfully pay tribute to Willy Brandt. It is what your resolution says, and rightly so. We are dealing with an aspect of the development problem. It is therefore natural to speak of the 0.7 %, which has progressively declined to 0.34 %. Nothing will be done without additional financing, but it is natural to speak of all the rest. Madam President, hunger has disappeared from our industrial societies with the progress of democracy between the 18th and 20th centuries. The challenge we now face is to know whether at world level we can make the same leap forward at the end of the 20th and perhaps the beginning of the 21st centuries. This Parliament is helping to clear minds, to increase understanding, to transform emotion into the will to act.

(Applause)

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

Mr Brandt. — *(D)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the report which we have before us and which Mr Ferrero introduced at the beginning of this item of the agenda today, on which the draughtsmen have spoken and on which the Commissioner responsible has just made an important statement, is, in my view, a good one.

I can tell the House that the Socialist Group is prepared to approve the report in its entirety and as it stands, unless the rapporteur feels it possible to accept the addition proposed by the rapporteur of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and provided that we can reach agreement on this.

Madam President, it is somewhat regrettable that it has not been possible to discuss this subject until

today. The delay is to some extent due to the working methods of this Parliament. These working methods are certainly still a long way away from what would be appropriate in view of the legitimation given by the direct elections. All reasonable politics have to do with priorities. Those who are unable to distinguish the essential from the not so essential should not complain if their opportunities for exerting influence remain limited.

I also mention this with respect to another issue. If the report of the Political Affairs Committee on the Madrid Conference is not debated in early or mid-October, we might as well save ourselves the trouble, as the opinions of the governments, who write the speeches for those who will be reading them in Madrid — for what they are worth — are being formed now and not after the conference has begun on 11 November.

As regards today's debate, I should like to thank not only those colleagues who have drawn up reports, but also those who have prepared the reports, Mrs Katharina Focke and the others who I know have put a great deal of effort into their work. I should now like to try to say in five sentences what in my opinion is the essence of this debate — and beyond this debate:

Firstly, Europe undeniably has a duty to help to alleviate, combat and overcome world hunger, and I deliberately use these words in this order: alleviate, combat and, I hope, someday overcome. This duty tallies with clearly understood interests, and it applies irrespective of numbers: whether 800m or 650m are involved, is immaterial. How much of this is genuine hunger or merely — if only quotation marks could be expressed in the spoken word — malnutrition and whether only 2m or 5m children a year are involved, this is certainly no substitute for family planning.

Secondly, food aid is and will remain necessary, but I hope most of us will agree that primary importance must be attached to measures with which agricultural production, the production of foodstuffs in the many developing countries where this is possible can be encouraged and increased on the spot if the necessary conditions are created.

Thirdly, I repeat, food aid will remain necessary and must obviously be increased beyond what is needed after natural disasters have occurred. Europe must undoubtedly play its part here, but this must not be regarded as a convenient way of ridding ourselves of subsidized surplus production, and the need for a reasonable reform of the common agricultural policy must not be obscured by references to hunger in the world.

(Applause from the left)

Brandt

Fourthly, the European Community — and we have just heard Mr Cheysson make an important statement on this — must leave adequate room for imports from the developing countries. Again, this is not only in the interests of others: it is in our own interests too.

Fifthly, the fight against hunger in the world cannot be seen in isolation from the far greater efforts being made to change North-South relations, the efforts being made progressively and fundamentally to reorganize world economic relations. But, ladies and gentlemen, the reference to the overriding task should never be used as an excuse to abandon or push aside a problem that is of immediate concern to so many of us. In other words, hunger in the world is not only part of something very much larger and more difficult: the fight against world hunger also has a dimension of its own, its own moral weight — and we must not ignore this, we individuals, we of the European Community and its Member States.

In New York — as I believe Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul mentioned just now — a further special general assembly of the United Nations recently took place. The proceedings were not entirely satisfactory. But one thing at least did become clearer than on any other occasion in the past which I can recall. Many speakers from developing countries this time referred and in some cases lashed out — and rightly so — at the depressing, at the grotesque, the shocking incongruity between armaments and hunger in the world.

(Applause from the left)

This is doubly incongruous in this day and age. For the first time in its history mankind has the technical means to destroy itself. But for the first time in its history it also has the technical means, if it wanted to use them, to ensure that human beings no longer go hungry, that they can fill their bellies, that they can be protected against epidemics, and from sound preparatory work done by experts I can tell you that the sum required, the billions — we have to count in billions of course — is not astronomical: I am referring to the funds which would be needed to make available now, in the 80s, the agricultural equipment, including fertilizers, expertise and personnel to enable many of the developing countries to live on what they themselves produce in the 90s.

Ladies and gentlemen, in the past wars have usually resulted in hunger. I have experienced this twice in my life, the first time as a small boy. Today world hunger and wide-spread human misery are another breeding ground for violent conflict. All armed conflicts since the end of the Second World War have taken place in Third World countries. All the trouble spots of the recent past have occurred where East and West, North and South meet — I do not need to show you a map of the world. And everyone in this Chamber knows how seriously we in Europe are also affected by events

in apparently remote areas. And we also know that the situation can become even more dangerous. The arms race and world hunger are not laws of nature: they are the consequences of political omissions, although I do not, of course, underestimate the role played by differences in cultural heritage and historical background.

At all events, on this 16th day of September 1980, while we are meeting here in Strasbourg, about one-fifth of the population of this world do not have enough to eat, whereas on this 16th day of September, as on every day of this year, some \$ 1 500 m will be spent on armaments throughout the world.

It is therefore absolutely essential that a limit should be imposed on these resources, which, if we can be objective, are simply being wasted, and that a major part of what would otherwise also be spent on armaments should be spent on development projects, and that is why I mention the subject at this juncture.

Both Western and Eastern Europe — and I say this very deliberately, although I could also say Eastern and Western Europe: the order is immaterial — have important tasks to perform in this respect, so that further serious mistakes can be avoided and the rapidly advancing militarization of the Third World is not further aided and abetted, but recognized as an additional danger, which Europe can help to alleviate. And it is not even true to say that all these countries want weapons. There are some among them which are forced into or at least talked into having them.

The report before us sets out reasonable objectives and very clear recommendations. The institutions and Member States of the European Community will have no difficulty in seeing what is expected of them.

But before I go any further, let me once again emphasize what I consider to be the principal task: if hunger in the world is to be eliminated, the developing countries — the many countries where this is possible — must be put in a position to provide their own foodstuffs in the medium and the longer term — and not only the longer term. The Community and its Member States can make a far greater contribution to this than they have done in the past by providing technical and financial assistance and personnel.

People must be persuaded to attach greater value to the agricultural sector in the developing countries. And European and international aid is surely not there to prevent or delay structural reforms that are necessary. Many will agree with me when I add: helping to create new structures cannot mean wanting to graft on our own structures.

(Applause from the left)

Food aid, I would stress once again, will be needed for a considerable time to come. Colleagues of mine, who

Brandt

unlike myself are experts, tell me, tell us that the Commission should overhaul and improve the organization of the competent administration. The Commissioner responsible has taken the wind out of the sails of the critics. We therefore wish him success. We should like to help if we can. The quality of aid measures might then be improved. After all, it is not always quantity that is important: quality also has a part to play.

I fully agree with the committee responsible when it recommends that the Community should be actively involved in the establishment of a new world cereals agreement. I would like to emphasize the following points:

Firstly, the food aid provided by the Community and its Member States should, wherever possible, be linked to multiannual programmes for agricultural development in the partner countries.

Secondly, agricultural trade policy must be better coordinated with development policy.

Thirdly, in international negotiations the countries of the Community, or their governments, should do their utmost — as the Committee on External Economic Relations made abundantly clear this morning — to ensure that the generalized system of preferences is enlarged to the benefit of the developing countries and that these countries play a greater part in international trade.

When it comes to reforming the common agricultural policy — and I realize I am referring to a very delicate matter, which I will not therefore dwell on — we will again be faced with the question of the specific role that Europe can play by making its own products available. There will be this role to play, but I expect most people will agree with me when I say: hunger and malnutrition in the world will not be eliminated by a costly and poorly managed distribution of European surplus products. More than this and something different from this will be required. More of everything to enable others — how many times have I already said this? — to help themselves.

The Committee on Development and Cooperation will be informing Parliament regularly in the future on the progress which I hope can be achieved in the fight against hunger. I assume that the reports will refer not only to the Community, but also to the Member States and that the services rendered by non-governmental institutions will also be acknowledged. We must see all this in context.

Ladies and gentlemen, wide-spread hunger, hunger in the world is not, of course, an isolated problem. But the fight against this hunger is a task in itself.

What I mean by this is that however right the references to a fundamental reorganization of world

economic relations and new development strategies may be, as Mr Ferrero has quite appropriately said, they cannot relieve us of the duty and must not be taken as an excuse when it is a question of doing today what can be done today. That is what we have done, well advised as we were, in our countries. When I was invited to Quaker meals in my home town of Lübeck after the First World War — donations received from Quakers in England and the United States — it would not have meant anything to me if I had been told what people would be eating in Strasbourg today. And when the millions of refugees were streaming into the Federal Republic and having to be accommodated in barracks and camps, it would have been no consolation for them to be told that in the year X there will be modern residential areas.

But there must certainly be fundamental social and intellectual change, not only in other countries, but above all in our own industrial countries. The *non-economic* aspects of development — we have talked here almost exclusively about the economic aspect — must undoubtedly be paid far greater attention than has been the case in the past.

And a cowardly attitude towards taboos is not compatible with the need for world-wide responsibility. There is no need for exaggerated concessions to be made elsewhere in order to ape what is supposed to be thinking in terms of national prestige and is in fact close to bankruptcy.

(Applause from the left)

And talking of taboos in connection with reducing the population explosion, we can hardly expect to be given advice where it is to some extent in the nature of things that little should be known about the subject. What the rapporteur had to say I therefore found helpful.

I appreciate that on this occasion the report of an independent international commission has been obtained and that it has been under discussion for several months. Mr Jackson and Mr Cheysson have just mentioned this. This is the commission which the President of the World Bank suggested should be set up and which I chaired in 1978 and 1979. And I am conceited enough to say that it would do the European Parliament no harm to consider that report again and in greater detail. Our colleague Edgar Pisani made a major contribution to the report, particularly in the fields of agriculture and food, in which he has considerable experience as a result of his earlier ministerial activities.

Members of the other groups need not be put off by presumed one-sidedness. I still do not consider my friend Edward Heath, the former Prime Minister, to be a left-wing Socialist, but he was a good member of my commission. And so was the former Chilean Presi-

Brandt

dent Eduardo Frei, a Christian-Democrat, whose views I did not always share. In addition, he again adopted a courageous position on the so-called elections that have taken place in Chile.

(Applause from the left)

And the members of the Liberal and Democratic group will not be unfamiliar with the Swedish name Ohlin. Despite differences of opinion, we and others managed, after a great deal of argument, to come up with joint proposals for solutions in our consultations with a large number of colleagues from developing countries — some radical, as they say, and others not so radical. And this was possible without anyone having to abandon his political identity or his own convictions.

Our outline emergency programme has as its priorities energy and food — the subject we are discussing today. And then we merely add — and this was also mentioned this morning — proposals for a number of important initial steps towards the reform of the international organizations that are concerned with economic and financial questions. But — fourthly — there can be no doubt that more financial resources should be made available, not least to the benefit of the poorest countries, or the least developed countries as they are known in UN language. I would recommend the house to read the moving and unusually expert words used by the President of Bangladesh at that special assembly of the United Nations devoted to the subject of the least developed countries.

In this context, it is significant that we call on the governments not to leave it at an abstract pledge to meet the 0.7 % objective — 0.7 % of gross national product for public development aid — but to aim at achieving this objective by establishing a binding timetable. I say this as one who, when he had direct influence on the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, did not do enough in this area. Sometimes a guilty conscience is not the worst motivation to get on with the work. We are in the process of doing more in the Federal Republic of Germany.

Our appreciation must go to the Dutch and Danish Members for the fact that their countries are ahead of all the others in the Community.

(Applause from the left)

I stress this point not because I feel it can eliminate all the misery in the world. But it would certainly amount to more than the proverbial drop in the ocean. And if we adopted a more practical and more resolute approach in this, we could, of course, also make our demands to the rich oil countries clearer and say even more clearly than today that the poor South can expect something not only from the North-West, but from all industrial countries, regardless of their political system.

(Applause from the left)

And then, next year, there should be various opportunities to make some progress — not great progress but progress nevertheless — in the negotiations between the industrial and developing countries, which are marked by many years of omissions and errors, of too wide a gap between excessively high expectations on the one hand and too little willingness to make concessions on the other.

The European Community now has a major responsibility. And I am one of those who say that not only can the opportunities for cooperation set out in the Lomé Convention be developed further: information on them can also be passed on to others so that they may enjoy the benefits of the experience we and the ACP States have gained.

Before the summer recess, in June and July, the European Council and the Council of Ministers once again referred to the need for an early process of understanding. Much will depend on the impulses given by the Member States of the Community and the Community itself at the forthcoming negotiations.

It is very much to be hoped that a reasonable procedure is adopted to ensure that the global negotiations due to begin in New York early next year and to continue for at least nine months will be conducted with the greatest possible speed. This will not come about by itself. There is a great deal to be said for not allowing the negotiations to cover every possible subject this time, but to pick out central issues and to attempt to reconcile differences of interest by seeking a common denominator.

I know there are moralists — or should I say idealists? — who, to say the least, turn up their noses when they hear a reference to interests. I nevertheless feel that recognition of common interests among the nations will play an increasingly important role — and by this I mean not only interest in the survival of mankind, not only interest in the fight against hunger, but also interest in jobs with a future in other parts of the world and here at home. I say this to young people in my own country. Why should I not say it here as well? Whether or not today's young people, their children and their grand-children have jobs with a future will depend on our economic links with other parts of the world becoming more extensive and more intensive.

Again, at the world economic summit meeting to be held in Ottawa in Canada next year, Europe can show that it is dealing constructively with the legitimate demands and the understandable expectations of the developing countries. Before then an initial consultative meeting of leading representatives of the industrial and developing world might also prove useful. The Austrians and Mexicans are trying to do something along these lines, and I hope that their efforts will bear

Brandt

fruit next year in Mexico. This can give new impulses to the United Nations global negotiations.

Whether this debate or the decision taken by this Parliament as a result of it tomorrow or the day after is of any significance will depend on what we can persuade others to do, not only in the institutions of the Community and the national governments, but also in cooperation, in intellectual and political contacts with churches and trade unions and universities, with the many and varied media and European associations, but above all with young people, whose future is far more at stake than that of us older ones.

We must not therefore content ourselves with appeals to the Commission, the Council and the governments of our countries: softly, softly, nothing extreme, mustn't upset anyone, as is so often the case.

Mr Cheysson congratulated us and felt we should be proud. Mr Commissioner, we can be proud or at least satisfied only if we achieve something over and above the adoption of a resolution in this House.

(Applause from the left)

We should say to our peoples, our citizens, in other words those who have sent us here, and in particular the youth of Europe: this is — let us be quite frank about this — a European Community full of imperfections, but a Community of stature and influence, influence through its share of responsibility in the world.

The youth of Europe will follow us if we make it clear to them that it is our serious intention to help eliminate hunger in the world. For the youth of Europe are aware — as I said just now — that not only does hunger follow war, but that war may also stem from hunger.

Whatever else may divide us in this House, whatever else may be the subject of disagreement and therefore dispute here, let us tell the peoples of Europe and above all the youth of Europe: we do not simply want to talk, we want to act, in other words, we want action to be taken for the sake of mankind and of peace and also of our own well-understood interests.

(Loud applause)

President. — I call Mr Vergeer to speak on behalf of the group of the European People's Party, (C-D group).

Mr Vergeer. — *(NL)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the debate on the European Community's contribution to the fight against hunger and malnutrition in the world is in fact the first fundamental debate that this institution has devoted to this immense problem of our times. Our debate is based on over ten

months of careful preparation involving studies, hearings attended by Third World representatives, experts and those directly concerned with development and cooperation and agriculture, the four reports drawn up with great care by the sub-rapporteurs, the major contribution made by the Committee on Development and Cooperation and lastly the opinions of four other committees of this Parliament. On behalf of the Group of the European People's Party I should first like to express my thanks and respect to the general rapporteur, Mr Bruno Ferrero, who has succeeded in combining the various documents to form an acceptable synthesis. He has made it possible for the members of the Committee on Development and Cooperation and the principal sub-rapporteurs to form a kind of common front, ignoring political divisions and party interests in view of the extreme gravity of the problem, of the supporters of a significant increase in European action to combat hunger and underdevelopment. I accepted the task of drawing up one of the four basic reports, which concerns the development of agricultural and rural areas because I was and am still convinced that a solution to the problem of hunger in the world must be technically possible. I still believe this despite all the disappointments we have had in the last twenty years or so, and I therefore believe that a proper start can and must be made on solving the problem during the 80s. Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, while preparing for this debate I asked myself several times what the point of the debate was and in particular what the outcome would be.

What above all do the 800 million people or so in Third and Fourth Worlds having to live below the absolute subsistence level expect of us? This is a crucial question. Will this Parliament really provide the impulse for a movement that will put an end to this form of violation of human rights, which has ravaged the world for centuries, or will the outcome of this debate be a sham, nice words, without any real prospects. As Members of this Parliament, as representatives of a major part of the industrialized world, do we really see this debate as an indictment of ourselves? I hope that an answer can be given to this question at the end of the debate. My group feels that the central issue in this debate must be whether there is in fact the political will in Europe quickly to achieve a consensus of all the Member States on the magnitude of the problem and willingness to set priorities in this area without waiting for the North-South dialogue, which — forgive me for saying so — often appears to be a dialogue of the deaf, to drag to a close.

The fight against and the debate on the world food problem has been going on for decades. As long ago as 1945 protection against hunger was designated the objective of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, the FAO, then being set up, alongside the improvement of agricultural production. And since then there has been no shortage of fine-sounding words. Reading them is really depressing. Let me

Vergeer

quote a few examples: at the first World Food Congress held in Washington in June 1963 the then American President John Kennedy spoke the following familiar words: We have the means and we have the power to eliminate hunger in our lifetime. All we need is the will actually to do it. And at the World Conference held in Rome in November 1974 all the countries of the world unanimously supported a resolution submitted by Henry Kissinger which contained the following brief and succinct message: In 1985 not one child must go to bed with an empty stomach. But in fact in the year 1980 hunger is a daily reality for a quarter of the world's population and 40 000 children die every day in the Third and Fourth Worlds. In fact one hundred million children in the world will be physically or mentally handicapped throughout their lives as a result of hunger and malnutrition. And this process of the destruction of human lives continues, and continues at an ever increasing pace. Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, these events wait for no man. Every month we receive appeals from all over the world, from Africa, Asia, Latin America, where there is a threat of hunger and death. The names of some countries are still topical, examples being Kampuchea, Chad, Uganda, Somalia, El Salvador, and there are undoubtedly new names to be added. That is the reality. It is therefore abundantly clear that many developing countries are unable to break out of this infernal circle of poverty and that the future prospects for these countries and their rural population are extremely gloomy.

Mr President, the trend publicized by the World Bank is alarming, particularly where a number of African countries south of the Sahara are concerned, the fear being that national income per head of the population will decline even further. Twenty years ago the FAO introduced a world campaign against hunger, and twenty years later there has been no decrease in hunger in the world: on the contrary, it has steadily increased and is still increasing. The efforts of many people have not succeeded in preventing the world food problem from growing from year to year. We must also realize that underdevelopment is, of course, a major cause of hunger and malnutrition, but that wars are in no small measure to blame in this respect. I am thinking here in particular of the sad fate of the many millions of refugees. In this context, it comes as a shock to realize that military expenditure in 1979 must be estimated at about \$ 600 m and that the industrialized countries have spent an average of about 7 % of their gross national product on armaments in recent years, compared with an average of 0.4 % on development aid, and in addition that the Third World has itself doubled its spending on arms between 1970 and 1980.

In many developing countries there is not enough food because the people no longer have the land to grow it, owing to overpopulation or because rich land-owners have taken their land to grow products for export or because the people have been driven away to the

poorest land, an example being many of the Indians in Latin America, as I was able to see for myself a few weeks ago. Another reason is that the governments of the developing countries lack the resources or the motivation to help the people with investments. The people are also unable to offer any resistance to or be protected against natural disasters, drought or disease. The governments of many developing countries have furthermore neglected the food question and given priority to industrialization and exports. Moreover, the rich countries, including the countries of the European Community, have been unable to agree on who should pay for food aid and how much.

Against this background the Group of the European People's Party wishes to express its great concern at the course of events during the special United Nations Assembly that has just been held in New York, where a new development strategy for the 80s was discussed. It has become clear meanwhile that the countries of the European Community are completely at odds over the deadline by which they must surrender 0.7 % of their GNP to the poor countries. Voices have even been raised in favour of a return to separate, national policies to replace the further-reaching European integration that is needed in this area. A worse development is hardly imaginable. If the European Parliament really wishes to show that it wants to lead the way and that it stands above the national governments and above the national parliaments, it must do so during this debate. This Parliament must then express its serious concern in unmistakable terms at what happened in New York. We must not and we cannot unload our own economic problems on to the Third World.

But the European Parliament cannot content itself with emphatic references to the responsibility of the governments and the parliaments of the Member States. No, it must itself make a gesture to show that the Community itself seriously intends to tackle the problem of hunger in the world. To this end, my group has tabled an amendment based on an idea put forward by Mr Wawrzik in October of last year during the first debate we had on this subject. This amendment proposes that we should be prepared to state during the 1981 budget debate that 1 % of the total budget of the European Communities will be made available as a special contribution to the fight against hunger in the world as part of the cooperation with the developing countries.

I sincerely recommend this amendment to the House and hope that it will receive sufficient support. To those who refer to the economic crisis as a pretext for holding things up I would say that even at times of great prosperity development aid has been short-changed by the Western industrialized countries. The Communist countries in Eastern Europe, and the Soviet Union in particular, have so far done virtually nothing to save their fellow human beings in the Third

Vergeer

and Fourth Worlds from starvation. The acceptance of such responsibility, or solidarity, is unfortunately not a term to be found in the Communist vocabulary. We must radically change the world economy and with it the way in which people think and act, if mankind is not to sink into a morass of increasing hunger, inflation, unemployment, energy shortages and armaments and the terror and wars that all this entails.

It cannot and must not be accepted that the rich North, accounting for a quarter of the world's population, should consume four-fifths of the world's income and that the poor South, accounting for three-quarters of the world's population, must make do with one-fifth of the world's income. Things can only become worse in the years to come if the world population rises from, say, 3 400 million in the year 2000 to 6 500 million. Hunger is a result of poverty, and everything must therefore be done to speed up the economic development of the poor countries. In this, the highest priority must be attached to agricultural development and increasing food production in the Third World itself. If we fail in this, the consequences may well be more serious than those of the present energy crisis. That is why the whole of the international Community must be mobilized to assist the developing countries in their fight against hunger. My group is absolutely convinced that the European Community can and should play a pioneering role in this.

The various reports now before us show that the world food crisis can in the longer term be put down to production problems, that the solution to the problem of hunger in the world is technically possible and can be achieved to a considerable extent in the 80s. I would stress once again the essential need for political will with regard to international cooperation. The Community has a duty in this connection to improve the coordination of the national development policies of the Member States. Development cooperation between the industrialized countries and the Third World is equally important for both sides and should therefore take place on the basis of absolute equality.

The European Community must, with the aid of this debate, set certain priorities in the fight against hunger in the world. I would summarize these priorities as follows:

1. The primary objective of the European Community and its Member States will continue to be an increase in the proportion of GNP intended for development aid to 0.7 % by 1985.
2. The increase in the aid we grant must be accompanied by better evaluation of our aid programmes; guarantees must also be given with regard to the administration and implementation of projects.
3. Most of the increased spending by the Community on development aid must be devoted to cooperation with non-associated developing countries. These countries

together have a population of over 1 300 million, or five times as high as all the countries associated with the Community under the Convention of Lomé. And these developing countries account for three-quarters of the people of the world living in the poorest regions.

4. If we want to motivate the rural population better and enable them to cooperate in their own development by means of cooperation projects and our food aid programmes, we must resort to cooperation with the non-governmental organizations more than we have done in the past. These voluntary development organizations, which work at grass-roots level outside official channels, outside all the administrative shilly-shallying that goes on, are often in a better position to meet the needs of the local population with their small-scale projects. The development aid work done by these organizations is interesting. It is therefore extremely important that full advantage should be taken of the know-how and extensive practical experience of these organizations.
5. We urge the Council and Commission to rethink the food aid policy. Our food aid must be incorporated into rural development programmes and projects, and the European Community must be put in the position to enter into multiannual food supply commitments, so that the developing countries can take account of them in their agricultural development programmes.
6. Each rural development project must be seen as an integrated whole, with its social, educational, economic, commercial and public health aspects. It must be geared to the agricultural communities and their basic needs. The deficiencies of the 'green revolution', to which I refer in my report, must be remedied. Rural development must therefore be more closely integrated in a general strategy to be established by each developing country, with account taken of its own priorities. That is why the European Community must give increasing preference to assisting them in the establishment of their development policies and development strategies.
7. There must be cooperation in the fisheries sector, the aim being to provide the developing countries with the means to take free and effective advantage of their exclusive 200-mile economic zone. In my report I have underlined the importance of Mr Enright's proposal that there should be a study of the possibility of transforming our declining fishing industries by means of development activities in the maritime zones of the Third World, where fish stocks are in many cases not being exploited to the full.

Mr President, I come to the end of my statement. My group has tabled a small number of amendments. The motion for a resolution before us and the report which accompanies it are completely acceptable to my group and will receive its support. I will conclude by expressing my sincere thanks to Mr Cheysson and his staff and also the staff of the European Parliament for their cooperation, support and assistance in the drawing up of my report.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

President. — I call Sir Fred Warner to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Sir Fred Warner. — Mr President, the original subject of this debate was to be world hunger.

It has now been widened to include the whole field of development and North-South relations. That is logical enough. As other speakers have said, chronic hunger is only part of the problem of chronic poverty, and to overcome it is only to provide a partial solution to the problems of economic and social development as a whole. Furthermore, these great subjects are being debated elsewhere, particularly in the United Nations and we must make sure that what we are doing here is measured against what is happening elsewhere. But best of all, by widening this debate we were able to hear the whole sweep of Mr Brandt's ideas and to hear how his thinking has developed in the course of the studies which he has been making during the last year or more. Nevertheless, the work done here in Parliament during the last year has been principally concerned with food aid, and it is about food aid that I shall speak today.

Yes, it is a whole year that we have been discussing this matter; it is just a year ago today since we first took up this debate in this chamber. And although it is very unfortunate that many many people have died during that year and that we have not been able to guide adequately the expenditure of many many millions of units of account during that year, I still think that we were right to take our time. We were right to go over the whole ground of food production and food distribution, agricultural development and agricultural trade, resources and financing. Your committee has read a great deal of material and listened to a lot of evidence and argument. The result is an extremely comprehensive document. Some may think it is far too long, but I do not think so. I think we were right to look at every aspect of the problem. I think it right to have produced for you, Mr Commissioner, a full overall blueprint which can provide you with guidelines, with points of reference, for every activity in this field.

However, I am afraid that fellow-Members will not have found anything particularly new in this document. It would be quite dishonest for us to suggest that it contains very much which has not been suggested before by other people. Again, I do not think we should be discouraged by that. It is right that this ground should have been gone over carefully by others. If there is anything strikingly original in our work, it is probably contained in the opinion we got

from the Committee on Agriculture, which to my mind does take a fresh look at some aspects of the problem.

Now Parliament will have made some progress if it manages to achieve the following. First, it must draw the attention of the European public to the urgent need for governments to make sufficient funds available. We — all of us, I suspect — have experienced in talking to our electors a lack of interest and the absence of a sense of urgency in this matter. It is quite easy to arouse interest for a particular situation: for Cambodia, for Somalia. But the general need for vast resources over a long period is not understood by the public at large. I get lots of letters — I am sure we all do — about Cambodia, I get letters about Afghanistan. But do I get letters about the constant loss of life in India? No, I do not. And that is something which we in this Parliament have to remedy. You are right, Mr Ferrero, you are quite right when you say that we are going backwards. People must be told that what they have seen on their television screens or in their papers as a series of periodic emergencies is becoming one permanent emergency.

Second, in this Parliament we have to make a number of sensible practical suggestions for directing the efforts of the Commission, and the resolution contains quite a large number of these. I would like to draw attention to what seems to me to be the most important for the future of the Commission's work on food aid. This is covered by paragraph 8 of the text. But I am afraid that the present wording will make it rather unattractive to donor governments. It is too vague and too widely drawn, for it asks governments to hand over an increasing amount of their total development programmes to multilateral administration by the Community. There must be some doubt as to whether this would improve the effectiveness of our industrial project aid. In fact there is reason to fear the opposite. Certainly, experience in the United Nations suggests that, while there are certain vast projects which certainly have to be undertaken and cannot be undertaken in any other way than on a multinational basis, the ordinary-sized project is perhaps better handled on the scale of a one-government affair.

But food aid, to my mind, is quite different. We already have in the Commission machinery, practices and networks which, if properly used and supervised, will obtain more food and hand out that food faster and just as reliably as a number of national efforts. In fact I am prepared to back the Commission if it has sufficient manpower and resources to do the job better. So we in our group have redrafted paragraph 8 and moved it to its proper food aid context so as to ask that Member States should entrust management of their food aid to the Community as soon as possible.

But really the main aim of Parliament's work should surely have been to reach an understanding of our own future relation with the Third World. Have we

Warner

succeeded in doing this? If there is an answer to this problem in the document, I doubt if it is a very clear one. Let us look critically at what we have tried to say. We have got to understand what we said. We have got to get on with this, and turn it into practical action. Let us look at what we said, or what we thought we were saying. We were saying that there are three ways of relieving chronic malnutrition in a community or a region. The first way is to give food aid. But every member of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, as far as I know, without exception was of the opinion that although food aid is absolutely essential at present, this is not a proper long-term solution. Indeed to make a country dependent on such charity is in the end to rob it of its independence. Nevertheless we have to face the fact that food aid will continue for many years and decades. Not one of us in this Parliament is likely ever to see the end of food aid programmes.

A better way of proceeding, it seemed to us, is to enable communities or regions to meet their own need for food by growing it. That is obvious enough, and everyone who has spoken has alluded to it. But this is just where the readjustment of our own lives begins. Increasingly the Third World has become dependent on exports of grain, fats and milk powder from Europe. If you look at page 5 of the Committee on Agriculture's report, you will see that demand is increasing rapidly in deficit countries for just these last two items — fats and powdered milk coming from Europe. The rate of increase is much higher than for other things.

In Europe we are also becoming a rival granary to the United States and to the wheatlands of South America and Australia. This tendency becomes stronger every single year. We are looking to the needs of others to encourage greater and greater production at home. But if we succeed in eradicating the long-term need for food aid, this trend will then have to be reversed. There are those in Europe — and there must be those — who do not particularly want this, and we ourselves have no clear idea, even after our year's work, of how the present state of affairs will ever be phased out. So that we can go back and study this properly, we have asked in paragraph 44 that we be given a full study of the effects of our food exports. In other words we are looking at the overseas effects of the Common Agricultural Policy.

I am afraid that the resolution leads us well beyond this. There is also the problem, so clearly indicated by Madam Wiczorek-Zeul, of trade in agricultural products. Those developing countries which are successful in increasing their output of food are not going to stop at a fine balance of their own needs. Some are going to produce a surplus and will want to export it. Paragraph 46 of the motion for a resolution says that we should open up our markets to these products. And so no doubt we should. Perhaps it will be easier for my country than for others, because

much of food which we would be asked to import will be of tropical or semi-tropical origin and does not compete with British agriculture. But are those who represent the Mediterranean area of the Community happy about this? Will the new entrants to the Common Market — Spain, Greece and Portugal — welcome these imports? Will our sugar beet growers welcome more cane sugar? Will those who refuse the import of British lamb welcome greater imports of meat from Africa or South America? The resolution says that they will. But I think they will need some coaxing.

The third way of feeding under-nourished communities is to enable them to buy their own food. Some countries may not have the will or the resources to produce their own food, and must produce foreign exchange instead. This can be done either by selling raw materials or by making and selling industrial goods. But the resolution has little to say about this last aspect. All of us have in fact already accepted clear responsibilities in this field. We have commitments arising from GATT and from our discussions in UNCTAD. We can expect a crippling new range of obligations to be proposed to us in the context of the North-South negotiations. Though our resolution does have the merit of facing up to the need for a proper return on the sale of raw materials, it has largely shirked the issue of trade in industrial goods. I therefore wonder if our committee is wise to drop the reference to expanding the GSP. In an amendment, my group is trying to draw attention more clearly to the existence of this problem by rescuing it from too much wordiness.

No two countries have exactly the same problem. As we have recognized, the poorest countries have particularly agonizing problems. But, fellow Members, is it not becoming clear that some of the main problems we have raised are not about other countries, but about ourselves. We are planning, in this document, our own future. There will indeed be changes in our way of life, and there will be transfers of resources. But how will this take place? Such vague statements reveal nothing. It is by looking at the detailed mechanisms of change and transfer that we see where we are really going to come face to face with the necessary real decisions.

I now turn to the text of the resolution. This represents an exceptional effort by the rapporteur to combine the thoughts and contributions of all concerned. In this it is remarkably successful, and we must all admire the work of Mr Ferrero, his skill and his fairness.

(Applause)

In order that we might debate it in this our first part-session of the new parliamentary year, it was unanimously agreed to forward it from the Committee on

Warner

Development and Cooperation, but of course, we did so in a bit of a rush. That does not mean that it is too late now to clarify the text, to improve it and to give it more force. For this reason, my group has sponsored a number of amendments which we would like you to consider very carefully. The resolution will be read by everyone who has an interest in the subject, and we do not want them to find repetitions, obscurities or contradictions. Some of the amendments we have proposed are designed to correct these or to remove points of disagreement.

The first major amendment concerns paragraph 5. Paragraph 5 tries to say a great deal without telling the reader what it means. It talks about far-reaching adjustments to our way of life in Europe and massive transfers of our resources, without, as I have already said, indicating how. It seems to say that we can only abolish hunger by becoming much poorer ourselves — or at least most people would read it in that way. Unless that is indeed what needs to be clearly said, would it not be better to make the point that you can use resources in different ways, productively or unproductively. Since so many of the world's resources today come to Europe or are created in Europe, we need to turn them to productive use for mankind as a whole. That is a moral imperative. But do we really need to make a parade of charity and puritanism?

The same paragraph mentions the evils of arms expenditure. But I think that perhaps it does so in a rather pointless and too general way. No one should dismiss the problem of arms expenditure. As Mr Brandt said, there is a grotesque disproportion between spending on arms and spending on aid. But people will dismiss the problem if it is not faced up to realistically and with truth. What is that truth? To me it appears that the truth is that we all live under constant threat of war and aggression. The truth is that Soviet Union is spending more than 15 % of its GNP on armaments. It is not surprising therefore that in recent years they have spent less than half of one-tenth of 1 %, 0.04 % of their GNP on development aid.

But far more serious than what they do is the effect on the rest of us. For what are we to do when faced with the reality of this vast expenditure on arms; with the reality of the invasion of Afghanistan? What we do is spend our own money on defence and spare far too little of it for the betterment of mankind. So those who are desirous of cutting arms expenditure will not get very far with just telling all of us to be more peaceful. They had better speak to their Soviet friends — if they have any — and ask them to break this deadlock by reversing present trends in the arms race. This is the point of our amendment.

The next point concerns oil and the contribution of the oil-producing countries. To deal with this, my

group originally proposed the substance of what is now paragraph 10 in the resolution.

We now feel that it does not cover the whole problem and I have tabled an amendment to supplement it. Of course we cannot tell other groups of States what they should do. We also have to acknowledge the tremendous contribution being made by Arab funds to the development of the Middle East and of Africa. We have to acknowledge that some oil producers are now spending a greater proportion of their income on overseas aid than ourselves, but we must draw attention to the futility of building up the earning power of developing countries only to remove it instantly by increasing the price of oil. The debasement of the Third World will grow, not diminish, unless we can bring order into this scene.

Another amendment refers to the provision of water supplies. That is a very important matter, but there is a psychological aspect to what we are proposing — there could be great advantage in giving European rural development aid a recognizable character of its own. My group believes that we can do this by concentrating on three things — not to the exclusion of others — but by making them very specially European, very specially our own. These three things would be the provision of water, help in eliminating post-harvest losses which consume so much of the food after it is produced and thirdly, the development of fisheries.

One of the most important passages in the whole resolution is paragraph 33. It asks for the establishment of emergency food reserves where they are most likely to be needed, that is, in the developing or the needy countries themselves. This is long overdue; it is absurd to have to rush around buying at inflated prices, hiring emergency transport, etc., every time such a situation arises. But if our governments are going to provide money for a better, smoother system, they need to know where the food reserves will be and how they will be managed. Our amendment is designed to give us a clearer idea of what will be done.

May I make a very quick reference to Article 23. Buried almost invisibly in this haystack of an article is a tiny reference to family planning. There is also in the paper the statement that world population is increasing fast and that this contributes to the problems of malnutrition. It is true that population is increasing faster than the supply of food. Another Member today has proposed an amendment on this and I will leave it at that. But I would only say this: we, in our group, fully understand why those who are Catholics have doubts about this — perhaps they will feel obliged to abstain — but I think a lot of the objections which are made are out-of-date and no longer relevant. I do not believe that we have the right to deprive other countries of advice on what we enjoy ourselves. I do not believe it is right that, because someone is an African, you should refuse to speak to him as you would to another man of your own country or your own race.

Warner

I come now to paragraph 53 on multinational companies. Here again it becomes rather difficult because we run into ideological and even mythological concepts which ought not to have any place in our thinking when we are discussing the interests of other parties and other countries. Inescapably the majority of firms which will operate effectively in third countries are multinationals, even if many are still small and only beginning to develop their multinational character. That is the nature of overseas business.

I suggest that this Parliament should decide whether they want to see such companies operating effectively or not. If we do, then we had better give them some encouragement, for they have had plenty of discouragement in the past.

Not surprisingly, however, developing countries are increasingly recognising this requirement and are in practice turning to foreign companies for help.

We also should stop being so nervous and say what it is we really want: this is that there should be proper guidelines available; that those concerned should strictly follow them and that the abuses which have come to light should not be repeated. We already have one set of guidelines in the OECD, so let us not spend time on drawing up rival sets of rules, but rather ensure that those on which we have already agreed become the basis for an international agreement at the UN. Meanwhile, I would suggest, Mr Commissioner, that you are going to find it difficult to cooperate with people who should be cooperating with you if you blame many of the mistakes of your own Commission and of our governments on them.

Finally, our last amendment goes one stage further; it faces the fact that half the transfer of wealth to the Third World today is through the private sector. It acknowledges that the most successful of newly industrialized countries have often taken that route. It acknowledges that governments are in no position to do everything themselves. If we are not prepared to say that, then we are telling developing countries that they have got to wait, and this is what they are not prepared to do. So many of our European companies are now getting good encouragement from many ACP countries. We should give them no less encouragement. They have many successes to their credit.

So it is on this note of enterprise, of what Mr Nielsen called 'pioneer spirit', and of possible success, that I will end. We ourselves support this resolution, though we hope to see some amendment to it. We believe that to put an end to hunger in the world is a moral imperative. We also believe that it can be done. But we do not think it will be done without changing the pattern of agricultural and industrial trade and we suspect that our resolutions are in danger of outrunning our will and our performance. That needs further study.

As for rural and industrial development, the Commission is our agent. We must constantly watch it, encourage it, and help it. We must study its actions to make sure it is choosing the right projects and carrying them out effectively and with economy of funds. We must encourage it to become our principal distributor of food aid. Europe is a mixed society of mixed economies. We can only act in accordance with our own nature, not that of someone else. Let us make sure that the whole strength of our public and private sectors together is exerted to abolish hunger in our lifetime.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Pajetta.

Mr Pajetta. — *(I)* Mr President, I would first like to express the approval of the Italian Communists for the resolution, and at the same time our approbation of the spirit which inspired the work of the committee, and of the near-unanimity of its vote. We also salute the unanimity of the delegation to the United Nations, which seemed to give strong support to Commissioner Cheysson, who was very active although not always heeded by the governments of the Community.

The situation is serious because we are at a critical moment and we find it difficult to face, much less to solve, the crisis. The bulletins coming in from New York seem to indicate that this crisis is even more serious than we had supposed. It becomes almost impossible to formulate a positive solution and even to conduct a productive debate. We have here a report whose importance is heightened by the unanimity to which I referred, but which reveals an overlapping of requests, good intentions, declarations of principle, advice, and questions addressed to bodies which it is sometimes difficult to identify. For this reason our approval must be tempered with a demand for clarification and concretization, so that the statements and desires expressed will not remain merely a list of irremediable miseries, sufferings, and fruitless hopes.

This Parliament must and will deal urgently with these problems, and I think it useful to examine today some of the threats which loom ahead. First I want to look at the question of the 0.7 %, which by virtue of repetition has assumed the form of a ritual in our discussions. The commitment made by the countries of the Community should have been gradually fulfilled during the second decade of developmental aid strategy, that is, by 1980. Not only is this not the case, but also a clearcut decision in this regard was fiercely opposed in New York, in the Council of Ministers, by some Community governments. The British, for example, have forgotten that they agreed at the same time we did to a gradual yearly increase in their contributions, and have decided instead to reduce their aid by 7 % in 1981.

Pajetta

What we may say to each other in this session has little importance in itself. We must try to put pressure on the governments as well as on the Commission, which perhaps is not so much in need of encouragement. Pressure should be applied by the parties that form and support these governments, parties who uphold one policy here while another is put into effect in the field of international politics. What should be the function of the European Community in the world community? On the one hand, as I said, we have the means for direct action and we must use them. But it is not any less important to act on the global level, within the United Nations general assembly, to influence the debates and the choices. Is the Community prepared to do this? Do the Member States pursue coherent aims in accordance with the principles expressed in this motion for a resolution which will perhaps be unanimously approved by our Assembly?

Let us take the essential and tragic problem of hunger. The solution is not to help the underdeveloped countries to live in underdevelopment. The problem is not merely to discuss more effective food aid programmes. The problem is to determine how this aid can contribute towards ending the crisis, while too often it is used instead as a means of hegemony, as a disguised form of neo-colonialism. Let us state clearly that sometimes this food aid, besides being a way to liquidate surpluses in countries with overproduction, can also constitute a threat to local agriculture. If the funds allocated were used for irrigation or for agricultural improvements, perhaps there would be a few more problems for those European producers who now lament over world hunger and a few more advantages for the countries which suffer from it.

The proposal of Mr Waldheim, Secretary-General of the United Nations, for immediate aid provoked in New York and extraordinary reaction on the part of those countries who would have benefited by it. Mr Waldheim suggested immediate intervention, and the countries on whose behalf it was to be made virtually refused. Why? Because they assumed, accustomed as they are to being cheated, that it would take the form of some sort of charity designed to avoid dealing with the essential problems. Do you realize the significance of this refusal on the part of starving people to accept direct food aid, a refusal motivated by the fact that they consistently regard such aid as a lover for manoeuvres which serve only to aggravate their situation?

What can the Community do with the means it has at its disposal? That is the first problem. Our Group once proposed that one billion units of account should be put on the budget for development. I must here again express my regret and that of the Group in regard to the negative vote on our proposal expressed by the Parliament.

The rapporteur indicated some priorities which I accept, and I also share the opinions put forward by

Commissioner Cheysson, especially with regard to raw materials and their costs. We also agree that the European agricultural policy must be corrected. We see this necessary correction, however, as above all a need to overcome internal contradictions. Unless we do this, we cannot confront the problem of agriculture in the rest of the world. It is certainly vital, therefore, to reconsider the problems of European agriculture so that its relationships with problems of world agriculture and world economy can be examined without delay.

I was speaking earlier of the news reaching us from New York. It is alarming. Some of the suggestions offered unanimously at the level of the Parliamentary delegation representing the Committee on Development were ignored in practice, and a schism resulted. I must say that I am unaccustomed to paying compliments to the Italian Government, to which we lead are vigorously opposed, but I must express my satisfaction and — Mr Bersani will permit me to say it — also my surprise that the Italian Government dared do what the German and British Governments did not with respect to the attempted prevarications of the United States.

There is some irony in the fact that the Brandt report, so highly praised at the United Nations, is so heavily annotated, since it is used for electoral speeches by an Italian Communist orator, but could not serve as a memorandum for the German delegation at the United Nations, in which members of the rapporteur's party were certainly present. I say this with bitterness, as you will understand, but certainly not because I want to find a new subject for argument; we should overcome this and consider it part of the past. In New York something important was accepted. There is always talk about the oil-producing countries and the justified or unjustified percentage of increase in oil prices. One cannot explain what constitutes a fair price for oil. When we in Europe, fix the price of a car, we include the wages of the workers — who have shoes and also automobiles — profits, privileges, taxes, costs of highways and arms, and we say: this is the right price for a Fiat, a Volkswagen or a Renault.

But what is proper price of oil?

It is the price fixed with reference to the people who not only go without cars, but who go barefoot. When we speak of these countries as if they were the countries of the sheiks and then recommend these sheiks to give us petrodollars to invest in the banks of the capitalist world we certainly cannot complain about what they do, since what we suggest to them is merely a little more charity for the Third World; at the same time we refuse to have these countries present in the international organizations where the world's financial and economic life is regulated. It is towards this objective that American intransigence, with British and German complicity, was directed: to attempt to prevent those countries from being represented in the places where decisions are being made.

Pajetta

For my part, I cannot accept the now-official terminology — I have seen it in the United Nations documents — which speaks of donor countries and recipient countries. The latter are not beggars: I certainly have no desire to retell history and explain why they have remained behind, but colonialism certainly played a part. I would like to say, however, that these countries, who are not donors, do have something and will have more to give. One has only to consider the problem of raw materials, of which I spoke earlier. Together, therefore, we must examine what we can and should do and what we can ask of the Parliaments, peoples, and governments represented here who declare their willingness to draw up a common policy.

The aid concept must be rejected. We are not opposed to all types of aid, much less to food aid and to emergency action; I referred for this reason to the reaction of the Third World countries to the Waldheim proposal. We believe that such aid should represent only one initial level of action, otherwise it is not only futile, but detrimental as well. It is important that the way in which such intervention is conducted should create the conditions whereby underdevelopment can be effectively remedied. The problem is one of participation, of the presence of each country; the issue is connected with each country's jealous independence and effective autonomy, and implies the refusal of any external interference or intervention, which we have always condemned.

The Lomé Convention, though limited in scope, was meant to set an example in this regard. The effort of the Community — if I'm not mistaken, Mr Bersani — was to work in association with others, to establish, at least juridically, a sort of parity, even though no one supposes that Great Britain and Grenada, or Grenada and the United States, have equal influence in the world. But this is precisely what was and continues to be rejected in the world debate now taking place.

A short while ago our German colleague, who deplored the shortcomings of the resolution, referred to the problem of international financial institutions. This problem is central. Is it possible to assign to a central body the work of coordination and stimulation and leave the big international organizations with their own specific character, their mode of action, and their autonomy? This presupposes structural changes in the big international organizations themselves, and above all in the International Monetary Fund and in the World Bank. Failing this, the old phrases will be heard yet again: we have the money, we are the masters and want to conduct ourselves as such. At the most, we are ready to make a charitable contribution or to slip a bonus to a minister in some Third World government.

Finally, since there have been references to structural changes in the Third World, to the timeliness of an agrarian reform, for instance, I would like to make, if it is permissible in an Assembly where so many

languages are spoken, a Latin quotation: *de te fabula narratur*. It is impossible to recommend social changes, equality, justice, and agrarian reform to the Third World without realizing that profound changes must be effected here in our own countries. This should involve an assumption of coresponsibility on the part of those who represent the parties and organizations of the working class. The defence of the conquests of the organized labour movement is certainly a motive force for world change as well as a point of leverage for liberation movements in the widest sense. This, however, should not be confused with elements of corporatism, with elements which could even be considered chauvinistic. It cannot be thought that European workers have played there full part if, they forget their duty to exercise international solidarity. Finally, let me say just a word about a problem which is all inclusive: that of detente and disarmament. Our British colleague who spoke a moment ago emphasized the expenditures that weigh on the socialist countries; he gave us the arms budget of the Soviet Union; but I certainly do not believe that this is the way to put a stop to this insane course. No! I think that, as to content, it is enough to recall the Brandt report, which I hope Mr Brandt at least will not forget and will have translated into German as well, if possible. I want to assert that without detente, without international negotiation, disarmament is impossible. And arms expenditure itself already overwhelms whole sectors of the economy, and in some countries is even considered to be an economic catalyst.

Today there is no progress for development, but only for rearmament for missiles, Pershings cruise missiles, and SS 20's. We, the Italian Communists, have hailed every international initiative, including the German; we have offered concrete proposals which have not been taken into consideration and which would have avoided, or at least made avoidable, this perilous decision.

At this point, the problems of the world crisis form part of a vast picture. We are opposed to a simplification which would consider part of the world as being outside the crisis and not involved in its resolution. Specific situations do certainly exist, but there is always a correlation. We reject Stalin's simplification of a world divided into two mutually exclusive markets. For that matter, recent events demonstrate that the crisis is also affecting the socialist countries. They also demonstrate that catastrophic solutions of crises in the Third World do not automatically create a new order and a new social situation which can be considered stable or even desirable.

World interdependence is demonstrated by the volume of trade, by technological exchange, by energy problems. This makes it impossible for anyone to consider himself as outside the crisis. For this reason we believe that the socialist countries should be involved in attempts to make the world emerge from underdevel-

Pajetta

opment and that they should feel themselves responsible partners in the common effort. It is not true in any case that they play no role in aiding development. Our British colleague has neglected to mention, for example, that Cuba is also a member of the Third World and that the Socialist countries provide aid for Cuba.

Illusory as it would be to think that the problem only concerns certain countries and that the only issue is that of aid to underdevelopment, it would be even more futile to believe, as some demagogues assert, that resolving the problem of underdevelopment in these countries will benefit everyone in the same manner. No, we cannot possibly convince our people, our voters, that an increase in our aid to the developing countries will eventually result in each family's owning another car. It must be realized that the effort in favour of progress must now be concentrated where it is most necessary from a global viewpoint. We are not speaking of charity, even though charity should not be undervalued. What is certain is that, should we not have the courage to resolve this crisis, if only as far as the problem of hunger and underdevelopment is concerned, there will not be another car for those who already possess one; there will be a global disaster. The avoidance of such an eventuality is obviously an appreciable advantage.

In the hope that this debate will promote some progress, the Italian Communists will vote in favour of the motion for a resolution, and urge others to do the same. Going beyond the question of the Community crisis, the Italian Communists wish to reaffirm with their vote the role of the European Parliament and of Europe. The principles outlined in this document must also however be coherently expressed in the governments' actions. And that, let me repeat, is the reason we consider very serious the division among the Nine which occurred in New York.

The Parliament has on other occasions followed a policy contrary to that of the Committee on Budgets, but this time the lack of agreement causes great concern because it opposes governments and parties which should mutually represent one another. We Italian Communists believe that a vote in favour of the report under discussion will be, inasmuch as it is unanimous, a concrete if modest step forward, a symbol of hope for an inclusive dialogue and immediate action.

(Applause from the left)

President. — I call Mr Pearce on a point of order.

Mr Pearce. — Mr President, I refer to Rule 15 — the use of languages in this Assembly. We are all now being issued with identity cards to get into this building. I find that mine has my status as a Member of Parliament written in French — only in French. Rule 15 says that all the languages will be used on

documents of this Parliament. Colleagues are laughing, but let me say this: I will not stand for the frenchification of this Parliament. This is not an extension of the French Parliament, and I serve notice on you, Mr President, that at the next session of this Parliament, in Strasbourg, I will not use this card and if you refuse me entry into this Chamber because I will not wear a document in French on my jacket, then I think you will be defying the whole principle of this Community.

Mr President, would you please stop this bias. Let us recognize that there are six languages here, not just one, and that French will not be rammed down my throat.

President. — Your question will be forwarded directly to the competent Quaestors. It is not merely a personal matter. You have drawn the House's attention to a rule which must be obeyed.

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.15 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

I call Miss Brookes on a point of order.

Miss Brookes. — Mr President, it is in fact a minute past 3 o'clock and you walked in punctually at 3. I would merely like to comment that everybody is aware that this House reassembles at 3 o'clock. At the moment, the audience is very sparse indeed. I would like to make the point that if the President is prepared to arrive at 3 o'clock, everyone else should also be here. It is not good that there should be so few people present for the deliberations of this very important Parliament.

President. — I note your comments Miss Brookes. However, I am sure that our colleagues will soon join us.

4. *Membership of Committees*

President. — I have received from the Group of European Progressive Democrats a request for the

President

appointment of Mr Clement to the Committee on Development and Cooperation, to replace Mr Messmer.

Are there any objections?

The appointment is ratified.

5. *World hunger* (continuation)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the Ferrero report (Doc. 1-341/80).

I call Mr Poniatowski.

Mr Poniatowski. — (*F*) Ladies and gentlemen I was pleased to see that, in their approach to this debate on so grave a problem, all the political formations of our Parliament have been concerned not with ideological or theoretical matters but with analysing realistic solutions and with the determination to put them into effect. No doubt we partly owe this to the realistic and concrete approach of the general rapporteur, Mr Ferrero, and the individual rapporteurs whom I have seen, in my capacity as Chairman of the Committee on Development, working month after month on a report providing a solid basis for our work and also for our decisions.

It has been said often enough that today some 800 million human beings are still living in a state of absolute poverty and that every year millions of people are dying of hunger. This is true, but there is every likelihood that the situation will be even worse in the future if nothing is done. The truth is clear from the events of the last few years. Over the last ten years, food production has increased at a slower rate than the population in over half the developing countries. In the poorest countries, average *per capita* food production fell by 3 % in the period 1976-1978 compared with 1969-1971. The number of ill-fed or underfed human beings in Africa and Asia is increasing.

This being so, the developing countries' food imports are steadily increasing. Economic planning on a sound basis is becoming impossible for these countries which are forced into heavy debt every year to ensure the survival of their population. If we look at the requirements of South America (and Brazil and Mexico in particular), Eastern Europe, Asia and Africa over the next few years we can see that this trend for imports to increase will accelerate even further. A point here is that Soviet Union aid is negative in two ways. Not only does that country provide no assistance to the developing countries in any field or in any form but in addition, having failed to organize its agriculture on a rational basis its own food requirements weigh heavily on the world market. In the early 1950s, the develop-

ing countries were importing only 20 million tonnes of food products. In 1970 they were already importing over 50 million and this year food imports will be 4 % up on 1979, reaching a figure of 85 million tonnes. Lastly, in 1990 foreseeable requirements of the 80 poorest countries in Africa and Asia are likely to be about 145 million tonnes.

These figures take on all their importance if they are compared with the developing countries' production and export potential. An FAO study forecasts that their grain import requirements will be 143 million tonnes and their export potential 61 million tonnes by the end of this century. This means a deficit of 82 million tonnes and there is nothing to suggest that the problem will then be solved. The situation will also be extremely grave for a product that must concern us for reasons we all know. I am talking about milk and dairy products. For these products, the same study estimates that the developing countries' exports will be practically negligible which means that vast quantities will have to be imported, i.e. nearly 32 million tonnes by the end of the century compared with 19 million tonnes in 1990.

Forgive me for quoting so many figures and statistics. In substance, of course, the problem lies at a level which transcends these figures and statistics. But it would be too easy to arouse public opinion by using arguments based on sentiment and not on a logical and lucid analysis of the realities with which we are faced. Figures are eloquent. They show very clearly the grave situation of the poorest countries. As an illustration we have only to think of a country like Zaire which, 20 years ago, was still exporting food, whereas today it is forced to import food worth \$ 300 million. Whereas food prices were steadily going down for some hundred years, a continuous upward trend has been manifest for some time now and the developing countries' requirements merely strengthen this tendency and that itself further worsens their situation.

Three types of action are called for: development of the developing countries' food crop production for domestic consumption, development of food trade among developing countries and lastly, contrary to what is so often said, development of food production in the developed and advanced countries.

As regards the first point, the share of budgetary expenditure devoted to the agricultural sector in the developing countries rarely exceeds 5 %. In many developing countries, the allocation of priorities among the various sectors does not give agriculture the position it should have in the country's economic development. This imbalance needs to be corrected and priority given to agricultural development in many cases. The ACP States have recognized this need because over one-third of the EDF appropriations under Lomé I goes to rural development. The setting up of the Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural

Poniatowski

Cooperation provided for in the Lomé II Convention is also an ACP initiative. It is to be hoped that this Centre will play an important part in the ACP States' rural development strategy. Although it is necessary for the developing countries to promote their agriculture, this does not, of course, mean that the developed countries can evade their responsibility. Agricultural development in the developing countries is a responsibility common to and shared by both developing and developed countries. So our financial effort will still be necessary for many long years. More than ever will it be necessary for us to advance towards the target set a long time ago by the international organizations, in other words to devote 0.7 % of our GNP to official development aid.

Development in food trade among the developing countries also seems to me to be an important point. It often happens that food products exist but, for various reasons, do not reach the point where they are needed. It is sometimes easier for certain big developing countries to import a product from an industrialized country rather than have it transported from a neighbouring country. The share of food in the growth of inter-developing country trade, at 16 %, is much lower than the share of manufactured goods (39 %) as can be seen from the figures for the 1960-1975 period. On this point what is needed is to correct the shortcomings of the developing countries' marketing networks. Some experts see these shortcomings as one of the main causes of threatened famine in the developing countries. It is therefore urgently necessary to make questions of marketing, road infrastructure, transport and storage a major item in rural development programmes.

Lastly, we have to increase food production in the developed countries and, in particular, production of those kinds of food that are lacking in the Third World. In this field, the European Economic Community has a great responsibility. I know that this presents us with problems at a time when the economic crisis tends to make us introspective and to worry about our own difficulties first. But without food from the advanced countries, the developing countries will not be able to meet their increasing requirements. Far from reducing its volume, as is sometimes suggested, we need to increase it and to adjust what we produce so that it is better suited to these requirements. Could we not revive the mechanisms of the Common Agricultural Policy, orientating them more clearly towards improving the food situation in the developing countries? The present situation — chronic surpluses in Europe and malnutrition and famine in certain developing countries — is intolerable. Ought not the European Community to have a strategy worthy of the name enabling the EEC's agricultural trade to be improved and long-term contracts to be signed? This is also what our ACP friends have many times said they wanted.

So far what the European Community has been doing on other markets has too often been a matter of *ad hoc* action and the results have not always been very fortunate. In 1975, for example, the Community was unable to conclude a firm 5-year contract with Egypt relating to over 400 000 tonnes of agricultural produce and yet we see that certain countries, and the United States in particular, are perfectly successful in negotiating such agreements. There is, of course, no question of challenging certain principles of our Common Agricultural Policy but we need to make of this policy a useful instrument in the service of development cooperation. The contradictions in the present situation could well anger public opinion and yet a true cooperation policy is impossible without the constant and firm understanding and support of that public opinion. This means that the objectives of the policy must be clear and its methods simple which is not the case today. Our rapporteur, Mr Ferrero, has described the concrete steps that should be taken in excellent fashion and after so many studies of such high quality we are now very clear about what has to be done.

The unbearable pictures shown to us on television accuse and distress us. We must not remain indifferent. It is up to us to accept the human challenge of this closing millenium, that of helping all mankind to have enough to eat. We have the resources, we have the techniques and we need to have the political will. In this connection, some of you may have certain reservations or criticisms to make about the report that is before you but in its main lines it is excellent. The programme of action proposed is precise and practical. Now our Parliament has to state its view clearly and unequivocally. It has to make clear its unanimity at this very moment when the so-called United Nations, on the same subject, are showing how impotent, incapable and divided they are. In this world which therefore seems dominated by selfishness and indifference, let us hope that a few European countries at least will state clearly that they intend to and will in fact tackle this tragedy of hunger and that they cannot accept that people who have enough to eat should watch unmoved while those who do not die for lack of food.

President. — I call Mr Debré.

Mr Debré. — (*F*) Mr President, we have often deplored — and we shall no doubt continue to deplore — that the European nations have no transcending aims. It is true. Such an objective could be to take part in the conquest of space and not to leave this great adventure in the hands of nations outside Europe. Another could be a combined effort to discover the riches of the sea bottom over the next half century and not to leave this effort, too, to non-European nations. But here in front of us we have another such objective of a particularly humanitarian and moving — but also political — kind that is the joining of the European nations together in a war on hunger and malnutrition.

Debré

A first observation that needs to be made — at all events I am making it — is that this action, though part of a policy towards the developing countries, is at the same time a policy in its own right. Of itself it is a major enterprise. And this is why, unlike the previous speaker, I do not have unconditional admiration for the report before us which I see as a list, a kind of summary catalogue, of measures some of which we know will never be applied.

There is a Chinese proverb which says 'When a man is hungry do not give him something to drink but teach him how to use a net to catch fish'. Like many proverbs this is only half true. True enough we must teach the undernourished countries and the people suffering from famine to cultivate their land. They need agrarian reform in order to develop family farms, irrigation and energy supplies to help fertilize the land and in general manpower training, the presence of cooperation helpers and agricultural equipment. This is certainly an immense task for which France is in a position to provide many examples. It could be the task of a European foundation, grouping national non-profit-making institutions of the same type into an international association. This European foundation would be responsible for coordination and, being neither a government body nor an official institution, it would enable those concerned and farmers in particular to join in an effort to develop certain rural areas.

This, it seems to me, is where an ambiguity in the report and in our debate needs to be pointed out. It is certainly right — and we have said this often in other discussions as well — that governments should institute a market organization to facilitate exports of certain products whose prices would, in this way, be guaranteed. But this is only one aspect. The vital point is to place the accent on food crops. This is what went through my mind this morning when I was listening to Mr Brandt referring, on the subject of this policy, to the opening of the doors of the European Economic Community to agricultural produce. Here, to my mind, there is a confusion of thought. Apart from the fact that the EEC is one of the biggest importers of agricultural produce — coming to 20 billion u.a. — the first problem with regard to the war on hunger or help for the undernourished developing countries is not to develop agricultural produce for export. The prime need is to create and develop food crops. All too often business firms, and even governments, are allowed to develop competing lines or types of production intended for export to the industrialized countries whereas the primary requirement is crops to feed the people in these countries. In other words, contrary to the underlying assumption in certain debates, the important thing is not to make money in preference to producing food. In this effort to help the undernourished countries, therefore, there is a requirement which has to be clearly understood and that is that priority has to be given to food, in other words to crops and animal farming for the people living in the country and not to types of production intended for

export. Of course help has to be given but that is another problem and the two should not be mixed up.

It is perfectly clear to anyone who knows these countries that this agricultural development action will be very very slow. Self-sufficiency, the only answer to the problem of the food shortage, is a distant objective. The under-nourishment of tens of millions of children and adults calls for a policy in which agricultural surpluses are orientated towards assistance for those who are malnourished and hungry. And this is where the Chinese proverb is wrong. This is the point that has to be brought out at the outset. Let me say at the start that, with regard to the children, aid must not be made subject, even in a motion for a resolution, to provisions regarding changes in sexual behaviour or in political regimes. We cannot tolerate, as the previous speaker has just said, the sight of children or adults dying of hunger. The way their lives are ruled does not matter. We have to be careful not to mix up things which must be kept separate once we begin talking about the war on hunger.

But here again we have something deserving our thought, particularly if Members will cast their minds back to the debates we have had during preceding months. In the debates on the budget and those on agriculture we cannot cry 'away with surpluses' and then in the same voice, when we are not debating the budget or agricultural policy, 'let us give them food'. Giving food implies a policy of surpluses.

To that we are told 'there are surpluses of products which cannot be marketed and there are also food habits and even religious rules that have to be considered'. This type of argument is deplorable and unreal.

Admittedly there may be products that cannot be used, wine surpluses being the obvious and immediate example, although a fruit juice policy would offer great potential for a number of countries and the children in those countries. But we have to admit that most surpluses can be consumed, because food habits may change and the agro-food industry can convert products and, as experience has shown, habits and even religious customs. Mr Cheysson gave us an illustration this morning. Through nutritional research it is possible to use products which, on their own, might not appear to have enough protein or calories but which, if combined, provide excellent food on the basis of intelligently planned surpluses. In other words we should not adopt provisions in conflict with others passed a few weeks before!

The result of the vote on the motion for a resolution following this debate will either cancel out a vote against a policy of agricultural surpluses or will itself be cancelled out by such a vote. Let us not invite a charge of hypocrisy which is what would be implied if we want to separate what is complementary on the excuse — and here I refer directly to the papers before us — that we have to begin by changing the style of

Debré

production and life in the industrialized countries. When I hear this requirement put as a kind of condition for assistance to the undernourished countries, Mr President, I cannot believe my ears. In that case we might just as well say goodbye to any efforts on behalf of the starving millions. And I would add that we are very carefully not told what this change, what this new style of production and life is to be.

A minute ago I spoke about a foundation for developing subsistence agriculture in countries where there is a food shortage or famine, a European foundation coordinating the work of national foundations. These non-profit-making national foundations and this European foundation could administer the European nations' agricultural surpluses. They could provide incentives for some surpluses and for their conversion via the development of agro-food industries and research.

But the main need is for a programme lasting several years. My reaction to the anti-hunger campaigns I hear about is to wonder whether we are really responsible people. Next year, in two years or four years time there will still be underfed and starving people. It is not an annual campaign, not an appeal to public generosity for one particular year when, for one reason or another, one country comes into the headlines, that we need. The problem is permanent and if there is no pluriannual programme, more or less nothing will be done. I see the reaction to what I say and I understand it — what a lot of money. Part of the effort would be offset — as in the United States' case — by an intelligent policy of selling certain surpluses on the world market, but I feel there is a contradiction we have to face up to and it is not by voicing pious wishes about reducing arms expenditure that we shall be at peace with our conscience. No transcending objective whatever it be is without danger or sacrifice and sacrifice of money in particular. Aid for the unfortunate cannot be provided, as is so often done, by printing money, which feeds inflation, but by collecting a contribution from the well-off countries. And for the foundation I have referred to, though it would have the particular feature of being able to receive donations and grants from non-governmental authorities, its main role would, I am sure, be to receive large-scale official aid in order to establish cooperation with a view to the development of food crops and the necessary resources to be able to use our production surpluses to provide food to the underfed and starving countries.

What is important Mr President — and this is the only thing I would ask you really to remember — is not to create a division between two conflicting debates in this Assembly. In certain respects, it is the prestige of this House which is at stake. The Commission and Member governments should connect the two problems together and set above them a rational policy of agricultural exports and a rational policy of industrial

conversion, both inspired by the determination to help in the form of disinterested technical cooperation giving priority to the development of food crops and animal farming. In this way, Mr President, we will have done more for the prestige of the European nations and their influence than all the institutional debates we take such pleasure in. To serve a great cause, nothing is so effective as a great social achievement and this is why, beyond the catalogue that has been put before us, we must see things in simple terms and ask the Commission and governments to see the facts as they are in the way I have just — clearly I hope — described them.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* Mr President, honourable colleagues, ten months ago this Parliament adopted unanimously, with the exception of our Group, a resolution asking your governments for the immediate allocation of 0.7 % of the gross national product for development. It was your resolution and it passed in spite of our vote.

You are now about to vote on a motion prepared by our Euro-Communist comrade, our friend and colleague Mr Ferrero from the Committee on Development and Cooperation. Sir Fred Warner has praised the report, and it has also met with the approval of Mr Poniatoski, not only, if I understand correctly, for its style but also on the basis of cultural affinity. What is being celebrated in this House, Mr President, is the mystery of salvation through interclass collaboration, technocratic modernism and technicist illusions, with the agreement of the prestigious retired ex-revolutionary, comrade Pajetta, of Mr Poniatoski, and of all of you.

How many fewer people will die, in the next weeks and months, thanks to your agreements? None, I'm afraid, if it is true, Commissioner Cheysson, that the mortality rate will continue to climb, as specialized agencies unanimously predict, unless radical changes take place.

The resolution in question does not correspond to the concrete political decisions expected by public opinion. It seems that the interests of party politics allow you to ask for an immediate 0.7 % and to vote later, in your own Parliaments, in favour of a 0.1 % or 0.2 %.

Mr Pajetta was right, unfortunately, in reproaching Mr Brandt for writing, with other well-known persons, a report on behalf of that same World Bank which, having financed this work, now opposes its general principles. The German Social-Democrats themselves, who offer us this beautiful work,

Pannella

announced in New York their intention to reduce further their aid and subsidies in favour of development. This is not development policy, but rather the policy of 'detente', which in reality means 'arms race', so that, in this political game, it is impossible to understand where vaudeville ends and tragedy begins. Tragedy begins with death or murder or mass extermination. Perhaps it takes the place of vaudeville when Commissioner Cheysson calls attention to the fact that only seven officials of category A are available to him instead of the ten he requested and you denied him. Commissioner Cheysson, if you have the courage to state clearly your real needs and if you are not simply playing tactics, you would probably have to ask for many dozens of officials.

Mr Cheysson, here are represented the followers of the great pre-industrial and mercantile classes; you must not believe that a responsible bargaining technique will be successful. You should behave like a Levantine merchant: if you want three officials you must ask for forty, since the agricultural corporative lobbies among others, will compare the adopted resolution with the real attitudes of the governments of the Nine and of Messrs Klepsch, Bangemann, and others.

It was no more play on words when we stated last year that 'we knew that we did not know' what should be done. We did know, however, that your approach was illusory. You contemplate reality from the outside so as to live it better. You find it easy to be at peace with your consciences; you preach as if you were angels or devils untainted by the sphere of politics. But the problem is one of political will: your will, that of your political groups and that of your leaders — but you do nothing to change it.

We believe that the 0.7 % does not solve the problem: the issue is the transfer and distribution of wealth. We stated from the beginning that, if the problem is one of political will, it is essential to couple this political will with the weight of the law, without which any political will becomes a fancy, a sterile pretext or protest.

This is the case of Mr Pajetta, who criticized Mr Brandt for contradicting himself seriously on many occasions and who at the same time speaks on behalf of a party which for two years has supported in Italy the only government of the last 35 years to decrease the Italian public contribution to 0.32 %. Thus the Italian 'coalition government' of Communists and Christian-Democrats has caused our contribution to slide to the last place among industrialized nations.

In our opinion the main problem is one of procedure. Already last year we stated that, in terms of procedure, the question should have been brought before the authority of the United Nations and of the Secretary of the United Nations' Security Council, and that the theoretical procedures of the consensus had to be strengthened and directed towards the technocratic and diplomatic centres of power, for outside of the

reactivation and elaboration of the juridical doctrine of consensus it is impossible to make a country respect its commitments any more than it was with regard to the famous resolution on the 0.7 %. Mr President, in 1936 the so-called League of Nations — as Mr Poniatowski would — stated: 'the world has all the technical and financial means to defeat poverty and to avoid the prospect of war'.

Then, too, there existed a policy of detente. Mussolini's and Hitler's policies of war and murder were blessed by the Munich agreement, which finds a distorted but discernible echo with Mr Pajetta and Mr Poniatowski, and with all those who today in Europe believe that the cause of tragedy lies in the evil spirit of a Stalin, of a Hitler, or of anyone else.

Mr President, we had also pointed out that it is utopic to continue to say as do you and Mr Brandt: military spending must be reduced. We have proposed in technical terms a different policy of conversion of military expenses; we have said: let us even use the armies to create special forces of intervention, whether for transport or for emergency action. A period of famine can, with perverse logic, be an opportunity to formulate plans, to build bridges, making use of army technology which is, at present, fully adequate for such objectives, instead of the technology of Europe's big capitalistic construction firms who build big and disastrous dams where only small temporary bridges are needed.

We furnished many indications of this kind, Mr President; we contest the studies that have been made. While fully respecting other points of view, we believe that a small political family such as ours has the right and the duty to compare studies, so that this Parliament may be proud of having included what the minorities can in their turn propose.

However — as President Debré reminded us — this is not a Parliament, Mr President: by the terms of the Treaty this is an Assembly, and, I will add, an Assembly with a unique character because it is based on the political indifference of the Ferrero report, based on this technocratic delusion, without honouring the ideas and ideals for whose sake we are here and lacking the courage to acknowledge differences and to recognize different kinds of good faith.

An Assembly that holds such mutilated discussions is an Assembly that can contribute only to that destruction which it is already approaching. Who are, in fact, the lords of the earth? Who are the lords of politics in this world? Who produced the moral and economic confusion now established in the world? It is your parties, Mr President; and even more it is the narrow-minded attempts to dominate this Assembly by means of hairsplitting regulations such as those you use to discipline the debate. We participate in these debates in order to be at peace with our own consciences and

Pannella

to respect the right of our adversaries to be fully honoured with our attention and our criticism. This is not permitted to us. You are the bit-players in the tragedy of catastrophe. It is sometimes tempting to say that we are on a boulevard rather than in a hemicycle, and to say to you: good-bye; we will talk less and less; you manage for yourselves. Gandhi taught there are moments in history when democracy and liberty must be served in different ways, and they are not those of soulless institutions, capable only of killing bodies and destroying the reasons for which they were created.

President. — I call Mrs Dekker.

Mrs Dekker. — (NL) Mr President, my approach will be somewhat different from that of the previous speakers, but I shall nevertheless attempt to treat the subject in my own way as well as I am able. Mr President, on the way to Strasbourg I read in *The Economist* that more is now spent in the United States on house plants and flowers than on development aid as a whole, \$ 5 000 m as against \$ 4 500 m on development aid. We are now discussing hunger in the world. One out of every five people on this earth goes hungry or dies of starvation. And this can happen even though sufficient cereals are produced on this earth to feed the whole of the world population. Mr Vergeer says in his excellent working document that a solution to the problem of hunger in the world is technically possible and that the problem can largely be solved in the 80s. He adds that in the present world food crisis it is a question of distributing what is available, but that in the long-term production is the answer. Hunger is also a sign that the resources are not available to buy food. Ironically, and this is enough to make one cynical, hunger is most wide-spread in the rural areas of the poorest countries. Combating hunger and providing people with sufficient food therefore also means combating poverty. If the worst poverty and therefore hunger are to be eliminated in the short term, financial resources are needed. These can and must be provided by the richer countries. The distribution of incomes throughout the world must also be gradually improved. But what sign is the EEC, which includes some of the richest countries of the world, giving at the beginning of the third development decade? A pitifully shabby and reticent approach, with even the threat to revert to commitments entered into in the past and frequently confirmed, particularly the aim of spending at least 0.7 % of our gross national product on development cooperation. I feel that developing countries should certainly not be called upon to accept less than was agreed before the decade that has just finished. If the EEC continues to adopt this not exactly positive line, it will go down as the club of rich countries which spend less on development cooperation than, for example, on sweets. It is not simply a question of solidarity or the right of all people to some kind of security: it is also important for a more constructive position to be adopted, particularly, by

the EEC. The Community is now about to turn its back on, to turn away from two-thirds of the world's population, the peoples of the Third World. Added to this, the monetary crisis which is affecting many developing countries cannot go on. If measures of substance are not taken, especially structural help with payments in order to bring about a substantial decrease in the debts of the Third World countries, which according to IMF information now amount to more than \$ 70 000 m, there is a danger that monetary blows will fall, which will also affect our countries and all that that entails. It would be extremely short-sighted not to take practical, creative measures in this respect. The economic recession that is a feature of the Western nations is hitting the developing countries just as hard. It must not be used as an alibi or as an excuse. Nor were we very generous during our prosperous period. Hunger and poverty or lack of purchasing power go hand in hand. This is not an original statement, but one which we must bear in mind if we seriously mean to eliminate hunger. The motion for a resolution begins with an appeal to our own peoples to help achieve a fairer distribution of wealth with a view to creating a new world order. Quite right, because it will be a costly venture. At this point, I should like to express my appreciation of the excellent reports and documents and, with one exception, opinions delivered by the other committees. We owe the rapporteurs and draftsmen a sincere vote of thanks for their very considerable efforts in many cases and fortunately very clear and practical analyses and for their proposals on the economic policy measures required, without getting lost in high-pitched unrealistic standards, which are often too vague.

So many words and so much paper have already been devoted to this enormous problem. When I went in search of material and information in preparation for this debate, I had over a metre of documentation and publications within an hour, all on hunger in the world. Let us in the name of peace not allow this unique initiative to become yet another paper exercise to be added to the pile of dissertations already available. Let us instead use our combined political forces to take concrete action. 'More bread on the table rather than more paper in the cupboard' should be our slogan. The impulses needed for the positive and decisive contribution which the EEC can and, in my view, must make to the development of the Third World primarily come from the European Parliament. Of course, the improvement of the living conditions of the poorest groups in the developing countries mainly depends on the policy pursued by these countries themselves. But this certainly does not relieve the rich countries of their duty to offer financial, economic and technical help. The much quoted Brandt report also addresses recommendations to the developing countries themselves, regarding, the improvement of the position of the poorest. But if the required increase in food production is to be achieved, aid must rise by \$ 8 000 m a year, \$ 4 000 m of which would be availa-

Dekker

ble if the rich countries increased their spending on development to 0.7 % of gross national product in 1985.

There must also be an international system for collecting these monies, and larger food stocks must be established to ensure supplies throughout the world. Increased food production, prevention of excessive population growth and better distribution of land and incomes are the measures recommended by the Brandt report in this connection. Without wishing to detract from the merits of this report, I must say I find it rather sad that, if no more than a few of the proposals made in the various, similarly very valuable reports appearing in the early 60s after the first development decade had been implemented, a not inconsiderable portion of this new report would have been superfluous. Mr President, Parliament can very soon add deeds to words, initially by adopting the motion for a resolution without changing its contents or tenor and also by taking advantage of the possibilities open to us and doing our duty in translating our good intentions into a practical policy during the debate on the 1981 budget, which will be taking place soon. This will show how far the words spoken here go. Mr President, I would have liked to make a number of specific and more detailed comments on the policy we must pursue and the measures we must take if we are in fact to solve these enormous problems. But I see that I do not have enough time for this. I will therefore conclude by referring to the two amendments that I have tabled to the motion for a resolution. They leave the contents of the motion completely intact but provide an additional incentive to implement the proposals made.

In the first place, I suggest that the Commission should submit to us a six-monthly report containing figures on progress achieved in this area, on the basis of which Parliament can then see what the situation is and what must be done, this being completely in line with this Parliament's responsibility has to check policies that have been introduced. In my second amendment I propose the establishment of a system we already have in the Netherlands, a kind of automatic information procedure, whereby important decisions on commercial policy and in the agricultural sector are automatically brought to the attention of the relevant bodies where they affect the situation in the developing countries. Mr President, I conclude my speech with an appeal to Parliament to add political action to its words.

President. — I call Mr Cohen.

Mr Cohen. — (NL) Mr President, before I discuss the subject of today's debate, hunger in the world and our relations with the developing countries, I should like to make a few preliminary remarks. I too should

like to express my appreciation of the work that has been done by Mr Ferrero and by the sub-rapporteurs, which forms the basis of the debate we are having today on hunger in the world. I believe that through this working method Parliament has shown that it is capable of effective and fruitful work.

A second remark I should like to make is this: I was very happy to see that the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture was available this morning. Perhaps I do not quite understand the situation, but I always thought that an opinion was delivered to the committee responsible and that the committee responsible then took account of that opinion when drawing up its resolution. What the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture can now add to our debate is not quite clear to me. I feel that the Bureau should consider what status the draftsman of an opinion in fact has, so that we can in future avoid such practices.

Thirdly, as Mr Brandt said this morning, the Socialist Group has not tabled any amendments and fully endorses the resolutions tabled by Mr Ferrero. The resolution does not completely reflect our views, but we agree with 90 to 95 % of it. We felt we should not table amendments because we believe that so important a resolution on a matter we ourselves raised, should be adopted by Parliament by a large majority, if not unanimously. There is no point in repeating during this debate everything that you can find in Mr Ferrero's report and the other working documents. I shall not therefore be giving any figures, any analyses, any background information. Those who are interested need only refer to the reports, and they will then know what today's debate is about.

At this stage of the discussion we are concerned with a different matter. What is important now is to prepare for action, to prepare the way for a genuine policy. I do not intend today to speak on behalf of my Group on the problem of hunger, but on the relationship between the European Community and the developing countries in the spheres of trade and financial aid.

As regards trade policy, I would refer you to paragraphs 43 to 52 of Mr Ferrero's resolution. The Socialist Group takes the contents of these paragraphs very seriously. They address requests both to the Commission and the Council, or to put it somewhat less diplomatically, they issue instructions.

We feel it is extremely important that these instructions should be obeyed. A study of the implications of the common agricultural policy for the developing countries is a first requirement if we are to know how we must attune our policy the interests of these countries. Mr Cheysson has already said that he is prepared to carry out this study. Yet another study, you will say, and indeed, a study takes time and we cannot wait that long. Something must therefore be done immediately. The Community has the unique opportunity to

Cohen

prove that, whether or not all these studies have been carried out, it does intend to take account of the interests of the developing countries. I am thinking here of the extension of the generalized system of preferences in 1981. We are involved in the preparations for this at the moment, and Mr Ferrero's resolution makes it quite clear what must be done: removal of trade barriers, removal of tariffs on agricultural products generally, much improved access to the Community market particularly for the agricultural products of the poorest developing countries. We are obviously thinking above all of the opportunity the Community is being offered in the implementation of its day-to-day policy. Last year it was the sugar agreement to which we attached such great importance. This year, now that the review of the generalized preference system is soon to be made, I place the emphasis on the important step the Community must shortly take, with which it can demonstrate that it really intends to consider the interests of the developing countries.

There are other matters on the agenda which the Community can use to show the same courage, the same interest in the developing countries, apart from generalized preferences. It is absolutely essential, as the resolution again says, that the Community should accede to the international sugar agreement and that it should also sign the new international agreement on cereals. And what is perhaps most important of all is that the Community should do everything in its power to make a success of what is known as the common fund.

So the Community will face three specific tasks in the near future.

And there is yet another matter, which is not mentioned in the resolution, but I should like to put it to the institutions of the Community whose task it is to take the decisions for their consideration. Is it not high time the Community made a trade pledge, like the one that already exists among the industrial countries within the framework of the OECD? When we see that trade among the industrialized countries is slackening, we are always prepared to look for the causes and possibly to put forward proposals to restore that trade to its original level or preferably to an even higher level. I wonder whether the time has not come for the Community to make a trade pledge towards the Third World, with the aim of keeping up, if not increasing, trade with the developing countries. So much for trade.

As regards financial aid, I have the following to say. Mr Ferrero's resolution refers to the Brandt report and calls on the Commission to make a study of what Mr Brandt calls the automatic financing of development aid. As I have said before, we feel it is extremely important that the Commission should carry out this study and that it should put forward proposals on how such a system of automatic financing, either by the world as a whole or by the Community to begin with,

might find acceptance. The Brandt report itself makes various proposals. One of these proposals is that automatic financing might be coupled to spending on armaments. That idea, I will say straightaway, does not seem so good to me. It would mean the more spent on development aid, the more spent on armaments. I do not feel that is the course we should follow. But any other proposal for a system of automatic financing merits consideration, and I therefore hope that the Commission will shortly be producing a study of this kind. The same is, of course, true of the commitment to make available at least 0.7 % of gross national product for development aid. In New York, as you all know, only two Member States, Denmark and the Netherlands, were prepared to give a firm commitment on this 0.7 %. The Community refused. Nevertheless, this naturally remains an important objective, and we therefore feel that the Commission must ensure the availability of the information from which we can conclude how, when and by whom the 0.7 % should be provided. The other suggestions made in the Ferrero report — extending the World Bank's activities, increasing and simplifying International Monetary Fund facilities and, not to be forgotten, the contribution the Community should make to the International Fund for Agricultural Development — should, in the opinion of the Socialist Group, also be given top priority.

I should like to make particular reference to two factors at this point. They have to do with the indebtedness of the developing countries. I am principally thinking here of what we might do in cooperation with the OPEC countries. As you probably know, two OPEC member States, Venezuela and Mexico, have already entered into commitments towards countries in the Caribbean and Latin America aimed at reducing the burden of increasing oil prices on non oil-producing countries in that part of the world to a somewhat lower level than would have been the case had these commitments not been made.

I wonder whether the Community should not endeavour to have the Arab member States of OPEC emulate Venezuela and Mexico in its efforts to establish good relations with the Arab countries, though for different reasons. Even if all the proposals and all the measures mentioned in the Ferrero report were implemented, the developing countries would still be left with an enormous debt. We must therefore rack our brains over what can be done about the position of the developing countries in this respect. A general moratorium does not seem to be the most appropriate way of solving this problem, but thought might well be given to writing off the debts of certain countries at a set annual rhythm. Although this is a world-wide problem, the Community also has its own responsibility, in that it has assumed the position of creditor in its relations with the developing countries through European Development Fund and European Investment Bank loans.

Cohen

Parliament has applied a unique method of studying and drawing general attention to the problems of hunger and poverty, of underdevelopment and present interdependence. Never before has the subject of development cooperation been discussed with such fervour and in such detail as today. This debate too will conclude with a resolution, because words, including those contained in resolutions, are the weapons of parliamentarians and democracy. But let there be no mistake. This resolution by Mr Ferrero, which merits unanimous adoption, is only the beginning, not the end.

This resolution is not the dutiful reaction of this Parliament to proposals that have reached us from elsewhere, but the expression of the democratic will, born of our own initiative, to influence and improve the Community's policy. Parliament will come back to today's statements at regular intervals in the future. We will come back to them in order to stimulate or to criticize, to pillory or to threaten, as the need arises. This seems all the more necessary now that the outcome of the New York Conference is known.

We had expected something of this kind, but the results are perhaps even more meagre than we had feared. It seems that in New York it was forgotten what was really at stake, what is expressed so well in the Brandt report. What is important in our relations with the developing countries is that we should establish a programme for survival, specifically of the younger people, the generations to come. For this worldwide cooperation is needed.

But the Community cannot hide behind the inactivity of others. The Community has a duty and a responsibility of its own. As the largest trading bloc in the world, comprising nine Member States with an infinitely higher gross national product than the countries of the Third World, the European Community has a special responsibility. There is no point in repeating in this debate what can be read in the Ferrero report. But it must be clearly stated once again that the Community must fulfil its obligations. It must give the developing countries the opportunity to survive, to grow in the agricultural sector, in the industrial sector and in all those sectors mentioned in Mr Ferrero's resolution. To this extent, the Socialist Group accepts Mr Ferrero's resolution as a beginning, not as an end, as a duty and as an assignment. This Parliament has taken the first step on the path towards the shaping of a genuine development policy. Other steps will follow, must follow. We Members of Parliament must ensure that this subject remains on the agenda in the future.

President. — I call Mr Bersani.

Mr Bersani. — (*I*) Mr President, honourable colleagues, it is undeniable that our debate and the work which preceded it have a particular significance. I too

would like to associate myself directly with those who have given their complete support to the work of our rapporteur, Mr Ferrero, and of the other colleagues who worked with him in the working parties and in the committees asked for their opinion.

The proposals elaborated by Mr Ferrero, with the help and agreement of the committee, tend to create the conditions for the widest possible consensus. I believe this is a worthy objective. The proposals seem to me to be appropriate, and obviously if they appear, in so far as they represent a moderate position, to take no account of the more advanced viewpoints, I still consider them to be, in the present phase of our thoughts and of our work, well adapted to the purpose of our debate. I agree, then, with the proposals; I agree with the spirit which inspired and aided the preparation of the texts by which we will measure our political will; I agree also — and this was after all the view of the rapporteur — that we should not let stop at this objective, but should rather exploit the results which we count on achieving today and plan new goals and new courses of action for the Community.

The problem of hunger — as we have said so many times and as I believe today's debate expressed clearly and soberly, without allowing ourselves to be carried away by the emotion we all feel when we think of the immense tragedy which lies behind this discussion — is certainly the most serious problem facing the international community. No other is as pressing or as important, and what we have attempted to elaborate up to this point is still far from being an adequate response. We do not, however, have to start from scratch: we have, especially at the Community level, much valuable experience which is incorporated in the facts and statistics now before us. We have enriched this experience with the attitudes and tensions which animate the ideal strategic design behind the initiatives taken in the Community, with the approval and influence of Parliament.

I would like to enlarge upon three subjects in particular: in the first place the links between Europe's responsibility and the global framework in which problems of hunger and development must be solved; I would then like to make a few very brief observations on the subject of agriculture and on the dramatic aspects presented today by the problem of hunger in Africa. We were present in New York. For the first time the European Parliament — and this in itself has a significance of which I would like to remind you here — named its own delegation to an institutionalized international organization. For the first time this delegation played its own political role: it went not merely to observe, but, I repeat, to play an active role. I would like at this point again to express my gratitude for the services of the Commission and also to thank the President of the Council, who made possible a small but significant event. Before the Council of Ministers met formally to decide upon the Community platform,

Bersani

there was a three-way meeting which included the Council of Ministers, the Parliamentary delegation, and the Commission. Certainly this cannot be said to have constituted a formal precedent, yet it is the acquisition of a new point of reference, and it is significant that this occurred in connection with the problem under discussion. We all evidently realized that, in the face of such an extraordinary problem, normal methods and procedures are inadequate, and that we must have the courage to transcend them. Unfortunately, this did not occur in the special assembly of the United Nations, which foundered precisely on these same procedural and political reefs. From the beginning we found ourselves in an atmosphere of great suspicion and distrust. And concerning this I would like to say — having been in contact with some twenty Third World delegations coming from countries under the Lomé Convention or other European treaties — that as soon as we referred to the treaties the atmosphere changed immediately, and deep-rooted suspicion gave way to a climate where concrete discussions could take place, at least to some degree, in an atmosphere of understanding, dialogue, and collaboration.

As you know, there were three fundamental problems. Firstly, there was the question of worldwide North-South relations, secondly, that of defining the new United Nations Third Development Decade, and thirdly the need to take a decision on the Waldheim proposal, which called for immediate emergency aid for the poorest countries, where the hunger and starvation are omnipresent and desperate.

However the situation was dominated by the negative attitudes adopted by the principal groups at the international level. The United States, in view of the coming election, would venture nothing; the Eastern bloc was totally uncommitted, and, I would say, animated by archaic motives in a world which is rapidly changing by virtue of the very conditions of development and international cooperation; Japan was at first uncertain and then rather inclined to welcome some of the European initiatives. In this very difficult and complex framework, our efforts were concentrated on urging the Nine — divided, alas, among themselves — to develop a formula which could open up the conference, and, secondly, on participating in the definition of some unarguable objective strategies like that of the 0.7 %.

Unfortunately, the Community was unsuccessful in obtaining the internal clarifications that it had the grave responsibility to achieve in these circumstances, where actually, before '77, it was the only voice to possess some credibility and was therefore in a position to form a point of reference, a stimulus to forward the negotiations. The session ended yesterday — I have here the various documents — in an atmosphere of considerable disappointment accentuated by the awareness of the importance of the problems involved and by the expectations we had previously formed. All is not lost, however, because in my

opinion, the documents which were presented by the Community at the close of the session offer an opportunity for our Parliament to play an important role in improving the situation. Fundamentally, although at the last moment and with the reservations we deplored, — I agree fully with Mr Pajetta concerning the British and German attitudes — the commitment of the 0.7 % was, if only in general terms, reaffirmed. There exists also a declaration of consensus regarding a part of the general statement on developmental strategy — a long declaration comprising some 107 articles — wherein the Community also, in expressing its agreement on the 0.7 % though without establishing time limits for it, approved the increase from 0.7 % to 1 %. There exists, then, alongside our denunciation of the Community's inability to assume its responsibility precisely and coherently at such a serious moment, a concrete space in which to work with increased strength and a deeper conviction, since in the course of the negotiations some small developments took place and some progress is foreseeable. The problem is certainly such as to influence a large part of our deliberations. The East-West problems which have dominated world history since the war, are becoming ever more involved with the problems of North and South. The European Community with its broad policies has certainly shown itself able to grasp such interconnections between these two great moments in human history. The Community's participation, responsibility, and experience, though limited and partial, indicate a point of departure on the long road towards the assumption of a greater and more decisive international role. It has already realized its ability engage in credible negotiation. If there is a negative aspect to the New York discussions — and they have as yet only just begun — it lies in the fact that this credibility of the European Community, this patrimony which we should tend carefully that it may help bring about a wider vision, was partially damaged.

Mr President, I believe we should firmly urge the Nine's governments to attain without delay a closer unity and increased clarity on these positions; they must overcome the inadmissible hesitations and reservations which characterized their attitudes in New York, and assume more decisively their proper role: that of motivating force, of basic participant in these most serious of world problems. The European Parliament has already, for example, influenced with this debate the Italian Parliament, where, in the wake of our own discussions, a body of provisions was approved on the political level, provisions which will in four years increase Italy's commitment from 0.32 % to 0.42 %. We hope that this will soon be accorded formal approval, but the interrelationship demonstrated here is already significant, and I am encouraged to hope that we can establish with the national parliaments a more functional alliance. In this regard I will make a formal proposal that we encourage common deliberations with the corresponding committees of our national parliaments concerning our present responsibilities.

Bersani

I meant to speak of agriculture, and of Africa, but time is lacking, Mr President. Agriculture remains the key factor in any possible initiative, and it must be involved not only with nations but also with many internal elements in our society and in that of the developing countries. As for the problem of Africa — of hunger in Africa, of the tragedy in at least twenty-five African countries on whose behalf the FAO has planned an upcoming special conference in Rome — this remains, especially for us who within the Lomé framework consider Africa as a fraternal partner bound to us by many circumstances, a problem of the gravest responsibility.

I certainly would like to think that something new, more adequate and more appropriate, will result from the proposals we have advanced. The situation is desperately serious, and I believe that our Parliament should immediately examine, in agreement with the Commission, extraordinary measures whereby a timely response to this specific and dramatic problem could be made.

President. — I call Mr Simmonds.

Mr Simmonds. — Mr President, hunger in the world is rather like sin. There is no shortage of it in the world, we are all against it, we deplore it. Many of us every week confess our sins, and there is certainly no shortage of fora in the world in which to discuss and deplore the subject of hunger. If only the hungry could eat the paperwork that is generated by debates on the subject, there would not be an empty stomach in the world.

I do hope that every Member has read or will read the annex document containing the opinions and working papers on this subject. May I draw the House's particular attention to my report on page 125 on which I have placed the following heading: Summary of new proposals to alleviate hunger in the world, which are likely to be accepted and implemented by the nine member countries of the Community. I have left the rest of the page blank — blank, so far, Mr President, because although we have 57 paragraphs of resolution in the report, it is the member governments of the Community that have to make the commitment and produce the cash to carry them out. Everything I have heard to date leads me to believe that neither that extra commitment nor the extra cash will be forthcoming without considerable and concentrated pressure, not just from this Parliament but by every voter in Europe.

Now for a moment, Mr President, I would like to turn to my particular area of responsibility in the report, and particularly to Mr Cheysson's remarks when he deplored the fluctuations in the stock and commodity markets and the motivations and activities of some individuals. I share his wish to develop Stabex — to

develop greater price stability in the Third World — but what I believe was missing from his remarks was the argument that, although the private sector may have its shortcomings, interference by the State in the free market, whether European or national, usually creates more problems than it solves. That is a point I have developed to the full and at length in my report.

Secondly, Mr President, I would refer to the remarks made by Mr Pannella. I am sorry that he is not present, but having spoken to him I understand somebody is taking notes on his behalf on what I have to say. You will note from page 4 of the resolution that Mr Pannella was appointed a rapporteur on this subject, but you will also note that there is no report from him. I hope that this House and you, Mr President, will take particular note and ensure that the next time that his particular brand of street theatre is introduced into this chamber, it is viewed with the contempt that it deserves.

So far, Mr President, the European Parliament has spent a year preparing the reports and resolution before this House. Many speakers have congratulated those concerned on their work and research, but I fear that these congratulations are premature. The millions of words spoken and written so far have resolved nothing and fed nobody. I will reserve my congratulations for 12 months, and then I will only award them on the basis of what has actually been achieved and implemented because I fear that after one and a half days of debate, Parliament will feel that it has dealt with the subject and put it on one side.

The real test of our intent and sincerity will be the work we put in to ensure that our requests and recommendations are carried out by those who have the power of implementation which we, as a body, lack. I hope that European public opinion will receive a further jolt from this debate. In October, people from all over Europe, from all over the world, will be uniting to promote a world development campaign, and the better sharing of its resources. They will unite under the slogan 'One world — share it'. That is the philosophy behind our debate. But the real challenge, Mr President, is to translate our words into action.

President. — I call Mr Gremetz.

Mr Gremetz. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, for us French Communists, the poverty and unhappiness of millions of human beings are intolerable. How could the hunger tragedy we are today discussing leave indifferent the defenders of human rights that we are? This is the age of the atom and of a scientific and technological revolution opening up gigantic potential for the satisfaction of human need and yet in 1980, like every year before it, 50 million men women and children will die of hunger and millions of others will be underfed, diseased and suffer

Gremetz

all the effects of underdevelopment. This situation is intolerable, it calls for exceptional and urgent action by the international community.

This is why we, the French Communists, supported and continue to support the proposal made by President Fidel Castro last October in New York on behalf of the nonaligned countries that a sum of 300 billion dollars be raised over the next ten years to help defeat world hunger and under-development. This is why we are in favour of increasing supplies of foodstuffs — what is conventionally called 'food aid' — from the Community countries to meet the most urgent needs. But let me say emphatically at this point that it is not charity that these countries are asking for. The people who are today suffering from hunger and malnutrition are struggling to have their right to dignity recognized. They refuse to remain, for ever dependent on assistance. Their aim is self-sufficiency and food independence and they mean to make their own decisions about the use to be made of international aid without conditions or interference. In a word they want to decide their own destiny in all sovereignty and independence. They are fighting for the institution of more democratic, more harmonious and better balanced relations among nations, in other words a new international order.

Yes, the international community has a great responsibility where they are concerned. But those responsibilities have to be defined in detail. How can those responsible, in the capitalist countries, for policies of austerity and unemployment and the undermining of national economies dare talk about efforts to do away with world hunger? How can those who, in this Assembly itself, use food aid as a political weapon against Cambodia or Vietnam, for example, dare to make speeches about people in distress. How can those who, in the framework of the Community, organize the winding up of whole sectors of agriculture and animal farming and the weakening of agricultural research potential seriously bring up subjects of food aid and agricultural cooperation? These, for goodness sake, are the same people who in our countries exploit industrial and agricultural workers, organise poverty for millions and are responsible for shameless neo-colonial looting, bringing poverty and famine to many countries. These are the same multinational companies that we do not often mention in this House, which ravage our countries and reduce others to the level of suppliers of cheap manpower or producers of cheap raw materials. No, it is certainly not the harshness of fate we have to accuse when we talk about world hunger. To bring this terrible scourge to an end we have to fight against those who are really responsible, against imperialism and its old economic and political order based on capitalist plunder, grabbing and profit, national degradation and inequality.

At the same time, this stresses the deep-lying community of interest between the populations of the developed capitalist countries and those of countries which

imperialism keeps in a state of under-development. Moreover, the peoples of these countries understand this and it is because increasing number of them are pointing the finger at those who are really responsible that, for some time now we have been hearing more and more apparently highly commendable declarations of intent on the need for human fellowship. This morning is an other clear example. All it really means is an effort, on the part of the leaders of the big imperialist countries on a pretext of development aid and bringing in a new order, to open the way for ideas of inter-class collaboration in every country and at the international level. It is not, incidentally, irrelevant to recall that this was the objective that chancellor Willy Brandt openly set himself when accepting the proposition by Mr MacNamara, President of the World Bank, to lead a commission on international cooperation problems. There is no denying the enormous gulf between words and actions, between declared objectives and the policies that are actually put into effect. We only have to see how the governments of the Community countries forget, without the slightest qualms, their undertakings as regards contributing 0.7 % of their GNP. We saw the same thing at the Western Economic Summit at Venice. Far from planning the foundation for genuine international cooperation in the field of energy and raw materials, the leaders of the Community countries, with Mr Carter, stepped up their efforts to intimidate the oil-producing developing countries. The same happened at the World Energy Conference in Vienna. This attitude clearly confirms the determination to put obstacles in the way of the legitimate claims advanced by the movement of the nonaligned countries and the Group of 77.

At the Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to development, the European capitalist countries did not resist the United States' opposition to the opening of global negotiations in the UN framework. Some of them are campaigning — and would like to see the Community act in this direction — for the organization of a partial conference in Mexico on the pattern of that recommended by Chancellor Brandt. The only aim is to bring the proposal of the 77 that the discussions on the new order should have a universal framework, that of the United Nations, to naught. Lastly, the Lomé II Convention put forward by the representatives of the Community as a model for international cooperation is the target for increasing by bitter criticism on the part of the spokesmen for the ACP countries. These are concrete facts and they are evidence of the political determination to oppose popular aspirations to national sovereignty, justice and progress. For us French Communists, they confirm the view that hunger and development problems are closely linked. They strengthen our impression that the new international order can come only from gains in the popular struggle, in every country and at international level, against the system of imperialist plunder and to bring about a democratic and socialist future.

Gremetz

For our part, we shall work with all the forces of progress in the world to open up the way to political solutions and concrete, positive measures advancing us in the direction of a new international order. First of all we have to develop democracy in international relations. We therefore support the proposal put forward by the movement of the non-aligned countries and the Group of 77 for global negotiations relating to all problems of international cooperation in the framework of the UN. How can we fail to be shocked by the fact that all that would be necessary to make an effective contribution to the hunger and development problem would be to devote one-twentieth of defence spending to that object for ten years. This is why, at the United Nations Conference on Disarmament, we spoke in favour of setting up a development fund in the framework of the United Nations financed by curtailing this expenditure. Today again we are striving to oblige the French Government to seize the occasion of the next meeting in Madrid to have concrete decisions taken in this direction. In another field, the disorder of the international monetary and financial system makes its remodelling and restructuring a topical issue. It is not acceptable that institutions like the IMF and the IBRD, directly controlled by Washington and the big imperialist countries, should dictate their wishes to sovereign states. Nor is it acceptable that the privileges of the dollar should be maintained. The problem of energy and raw materials needs to be stated not in terms of confrontation and plunder but in those of mutual interests, consolidation of national independence and the development of diversified cooperation. It is urgent that genuine discussions should be able to take place in this spirit and in the context of global negotiations. Their successful conclusion would require that the leaders of the imperialist countries should abandon the idea of transferring part of their responsibilities and the effects of their crisis to the oil-producing developing countries. It would require that progress be made in the discussion of agreements on basic commodities and in the institution of the joint fund for raw materials. If there is a field in which cooperation could really grow its wings it is the, in many respects vital, sphere of agricultural development with the self-sufficiency of the developing countries in food as its aim. We arrive at the same conclusions when we tackle problems of industrial and technological cooperation.

This is a brief outline of our ideas and proposals. Action to defeat world hunger and under-development and to institute a new world political and economic order is for us a primary concern and a concrete objective in our struggle and solidarity. We shall not flinch from any effort with all the peoples of the world to help to bring it about.

President — I call Mr Sablé,

Mr Sablé. — (*F*) Mr President, Mr Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, the spectre of famine has disappeared from the European scene but modern information media are there to remind us that it still exists and that, in certain parts of the world, it even reaches catastrophic proportions. Recent televised reports have made us the horrified and impotent witnesses of the frightening starvation currently affecting Uganda and several other regions of Africa and Asia. The almost unbearable pictures reaching us from these countries, lying only a few hours away from Europe by air, where millions of human beings are under threat of death show that malnutrition continues to be an offence against morals and justice. FAO officials have just confirmed the tragic nature of the agricultural situation in Africa. Everything even suggests that it will continue to worsen.

The causes of poverty and of the North/South imbalance are well-known and were clearly summed up this morning in the admirable general report produced by Mr Ferrero. A weak agricultural sector, associated with logistic supply difficulties, and a chronic balance-of-payments deficit periodically aggravated by political upheavals can only result in poverty and food insecurity. According to the best-qualified experts, the average African has 10 % less food than ten years ago. Drought is again ravaging many sectors of the Sahel and East Africa whilst the number of refugees this year is higher than that in any other continent. At the same time we are still arguing in Europe about how to restrict agricultural production and how to get rid of surpluses at astronomic prices and organizing conferences on the medical effects of eating too much rich food. Is it morally justifiable to throw fruit and vegetables onto the rubbish tip every year? How can we accept without demur that 40 % of world grain production should go to animal farming in the industrialized countries of the East and the West although the grain deficit continues to mount. If this trend goes on at the same rate, the day when certain of these countries will be using more grain for animal feed than the population of the Third World will have to eat is already within sight. The conversion of grain into animal protein in the rich of meat, milk and eggs is a costly process. If the rich countries restricted their consumption of animal protein to what they need they would have sufficient reserves to come to the aid of the hungry. But it is unfortunately only too true that the starving populations of the Third World could not use them for lack of the necessary purchasing power and this is why, on the occasion of this important debate, we have to think about a new definition of the relations between Europe's agricultural policy and its policy of aid to the Third World.

By improving productivity and organizing its markets, the Community has achieved self-sufficiency for most of its agricultural products and is even producing surpluses in some cases. In the developing countries, on the other hand, production is far below require-

Sablé

ments. The evil of starvation can be averted only if greater efforts are made to develop food crops and animal farming making due allowance, of course, for the customs and habits of each of the countries concerned. In this connection, the Community has fully realized this need because 40 % of the projects under the European Development Fund are for the rural sector. But we should not be under any illusion; they will continue to need to import agricultural produce for a long time yet because subsistence crops, even if only for economic and dietetic reasons, cannot fully replace the agro-food farming which will provide them with jobs and wages as well.

To increase their purchasing power, to stop the terms of trade becoming worse still and to establish the conditions necessary for the rational development of their economy, the countries of the Third World are obliged to earn foreign currency by exporting their tropical products — mainly sugar, groundnuts, palm oil, coffee, tea, cocoa and bananas. It is in an increase in trade that the beginnings of a solution need to be sought to the problem of raising the standard of living of the Third World. Admittedly there is some complementarity between the European agricultural policy and development requirements in certain fields but there is also opposition that we have to try to overcome. Europe, the world's number one trading power, should be able, by means of the generalized preference mechanism, gradually to reduce the administrative and tariff barriers that adversely affect agricultural exports and thus to facilitate access for the products of the very poorest countries not only into the Common Market but also into the rich countries in general. The fact is that there are few agricultural products in real competition with European produce — mainly sugar and certain fruit and vegetables. In these sectors, as in the industrial field, we shall have to accept a new international division of labour making allowance for natural geographical advantages.

Why waste energy, sometimes subsidized energy at that, to produce certain fruit and vegetables under glass, like tomatoes and aubergines, when they can be grown more cheaply in the interests of European consumers themselves in countries with more sun? Do we have to continue to support the firms processing certain products for which the Mediterranean countries, for example, have geographical advantages? Everybody now agrees that there are mechanisms that need revising in the Community's foreign trade policy. For example, the Community is threatening Thailand with reducing its imports of manioc, another important constituent of animal feed, when European countries themselves encouraged the country to produce it.

Why try to negotiate a self-limitation agreement with a developing country when it would be preferable and more profitable to enter into this kind of negotiation with certain industrialized countries, the United States in particular, a heavy exporter of soya bean into the

Community? Conversely, reciprocal concessions based on a wider selection of exportable products would enable the Community to make an even greater contribution to the world's food supplies. It has to be admitted that in fact the Community has no coherent external agricultural policy.

The developing countries' primary need is for grain but the forecasts say that the world's grain deficit is going to increase from the present figure of 80 million tonnes to 100 million tonnes by 1985. 'I would prefer a grain mountain to a skimmed milk mountain because it could be put to good use' is what Mr Saouma, FAO Director-General, said in Brussels on 1 April. We have to find a way of restricting the production of products which are unnecessary or cannot be exported and, on the other hand, increase that of food essential to the developing countries until they have built up an agricultural sector operating satisfactorily.

The Community has an important role to play on the world market. So far it has not done so because it has acted on an *ad hoc* basis and thus failed to secure certain major contracts. Several speakers, including President Poniowski and Mr Cheysson, referred to this subject this morning. What it needs now is to equip itself, like the other big exporters such as the United States, Canada and Australia, with more flexible instruments including loan arrangements for granting better medium and long-term facilities and to negotiate outline supply agreements covering several years. This strengthening of the Community's role as exporter needs to be backed up by the conclusion of international agreements on the main categories of food.

Unfortunately, ladies and gentlemen, recent international meetings have proved disappointing. The prevailing feeling after the Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly on Development, about which Mr Bersani, Chairman of the European Parliament Delegation to the UN, spoke to us a moment ago is a certain pessimism. At the end of the proceedings, the American delegate said 'If we are going to start on global negotiations, no harm will be done if we do not start this month' — a strange way of speaking.

For my part, I consider that it would be wrong to lose any time at all in this field when one reflects on the vast resources available to the international community and the manifold potential at the command of the European Community, because of the trust it inspires in the Third World, to solve the tragic problem of world hunger.

IN THE CHAIR: MR HANS KATZER

*Vice-President***President.** — I call Mrs Dienesch.

Mrs Dienesch. — (*F*) Mr President, I have noticed from the beginning of this debate — which we requested and to which we have listened with extreme interest — the presence of two somewhat contradictory attitudes: on the one hand, a dramatic expression of the horror awakened in us by the drama of hunger, and on the other a feeling of relative satisfaction at our work, at our efforts, and sometimes at our results. I certainly do not wish to underrate the many hearings and reports we have heard, all of which I must say, include interesting and practical suggestions. One must not underestimate the time spent nor forget the many meetings which prepared for these proceedings. I will nevertheless remind you that we are still behind the course of events. Our requests for a debate on this problem do not date merely from last year. The Assembly which preceded ours and which had the same anxieties had in 1978 already submitted a series of proposals whose results, it appears to me, have not been outstanding. Whether the catastrophe of famine is sporadic or continuous, the profound inadequacy of our action has been observable throughout the entire year. We cannot be satisfied with resolutions and with hopes when we are confronted with the full sum of the difficulties of every description in which we find ourselves. I will not give an opinion on those which stem from political options already mentioned by some of our colleagues. Whether we speak of Vietnam, Cambodia, the Sahel, Uganda, or others, many explanations can be offered to justify the futility of our efforts. I do not underestimate these efforts, outlined for us by Mr Cheysson, but I am obliged to point out that they have not really achieved their goal. Among the long-term objectives we planned, which have been fixed in any case since the 1974 Rome Conference, was that of bringing about an average 4% yearly increase in agricultural and food production in the developing countries. This seems to have remained but a pious wish: 43 priority developing countries attained a mere 2% increase, and in Africa there was even a 1% decrease in food production in relation to the period from 1970 to 1978. I don't want to quote more statistics; those have already been given to us. But I do mean to emphasize today that we cannot show great confidence in the future, and above all we cannot be satisfied with mere words. At the very moment when aid from the European Community is declining, cereal imports are being forced up to astronomical levels.

Yes, the Ferrero report is very late in coming, and it is too late to influence the United Nations Conference. All we can give is a recapitulation of all the measures

suggested within the last five or six years for lessening the imbalance between developing countries and rich countries. Yes, I know we have made an effort — and herein lies the value of this debate — to try to perfect the details of the measures to be adopted, to monitor their effectiveness, and to find means to implement them. As far as the basic problem is concerned, however, I believe that it has not been sufficiently examined. We agree with these proposals. We offered the same ones more than two years ago now. They call for an increase in the volume of present levels of food aid, together with the supply of second stage products, in which the cereal ingredient is present in an appreciable proportion, and the creation of stocks to meet immediate needs. I had already pointed out in the October debate the need for three-way transactions, with the EEC supplying the developing countries with products bought in another developing country, if possible from the same geographical region. All that has been said, and it is nothing new; we repeat it, and we ask for it again. We know nevertheless that the problem of hunger must be confronted in an expanded context. Of course, Mr Brandt is right in calling it a disaster in itself. Wherever and whenever it strikes, efforts must be made to alleviate it. But it must also be said that hunger is linked in its origin and consequences with the development of agriculture in the Third World. It is therefore necessary to create the material basis for the production of basic foodstuffs within the developing countries themselves by transforming archaic methods of cultivation so that whole regions and populations can be supplied. We must use our technology — although this 'our' seems to me a bit smug and pretentious — to guarantee that geographic, climatic, ecological, and ethnic regions are respected, to set in motion networks for distribution, to encourage international cooperation, to develop a light food industry and to insure the equitable distribution of investments between industry and agriculture. There is one subject which should be considered apart, i. e. research. I don't think it right to say that proteins, for example, are superfluous when another country has to go without them. I think that if we have enough intelligence to find the means to reach the moon, we have enough to provide the developing countries not only with proteins but with calories and vitamins as well. It would be truly scandalous if all our sciences combined, biological, physical, and chemical, were not to accomplish this. I will also emphasize, as one of the positions of my Group, the fight against Malthusianism. We do not agree that it is necessary to regulate our aid by our own common agricultural policy. I say this because we have here two distinct problems, and it is not by eliminating surpluses that we can better help others. Let us remember that the problem of surpluses is, moreover, connected with the continued existence, even in our own countries, of farmers who, though not actually threatened by famine, still lack certain necessities basic to their physical and social development. Let us not therefore shed hypocritical tears over hungry and dying children while at the same time planning a decrease in agricultural production.

Dienesch

I have just made a rapid and schematic survey of the points made today with which we are in entire agreement. I would like to conclude by touching briefly on our effectiveness and on what we should consider more deeply. I have mentioned our delays and our insufficiencies and I will a gain underline the inadequacy of our effort. We must reject the illusion that intervention by another institution will allow us to relax this effort, and convince ourselves once and for all of the necessity to increase it, even though this means lowering our standard of living in Europe.

I wish to direct the attention of this Assembly to certain ambiguities in this debate. I feel a certain uneasiness. We sometimes assume a paternalistic assurance despite the enormous complexity of a problem which involves so many different factors.

I will offer a few examples, avoiding a categorical judgment but urging their careful consideration. They merit close attention, and should not be adopted without verifying their objectives. The respect of human rights and our programme of food aid have been mentioned. I cannot agree to the combination to these viewpoints at the present juncture when political problems already present so much overlapping that our politicians themselves have great difficulty in sorting them out. I will say, however, that any form of food blackmail is a complete contradiction of our hopes for the development of humanity.

There is a second series of questions, namely armaments. In all the debates I have heard a transfer of arms allocations is always proposed in order to create credits where there are none. I have heard it proposed for education, for agriculture; in every area we are told: 'well, eliminate, arms spending and then you can provide money for the developing countries.' Here again there are questions. We do not favour the proliferation of armaments, but in the first place it is not something we can control. It is not we Europeans, alas, who today hold the solution to the arms race. Nevertheless, if neither Pakistan nor Afghanistan had been armed, perhaps today they would be definitively erased from the map. Neither can one systematically transfer credits. While there are still peoples who threaten the liberty of others, we perhaps have a certain duty to maintain a military capacity, without however calling for increased spending or enhanced arms sophistication.

The third point, which deserves consideration and which really brings us to the heart of the debate. There has been talk about the necessity of relieving demographic pressure. How obviously simple-minded this is: We live well, we indulge in waste, we have a scandalous overconsumption, — and in order for us to be able to help others, they must have fewer mouths to feed. Therefore the means *par excellence* is the reduction of demographic pressure. We announce that we will give them excellent advice so that they can reduce

the size of their large families. There is certainly a problem here; it would be preferable to help the countries of the Third World to find their own solutions instead of imitating us. I am a little bit sceptical when I hear it said that this is intended to defend a woman's right to choose her own life. Behind this urgent request for a lowering of the birth rate, is there not a sordid struggle against the threatening demographical strength of these countries? Let us then try to evaluate the motives and the principles which lie behind certain of our actions. I will add one more thing, and that is that our efforts must be effective. We are making plans on behalf of the Third World, 'exhorting them and sometimes consulting them — I think that Lomé, and I salute it here, is still one of the most important factors for *rapprochement* — but I wonder how we can ask poor countries to reject the progress of the civilization of overconsumption in which we live. All sorts of polls have been taken in all parts of the world, but when will one be taken to determine what the poor man of the Third World really wants? I would be astonished if these people said they would renounce overconsumption, and had no desire to imitate our supposed social elites whose superiority is due primarily to wealth. I truly doubt that we would manage to find a little wisdom and a little prudence in the Third World when we have set such a different example. What strength and selfconfidence they would have to possess in order to reject this example and accept our advice. This confrontation of two civilizations, one of which cannot be developed without halting further development in the other, can only lead to hate and to revolt. Recent painful events like those in Iran are shocking to many of our values, but this conflict teaches us something about the motives underlying possible Third World reactions to the recommendations we think so noble, so great, and so wise.

In order to be heard, we must make changes in our lives. There has been frequent mention of life styles, but the term is much too vague. Beginning today we must put a stop to our overconsumption; it is necessary to reduce the wealth of the EEC in order to share it. This must be done very rapidly, and unfortunately such haste is impossible unless a powerful moral factor lies at the core of this modification of our ways of thinking. A highly-placed personage known the world over recently declared: 'no transformation of political, social, or economic structures can be achieved without an accompanying and sincere transformation of the spirit, the will, and the heart of man.' This was said in Brazil, as you will all have recognized. If we are unable, in the North or in the South, to tap this well deep in the heart of man; to establish a dialogue and an exchange, and if this impulse is not part of a universal morality, then I say: all our efforts today, all our good will and our intelligence will perhaps have been in vain.

President. — I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppeters. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we regard Mr Ferrero's report and the resolution it contains as very positive on the one hand, but particularly incomplete and unbalanced on the other, posing the danger that we will finish up with a two-day humanitarian debate, since at least three fundamental issues have not been raised at all or not raised with sufficient force and have certainly not found expression in the resolution.

Firstly, there is the part played by the multinational companies. I am very grateful to Commissioner Cheysson for his fine words on the subject. This delicate issue is closely connected with something which Mr Brandt recalled: the question whether our Western consumption models are not sometimes forced on the developing countries. Let me give a few examples. Firstly, there is baby food. Perhaps a report will very soon make it clear that it is not only hunger but also food that causes the death of millions of children. Secondly, there is the thoroughly improper practice of forcing nuclear power stations on others. The third and most important point that has been completely suppressed is the role played by the arms trade. I am glad I am able to speak after Mrs Dienesch, who was all too ready to brush this problem aside.

The role played by the arms trade is connected with hunger in three ways. Firstly, spending on armaments is so high that it will never be possible to achieve 0.7 %, let alone 1 %. Secondly, war and the arms trade are directly responsible for millions of people going hungry. The recent report on East Africa states that it is not the climate but war which causes hunger. Thirdly, we of the highly developed countries are the suppliers of weapons to dictatorial régimes, which make any kind of agricultural reform impossible with murder and terror. Mrs Dienesch cannot say that subtle distinctions should be made in this respect.

The 1979 CIPRI report tells us that the arms trade has increased by 25 % a year since 1970. In contrast, another report tells us that the purchasing power of the inhabitants of the developing countries has been falling by 10 % a year for twenty years.

Exports of armaments were twelve times higher in 1979 than in 1959 and five times higher than in 1969, and that is why we cannot become fully involved in action to combat hunger. Belgium, my own country, spends 7 000 m on development aid pure and simple. It supplies armaments to the value of 12 000 m, while total EEC spending on food aid amounts to a mere 10 000 m.

We might also refer to UNCTAD. You know what UNCTAD wants and the view that it will become increasingly difficult for the Third World countries to achieve economic improvement if they must spend their scarce financial resources on armaments. This too is a factor which should have been discussed during this debate.

The CIPRI report tells us something else. It tells us that 95 % of the international arms trade of the industrial countries goes to the developing countries and that the national governments of the industrial countries themselves control 80 % of this armaments industry and trade. So we cannot blame anyone else. No one but ourselves is responsible. Our governments are responsible. I will therefore close with a remark by Prime Minister Trudeau, one which the rich countries can make, but not the developing countries. It is a choice between dirty hands and an empty stomach.

President. — I call Mr Romualdi.

Mr Romualdi. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, there can be no doubt that the scope of world hunger and the agony it causes make it one of the most pressing human, social, and also political dilemmas facing the civilized world, and our Community in particular.

The anxiety we should be suffering, however, cannot be confined only to the wretchedness existing on a large scale in the developing countries, taken singly or in a group, to which the resolution we are debating is directed. The same problem exists to a considerable degree in many highly developed countries. In the countries of our own Community, in the very midst of ostentatiously and shamelessly wealthy regions, where waste and bad production administration are common, poverty and misery are rife, providing a spectacle of even more overt human and social injustice and implying graver and more shameful political responsibilities.

I refer in particular — though not exclusively — to southern Italy and to the incredible and incomprehensible destruction of so-called food surpluses in our countries. Aid for underdeveloped countries should not, as Willi Brandt said, take the form of commercial speculation aimed at disposing of excess goods; we cannot however accept the unseemly destruction which takes place in order to control prices, to defend the market, or for other equally disgraceful theoretical reasons, when hunger is on the increase throughout the world. This consideration renders less effective and less valid one of the points on which the rapporteur, some of the co-rapporteurs, Mr Willi Brandt and Mr Pajetta insisted: that of the enormous amounts of money that countries continue to spend on building up their armaments. This leads us to ask why they want these arms, and to examine the motives which, in the face of the persistent threat of Communist imperialism, determine this necessity. We will not explore this aspect of the matter, since as has been clear to everyone for some time, the fight against hunger is not a question of means. The fight against hunger is only a question of will. That was said back at the beginning of the sixties. Today we can add that it is perhaps no longer a question only of will, but also and perhaps especially a question of our ability to put into effect the plans and programmes we have undertaken to implement.

Romualdi

Now that the importance of the fight against hunger has been recognized, there remains the problem of how to organize this fight, how to determine the proper means and scale for our campaign and to transform our plans into concrete reality. The Ferrero report itself — which is actually only a list of things it is more or less necessary to do and not an organic critical approach — states, what has been repeated in many quarters, namely that the aid we are able to give to the development of the countries and populations in question, together with all that it implies on the technical, financial, political, even psychological levels, remains fundamental, since the scourge of hunger, disease, the deformities and rickets caused by malnutrition are becoming more widespread while we are debating our choices and resolutions.

Commissioner Cheysson has informed us regarding the amount of aid furnished to date by the Community. The results of this aid are obviously not as considerable as its mere volume, if it is true as everyone here has said on the basis of irrefutable data that world hunger and underdevelopment have not declined but increased in the last twenty years. It is unfortunately quite true that there are more derelict and hungry people now than there were in the deplored and far-off days of colonialism. Do we wish to go back to those times, or do we wish to go forward in our own times, in the economic and historical conditions in which we are now fatally obliged to function, employing all the means offered by our technology, better organizing our aid, making better choices, directing our efforts more accurately, increasing our resources in a more intelligent way and keeping better track of our accounting and financial activities? We must make an effort in this direction if we want to prevent the fight against hunger from becoming, instead of a serious and inspiring struggle, a descent into shameless speculation on the part of multinationals or other companies in search of ever more disgraceful profits, and on the part of political parties which have the reprehensible habit of making of every concrete and human problem a springboard for political propaganda, and who cannot bear to let pass the chance of exploiting even this most painful of subjects.

In this regard especially our Parliament must be able to demonstrate its ability and its will to play a significant role, to influence the decisions of other big international institutions and above all the governments; it must determine its choices carefully, discarding irrelevant or secondary questions in favour of the major human and political goals it must pursue if it wants to be faithful in the future to the high political mission for which it was elected by the people of Europe, and especially to perform the duties and fulfil the hopes of the new generations.

President. — I call Mr Jaquet.

Mr Jaquet. — (F) Mr President, world hunger: one only has to be aware of the statistics given us in the course of this debate to recognize the painful and dramatic nature of the problem.

At the close of this 20th century, nearly a third of humanity is undernourished and nearly 500 million human beings live in what is virtually a situation of famine. We can be certain — and this increases our uneasiness and underlines the urgency of the situation — that if no fundamental changes take place in international economic structures in the near future this picture will become progressively worse.

There are signs that the statistics and the outlook for the future is beginning to make an impact on world opinion. A new developmental strategy for the 80s is being studied, but we must admit that the results are at this point very disappointing.

The rich countries, and particularly those which we represent here, should understand how rapidly energetic action must be undertaken. In the first place we have a duty of solidarity towards those who are suffering. This is self-evident to all of us. But effective aid would also, — as Willi Brandt emphasized this morning — serve the interests of our people if they are properly understood. The industrialized countries can only maintain an indispensable economic vitality within the framework of a healthy international economy, and they can only carry on their own development to the degree that the seeds of international tension gradually disappear.

What, then, should we do?

The report presented to us by Mr Ferrero stated the problem clearly, and the document he submits to us today is remarkable for the earnestness and the coherence of its proposals and suggestions. I have no intention of reviewing all the points raised. I will limit myself instead to a few specific observations. To determine the action which should be taken, it is perhaps not unuseful to recall some of the causes of the present situation. I will try to remind you rapidly of these causes, but I believe that, in fact, the essential cause lies in the history of economic and political relations between the industrialized and the developing countries.

Colonization, it cannot be denied, included some tragically negative factors. Pursuit of profit was often the dominating interest, and in many cases, especially at the agricultural level, this resulted in the encouragement of income crops such as cotton or peanuts at the expense of basic foodstuffs.

The absence of egalitarian social structures in certain areas, notably in Asia and Latin America, have aggravated the problem of land distribution. The great Latin American estates are an example of this, where the

Jaquet

population is in a state of virtual serfdom. Let us also mention the indifference, the errors or the choices consciously made by the governments of certain developing countries which have encouraged industrial and urban development model for the benefit of a minority orientated towards the modes of consumption of the industrialized countries.

Especially in this regard, the multinational companies carry a large responsibility. Their behaviour, undeniably aggravates the present situation. Powerful agricultural and food processing companies are able to take control of the food market and even assume the ownership of the land. They are then in a position to determine the types of production, to fix prices and to impose patterns of consumption, not primarily in view of the essential needs of the population but in view of income and profit.

Let us also realize that, despite promises and commitments technical and financial aid from the industrialized nations has been and remains tragically insufficient. In 1970, at the United Nations, as all the speakers have mentioned, the figure of 0.7 % of the gross national product was unanimously accepted. We are far from achieving this. It is true that certain countries have made a praiseworthy effort: Sweden, Norway, and the Netherlands have gone beyond the projected rate and are not far from attaining that 1 % of the gross national product which it would be desirable to impose on all — I share on this point the opinion of Mr Bersani. But the other countries of the Western world, — which we represent here, — are far from respecting their commitments.

We here it said, 'Don't count too much on an improvement in this area, for you may be disappointed.' If this is so, then I am profoundly sorry, for that would mean that most of the governments of the privileged nations of the world are unable to overcome their egotism. But even if it is otherwise, we must not remain inactive. Our duty is to alert European opinion, which must become aware of the importance of what is at stake, and which has something to say about the policies of those who govern us. In the same vein, I wish to express my approval to Willi Brandt and to the members of his committee regarding the recommendations it offers us, and in particular my approval of those which plan a transfer of resources to the developing countries made possible in part by a desirable decrease in arms spending.

Mrs Focke has draw up in the course of our studies a very remarkable document on food aid, and I fully share her conclusions. I will now attempt, therefore, to offer some thoughts on another aspect of the problem.

It is absolutely necessary that the developing countries gradually attain a level of food self-sufficiency at least for basic nutritional needs. To reach this goal, they must, with the help of international aid, develop the

various technical methods applicable to the task: cultivation of several hundred million hectares which are now under-exploited, development of irrigation and better water management, production and use of greater amounts of fertilizer, wise use of appropriate agricultural machinery, improvement in professional training. The list could go on and on.

It is evident to me, however, that an essential condition of the effectiveness of these technical means is the ability of the governments involved to implement new agricultural policies in several priority areas: agrarian reform and the democratic organization of the system of land tenure, participation by farmers in decisions regarding agricultural policy at all levels, particularly in the development of cooperative institutions as a link between agricultural and industrial development. These are some of the conditions we consider indispensable if our efforts are to be truly effective.

We offer these as suggestions, and not, of course, as conditions. We would hope to impose upon those countries who solicit our help. Action to fight hunger must be unconditional, and we have been anxious to reaffirm here, in a recent debate, that food aid should under no circumstances become a political weapon.

Mr President, two more points before I close. In the course of the hearings organized in preparation to this debate, certain speakers emphasized the need to increase substantially multilateral aid programmes, and I fully concur with their opinion. Naturally, bilateral aid is and will long remain necessary, but it is primarily multilateral aid that should be developed. It is often more effective, and its relative objectivity and disinterestedness calls for less suspicion. This is why we think it desirable that the Community should assume on behalf of our countries the essential part of the responsibility.

Finally, I wish to assert that the whole problem of a new international economic order is involved in this attempt to establish food self-sufficiency. If we wish to contribute towards making the peoples of the Third World responsible for the production of the means for a decent life, we wish in effect to put them in charge of exploiting their national wealth and make them equal partners in the management of the international economy. We are talking about a new concept of the definition of national and international policies. In the agricultural field, particularly, no coherent policy can be defined without taking into account the necessary evolution of agriculture in the developing countries. It would in fact be desirable to establish a system of price guarantees on the world market. Such a policy is necessary to organize production and commercialization of agricultural products, and also to guarantee stable sources of revenue for the developing countries, most of whom depend on their agricultural exports for their principal balance of payments resources.

Jaquet

All these questions are at the centre of the international negotiations. They were the heart of the Lomé agreements and the debates of the UNCTAD. They dominated the discussions which have just concluded at the UN. But the failure which marked the end of that session has far-reaching consequences. The reaction to the problem of hunger depends on a positive attitude on the part of the industrialized nations, and in particular those which make up our Community. The developing countries are waiting for us to take the lead, with truly constructive proposals, in changing world economic structures. I hope we and our governments will realize this before it is too late. However, to make a start in this direction, we must also have the agreement and support of public opinion in our countries. Indeed, at a time when the economic crisis is deepening, some people have only too great a tendency to return the responsibility to the developing countries. In reaffirming the truth, we fully express the importance of our work.

These, Mr President, are our views, and I wished to express them in this debate, as others have done before me.

President. — I call Mr Michel.

Mr Michel. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would not want to repeat a number of things that have already been said so well in this House and will instead confine myself firstly to three general observations and then to five lines of thinking and pointers for action.

First of all, echoing all those who have already done so, I would like to thank Mr Ferrero and the whole of the team working on the report that is now in our minds and the subject of our debate. The first observation that I would like to make is this. We are all more or less in agreement that this problem of world hunger is the challenge of our generation. After all it is in this generation that it has grown to the scale we know and for which we all feel partly responsible because we have to justify ourselves to the rising generation. Are we going to find ourselves tomorrow in the same position as those who today have to explain away the holocaust of yesterday by saying 'we knew nothing about it, there was nothing we could do'? We know everything and we know that we can do something. That is where our responsibility lies.

My second observation is that we are, I believe, all agreed that the mad arms race is really very serious and is a stalemate for this and the next generation. You know the figures. Already in 1973, 25 times as much money was being spent on arms than on aid for the developing countries. Today we find war, or at least fighting, practically everywhere — in the Middle East, Asia, Africa and Latin America — and in ten years the Third World has doubled its arms expendi-

ture. No later than this morning I heard on the radio that two young people, or more precisely two children because one was 12 and the other 14, had been arrested for setting fire to forests in the South of France. This was their twelfth fire. When they were asked 'but why do you do it?' they replied 'because it is such fun to see the Canadair aircraft throwing water on the fire'. Looking at the way we behave, I have the feeling that we, too, are behaving in somewhat the same way. This is what many of us find and it is where, contrary to what some people believe, we have to shoulder our responsibilities and prevent this mad race going on and on as it is at the moment.

My third observation is that we all agree that we can overcome hunger and that we have the technical and even financial means to do so. Are we aware that, at the present time, there are 950 million petrodollars and Eurodollars looking for takers? Do we also know that there are all kinds of opportunities that could be seized and are not? In this war we have to wage we know that food aid is only one feature, useful no doubt, even necessary and sometimes essential but not the paramount factor. The main accent has to be put on development aid. Thirteen years ago, Pope Paul VI was already saying in his encyclical *Populorum Progressio* 'Development is the new name for peace'. And it is in terms of that kind that I would like to tell you about the five lines of action we feel ought to be recommended.

First of all, from the standpoint of development possibilities, we should not forget that in Latin America $\frac{4}{5}$ of the land is not cultivated. In Africa the figure is $\frac{3}{4}$ and in North America $\frac{1}{2}$ of the arable area is not used either. All these figures are given in Mr Vergeer's report on page 162. We also know that a whole series of crops — single crop farming, tea, coffee, groundnuts, sugar cane, cotton, etc. — are grown by a number of countries which, because of that, do little about food crops. We are not against continuing profit-making crops but we do say that these should not be grown to the detriment of food crops, i.e. those whose first purpose is to feed the rural population. That is the problem: to produce in order first of all to eat and live or to produce for the market and to make money. This is the issue facing a whole sector of the population. It follows on the colonial era and is nurtured, it has to be said, by a number of multinational companies of which examples are easy to quote. Contrary to what Mr Coppieters just said, the references to multinationals in this report are not watered down. This is perfectly clear from paragraph 53 of the motion for a resolution: we consider that there is an urgent need to formulate international rules regarding the activities of the multinational companies in order firstly to eliminate their negative effects and to harmonize their activities and the developing countries' development needs and secondly to provide a reliable frame of reference for private and public investment. We ask that the governments of the

Michel

Member States should give precise instructions to their representatives so that the work now being done in the United Nations and its agencies should rapidly produce concrete results. I also feel it would be useful — and this would be a first stage — for the Community to draft its own code of conduct for the multinationals as quickly as possible on the basis of the Treaty. In this connection we have special responsibilities because, unlike what is generally said or thought, the big agro-food multinationals are not American. The two biggest, by far, are European: Unilever is Anglo-Dutch and Nestlé Swiss. We know that the multinationals are by far the biggest. We also know that some of their activities, whilst earning profits for those who organize them, may threaten the stability of whole regions. It is well known, for example, that Nestlé brought about such a change to agriculture in the Andean pact areas that lakes of milk were created and at the same time the agricultural population was made wholly dependent on the multinational company. We therefore invite you to refer to a serious study made by the World Confederation of Labour which was published last June and shows clearly how it is possible for the situation of certain regions to be changed completely through the activity of the multinationals.

The second line of action is that which, in our view, should start from the grass roots and is a matter of succeeding, with the rural population, not only in doing regular and soundly based work but in planting, irrigating, spraying, hoeing, harvesting, improving, selecting, marketing, conserving and diversifying crops. Naturally all this means that there has to be a global, integrated development policy to include infrastructures as well, such as water supply, roads and dams, but also housing and the social, educational, health, economic and commercial aspects of the whole environment.

This cannot all be done by miracle and it implies that young people be effectively involved. In this connection I would like to put forward two other lines of thought and action. First of all it is in my opinion necessary to base what is done in many regions on the family community. Here I would like to quote the example of the family houses for rural apprenticeship. These already exist in over twenty countries. They have been active since 1935 in France and have developed very fast in other countries in Europe, Africa and Latin America. Their method is this. Instead of organizing the exodus to schools of general education, they build up, in and through the environment itself, a package of educational and training components at the professional, social and economic levels without young people having to leave the land. In other words it is a kind of alternating education or training in which young people stay in their environment and are given general education enabling them thereafter, if they so wish, to continue in other sectors of economic and social life. This saves organizing the brain drain. We know well how, both in our countries and in the

developing countries, young people who have gone off after engineering, agricultural or veterinary degrees are often lost to the environment they come from and build up the numbers in government departments and urban centres, leaving the rural environment to take care of itself. That is what, in my mind, we have to change. With regard to the provisions that are to be adopted, among others, for the technical centre for agricultural and rural cooperation to be set up under the new Lomé Convention, we would therefore be very glad if what has been done in this way could not only be used as a model but also brought to people's knowledge and spread abroad.

My third line of action is the association of rural workers. I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, not to lose sight of the fact that, at the present time, 60 % of all workers are employed in the rural sector and very often, it has to be said, in agricultural structures where, although there are unexploited areas of land, they themselves are over-exploited. We should take our cue from the measures introduced by the International Labour Organization for some years now with regard to this situation. The International Labour Organization has development programmes which, among other things, recommend a national agricultural prices policy and a consistent international policy, the institution of good marketing networks and the right kind of organization for agricultural credit. But they also recommend that rural workers, agricultural cooperatives and all those who live in the rural environment should be involved in running development programmes. These are the ways in which structures can be changed; they are not just words. They are realities which have to be grasped in and by the rural environment with the effective and active participation of agricultural workers.

Lastly I would like to say a word — and this is my fourth line of thought and action — on the subject of the cooperation assistants from our countries. My fear is that, if we continue the way we are going, we will soon have no assistants left to carry out certain projects. The sad fact is that, very often, these young people, full of enthusiasm, are not sufficiently prepared for the work they have to do; when they sign on it is for very limited periods and when they come back they are just left to themselves. Why? The reason is that, whether in our individual countries or at Community level, we do not make this recruitment of cooperation assistants our full responsibility. My belief, in fact, is that we exploit the generosity of the young. If we want this to change, if we want teams to be set up in which young people in the developing countries join with those from the developed countries, and if we want this type of scheme to continue to have a future we have to change our attitude. Lastly — and on this I will close — I want to say a word about the budgetary aspect. This is the fifth and last line of action. Mr Cheysson, during the debate on refugees from the Horn of Africa, spoke to me in these terms:

Michel

'It would be a good thing if Mr Michel could be logical with himself and ask his Group to be logical as well, because it is not sufficient to make generous speeches, we need to be consistent in our budgetary decisions.' Mr Cheysson, let me put the ball back in your court by saying that in the draft budget for 1981 there is a 1.28 % reduction in food aid. I accept this 1.28 % reduction because I do not believe that food aid is the essential element of what we have to do. For development, on the other hand, there is an increase of 107 m.u.a. Not only do I hope that this will be passed but the Group I belong to proposes that development aid be increased by the equivalent of 1 % of the total budget figure. My point is that whereas aid to development came to 4.09 % of last year's budget, this year — just when we are debating world hunger — the figure for development aid comes to only 3.75 %. So I hope that we shall be voting in the way you want and that, in that way, our differing concerns will end by converging and we shall be able to fight this battle together.

President. — I call Sir Fred Catherwood, Chairman of the Committee on External Economic Relations.

Sir Fred Catherwood. — Mr President, I speak to support the opinion of my committee in this document, that is the part to be voted on, Part A rather than Part B, which is more the rapporteur's own views. In particular I speak to support the proposal for freedom of access to Community markets for the agricultural products of the least developed countries.

This view, I am happy to see, is supported by Mr Sablé who says:

Agricultural protectionism on the part of the industrial countries unquestionably makes the poor countries poorer still... Subsidized exports of surpluses to the world markets strongly undermine the competitiveness of the developing countries.

That view by Mr Sablé is opposed by Mr Debré — I am sorry to see that he is not here any more — although he admitted at the beginning of his speech that the best way to help the hungry man was, in the words of a Chinese proverb, to give him a fishing net.

But Mr Debré then turned from this commonsense approach to tell us to send the hungry our subsidized surpluses. If they do not like what is left over from the rich man's table because that is not what they happen to eat in that country, then they must change their eating habits and overcome their religious barriers. On the other hand, it was a dream to think that we in Europe should change our pattern of farm production. That was the thing that was absolutely impossible.

Now, I really do not think that that view of Mr Debré's is likely to help overcome world hunger. We can change our own habits, but we cannot insist that

the Third World changes its habits to suit our production. That is what imperialism is, not what our friends on the other side say is imperialism. So I agree with Mr Debré's commonsense beginning, but not with his conclusion which has absolutely nothing to do with his beginning. The beginning was right and then he went off on a completely different tack. That is our problem.

I believe that trade is better than aid, and I want to give five good reasons why trade is better than aid. First of all, we can actually do something about it. We are all in favour of abolishing hunger, like abolishing sin, but what can we actually do to help, as opposed to talking about it? The Committee on External Economic Relations propose that we reduce trade barriers to these hungry countries, and that we can actually do as a European Community. It is within our competence, not so much in the competence of the national governments. It is in our power and it does not interfere with the customs and habits of those countries. It encourages them, on the contrary, to do something for themselves. It gives them Mr Debré's fishing net.

Second, the encouragement of food exports puts hard cash into the agricultural sectors of poor countries in far bigger quantities than aid. Look at any figures which contrast the export revenue of a country with its aid revenue. Exports clearly can help much much more in any country capable of exporting at all than aid can. The quantity of money that requires to be put in to overcome hunger in those countries is very, very substantial.

Now trade can fill that substantial gap in a way that aid cannot, so aid can never match exports as a source of revenue. Food aid is worst of all. In contrast to trade, it actually ruins the local farmer, who can never possibly compete with our huge subsidies. So it creates a desert and it creates dependence. That is what sending them our surpluses actually does for them. Food aid rots in the warehouses — again look at the figures for that — it is lost on the road and when it gets through, by all accounts, it is diverted to the rich and the poor still starve.

Now I admit that that is perhaps an impressionistic way of looking at it, but you ask any missionary at the grassroots of these very poor countries and he will tell you that the food does not get through to the starving. It stays with the rich. They keep it, and they eat it.

By contrast, the cash from export sales puts resources into agriculture. It builds up the local farmer and all aid experience shows that the encouragement of cash crops also builds up output for local consumption as the cash goes into agriculture, and builds it up enabling them to put down drainage and roads and all the other things that cash will enable these people to do.

Catherwood

Even the most corrupt government in the Third World knows that it should encourage its export industry; that it should not damage it by an excessive rakeoff — maybe it is too much to hope that they will not take any rakeoff, but they should not wreck it by an excessive rakeoff.

So, although food aid and cash aid may not get through, the income from exports from the country will go to the farmers throughout that country, building up a healthy agricultural sector and helping up a healthy agricultural sector and helping that country to get rid of its own starvation.

Fourth, it is surely more sensible to encourage countries to export what grows cheaply and naturally in mostly tropical countries than to close our markets to them while at the same time opening them under the GSP to sophisticated manufacturing goods that those countries cannot make with the result that as soon as they begin manufacturing simple goods we have to erect new trade barriers like the multifibre agreement.

Fifth — and this we have got to remember — it is all right making speeches about increasing aid, but we have got to go back and persuade people to pay more taxes. The citizens of Europe will actually give far more money to the very poor countries over the counter of a supermarket or a grocer's shop than they will through higher taxes. So again, at our end, more money will come in that particular way.

So, let us not just make great speeches. We have had some very great speeches, but let us not just make great speeches about what must be done. We have heard all day about what must be done, but let us not make impossible demands and then throw up our hands and say it is nothing to do with us when these demands cannot be met. Let us instead do what we can do and what we should do.

President. — I call Mr Denis.

Mr Denis. — (F) Mr President, the worsening of the food situation in the developing countries is in no way something beyond our control. As my friend Maxime Gremetz has shown it is the result of a century of plunder by imperialism in other words by the financial and industrial powers that are now still striving, in neo-colonialist forms, to enrich themselves from the labour of the peoples in the Third World and of the working class in their own countries. Yes, it is clear where the responsibility lies. Here I shall confine myself to a specific and highly significant problem: the link between the war on hunger and underdevelopment and the struggle for disarmament.

How can our indignation fail to be roused at seeing poverty and malnutrition increasing for hundreds of million women, men and children at a time when the

human, technical and material resources that could rid mankind of this evil exist as the experience of the socialist countries, from Cuba to China via Bulgaria and others, shows. It is a major scandal of this age to see so many developing countries increasingly in debt and unable to raise the funds they need for investment, infrastructures and social, educational and health facilities whose absence intensifies their underdevelopment and, at the same time, to see vast resources swallowed up by an arms race which has today reached an unprecedented pitch. At the hearing organized by the Committee on Development and Cooperation last February, I asked Mr Brandt how it was possible to talk about world hunger and in the same breath approve the decisions of the developed countries meeting in the Atlantic Council — in 1978 — to increase their defence spending up to the year 2000 and to install new American missiles in Europe. I was given no reply.

Those who reject the constructive proposals of the developing countries, too, refuse to reply to the proposals repeated by the socialist countries that negotiations be held on all medium-range missiles in Europe. They lift every limitation on the West German navy and, in Paris, start work on making a neutron bomb. The weepers, here, of crocodile tears are the same who use the weapon of hunger against people whose crime, in their eyes, is to want the sovereign right to decide on their own political and social policies. But the world is changing and these manoeuvres are encountering some stinging defeats. We only have to look at the example of Cambodia where the declarations of the big international and humanitarian organizations today confirm what we were saying in this House. It is high time for the Community to restore food aid to Vietnam and Cambodia as the Commission had undertaken to do. Even so it would be very quickly possible to find large-scale resources to contribute towards self-sufficiency in food. Among other things a few billion have to be switched from the appropriations concerned with preparations to kill to those concerned with life and human progress.

The proposal made by Fidel Castro on behalf of the movement of the non-aligned countries and since supported in all world conferences by the Group of 77, that a 300 billion dollar development fund be set up in ten years funded by reducing all defence budgets had the spokesmen of imperialism and, not least, the pundits of the EEC raising their arms to heaven. But they know perfectly well that this sum would only be one half-year of the defence spending expected over the same ten years, i.e. 1980-1990. It is a problem of political will. Our approval of this proposal is all the greater in that it corresponds with that put forward by the French Communist Party on the occasion of the Special Session of the UN Assembly on disarmament and that the same stance was taken by the Communist parties of the capitalist and socialist countries of

Denis

Europe meeting in Paris last April on peace and disarmament. I would also recall that, on our initiative, this proposal was favourably received by the ACP countries at the Arusha meeting of the Joint Committee. Anyone can check this. Those who refuse to set up such a fund and veto any measure designed to tackle the roots of the hunger problem in all the meetings that have already been held are the chief imperialist countries and the EEC. And your consensus, your pious hopes are not enough to make us forget what the governments that you support are in fact doing.

For our part, we support all proposals likely to reduce tension and the presence of armed forces, to outdate blocs, and to initiate negotiation particularly with the objective of creating zones free of nuclear weapons, battle fleets and foreign bases. We support, for example, the wise proposals put forward by the Malagasy President Ratsiraka for the Indian Ocean. We consider that the nations of the Third World, like those of the Mediterranean and beyond, are vitally interested, like us the European countries, in the Madrid Conference being a complete success so that military détente will enable armed forces, arms and defence budgets to be gradually reduced on equal security terms for all. So quite definitely, the war on hunger and the struggle for disarmament seem increasingly to be essential aspects of the battle to institute a new world order allying cooperation, détente and the struggle against poverty and underdevelopment.

President. — I call Mr Irmer.

Mr Irmer. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am afraid that today may go down as a black day in the history of the European Community and particularly of this Parliament if we achieve here nothing more than adding a further layer of paper to the enormous pile of clever analyses, opinions and proposed solutions that has formed over the years and then, our consciences clear, go off to snails, steaks and Alsatian Riesling. Today's debate as an excuse for continued inactivity? A dreadful thought. But I still have some hope. Today might mark the beginning of a new, more constructive period of cooperation between the North and South, at least to the extent that the European Community can contribute to this. I feel that the Ferrero report contains ample scope for this. This hope can, of course, be fulfilled only if we are all prepared not only to approve Mr Ferrero's resolution, but also subsequently to take its contents seriously in our daily work. In other words, this debate will have served a purpose only if the practical suggestions made here can be translated into practical policy without delay. This directly affects each and every one of us. Let me give you a few examples: paragraph 14 of the resolution calls for the entry of:

a substantial sum in the 1981 budget for the revival and strengthening of the International Fund for Agricultural Development;

and paragraph 40 states that

it is essential to increase the budget appropriations allocated to emergency aid substantially;

These are only two examples. Ladies and gentlemen, I must ask those of you who are not prepared to use their voices during the debate on the 1981 budget in the autumn of this year to translate these demands into real policy and are not prepared for conflict with the Council in these matters if that should prove necessary, not to vote in favour for the motion for a resolution. Paragraph 47 of the resolution says that the new generalized system of preferences must be an improvement over the old both as regards the type and number of products benefiting by the system and as regards the mechanism of the arrangements, and so on and so forth. The report is full of well-founded and practical suggestions of this kind. Those who are not prepared to fight for all these demands in this House in the future, those who are not willing to take the wise and reasonable conclusions drawn by the resolution really seriously and possibly again to accept a fight with the Council, the Commission and the industrial associations directly concerned should vote against the Ferrero resolution. But those who vote for the resolution — and I hope there will be very many of them — must realize that, in so doing, they are entering into very specific commitments, that they are in fact casting their votes for a later time when it comes to translating the theoretical policy developed here into practical action and budgetary decisions. For some of us this will undoubtedly be by no means easy, and it will also require some rethinking. Let me give you another example, and I am now following up something Sir Fred Catherwood said:

It is generally recognized that the development gap can be filled only if we go in for structural development in agriculture. It is also said that structural development in agriculture is possible only if we are prepared to open our markets to these products. But occasionally this is bound to give rise to conflict between domestic producers within the European Community and potential producers in the developing countries. We have become accustomed to always solving these conflicts by protecting our domestic producers. I feel we should give some thought to a different method of resolving this conflict in the future, and this not only to the detriment and at the expense of domestic producers, who might then have to be — let us be quite frank — compensated with direct subsidies. But, ladies and gentlemen, this money would, I feel, be better invested in this way than the money we repeatedly have to pump into the bottomless pit, the developing countries, for emergency measures, to plug the largest holes, without really achieving anything structural. It is undoubtedly better

Irmer

to pursue a temporary policy of additional subsidies for endangered sectors of the economy than to go on refraining from doing what we all recognize as being right for the developing countries. I can but agree with Sir Fred Catherwood when he says that this is an area where we, the European Community, can ourselves take action without having to ask the Member States.

A final example of such rethinking. I feel we should take paragraph 8 of the resolution very seriously. It states that the Community aid as a percentage of Member States compared bilateral aid must be increased progressively. Not only must it be progressively increased: in the longer term we must also have a situation in which the European Community is in sole charge of development aid and the development policies of the Member States are subordinated to Community aid, because this is a classic example of an area that justifies the association of the Member States in the Community. Only the Community will be able to take the necessary measures.

President. — I call Mrs Weiss.

Mme Weiss. — (*F*) Mr President, fully aware, by experience, of world malnutrition and famine, let me assure you first of all of the infinite human sadness underlying the cold reasoning that I am resolved to put to you, realizing the limits to what a Europe can do that is already heavily in debt for its own needs and bent under the weight of the burdens it has taken up on behalf of the Third World.

I shall make three points.

The first is that these burdens — advance warnings of the ruin you can see written into our national budgets if you hold them up to the light — these burdens are recorded in such a tangle of statistics that after careful study they were completely indecipherable to the housewife that I am. Mr Vergeer has already said, quite rightly, that he wanted to know, in addition to the aid given by the Community, how much aid was given by the individual Member States and distributed through the various international channels among those who come begging of us. All this aid, let me remind you, always comes from the same source in other words the impotent, ill-informed taxpayers of the West. They have a right to be told and by our Parliament in particular. I therefore demand for the first time that we tot up not only the loans made from their money, but also the presents implicit in the lengthening of repayment terms, the lowering of the rates initially asked and then, ultimately, the conversion of loans into gifts. On top of these considerable sums there are the outright gifts, unprofitable investment and investment that ought to be profitable but because the terms are not honoured saddle the guaranteeing countries with the risks entered into by the supplying firms. To all this must be added the funds for sustain-

ing raw materials prices, the tax reliefs of all kinds, the money administered by the international or non-governmental relief organizations and the considerable funds applied by the churches to more or less the same object. We really do not know who pays whom and how much.

At the moment we would be completely in the dark if figures had not been produced which, although far from covering all the aspects I have just mentioned, tell us, in Mr Jackson's remarkable report, that aid from the Nine is 0.45 % of GDP, that from the United States 0.25 %, that from Japan 23 %, and that from the USSR only 0.03 %, which reduces Mr Ferrero's report to a piece of propaganda aimed at blaming or, more explicitly still, destroying Europe.

My second comment is this. To hope that all the European countries putting public and private money into helping the Third World will take decisions in agreement with the Community seems today no more than a pious hope.

Even so, and I refer to Mr Jaquet's pertinent report on the Community's decision-making mechanisms for granting this kind of aid, our Parliament should certainly be better informed about them and in particular their criteria.

These billions are badly managed as everyone knows. I commend to your attention the report by Mr Simmonds. In the interest of the dignity and effectiveness of this Parliament, it seems to me that these criteria should be human rights on the one hand and Europe's right to exist and progress on the other. We are here to defend Europe.

A few words on the subject of human rights. The Lomé Agreements do not even refer to them and the countries we help refuse to apply them so that, for the Third World, Europe — blamed for everything — is in a situation of a hoodwinked benefactor. In the name of human rights, the dictators in the Third World with their majority in the United Nations Organization claim that our duty as Europeans is, at least, to provide the minimum their populations need to live. In the name of the same rights, however, they refuse, on the excuse that it would be interference in their internal affairs, the controls that are nevertheless customary between borrower and lender. We need no list of the abuses, misappropriations and subversive uses made of our aid. Europe in its weakness, not content to be ridiculed, has reached the point of going on its knees before the authors of the most cruel forms of genocide to beg them to accept its money for the victims of their ferocity. They never accept without benefiting themselves. That, therefore, is the moral tragedy of Europe. Benevolence is the cloak it uses to hide its impotence. Uganda was not short of food or drugs. All it needed was policing to control the looters.

Weiss

No one dared. I know the area well having spent much time there. International aid to Cambodia was sidetracked and no-one took any account of it. We no longer remember the Iri, that fine tribe that Amin Dada killed off by herding the people onto infertile hills. Then, however, he was in power and showered with tributes from Manhattan.

My other criterion, Europe's right to exist and progress, seems to me to be just as fundamental. I am not pleading a case. I am questioning the Commission. Should the Third World countries that are hostile to Europe and provoked to attack their neighbours, our allies, weapons in hand, benefit from aid given by our Communities? Yes or no? Our political will has to be defined. Take the example of Ethiopia where the Kremlin governs by remote control. Christian and Islamic traditions are being systematically stamped out but the whole country is being armed.

Perhaps the Kremlin could also feed and educate the Ethiopians instead of leaving this responsibility to their opponents, kind souls that we are. Under the Lomé Agreements, its Ethiopian colony has just received some 200 million dollars. On top of these 200 million dollars there is direct aid from Brussels of about the same figure. What is your intention, then? Tell us clearly.

Finally, here is my third and last comment. An indicator of startling simplicity for the malnutrition and starvation that grieves us so much is the division of resources by the number of mouths feeding on them. Here again we should pay tribute to the detailed work on the improvement of these resources on which Mrs Katharina Focke and Mrs Heide-Marie Wiczorek-Zeul have produced reports. These tell us everything about agricultural education and the frightening threat to the ecology of the whole of the world from the abandonment of rural areas but little about sexual education which is at least as important. In other words there is a shamefaced silence about runaway birthrates whereas contraceptive facilities would do more than powdered milk dissolved in often polluted local water to secure the survival of a famished race. An alarming report by the International Labour Office just out says that the Third World, in spite of the aid we are giving it, is galloping towards underdevelopment.

And this — let us be frank — is out of fear of the ideological argument that is immediately trotted out: do only the rich have the right to live? The highly-publicized Bucharest conference was unable to resolve the problem. There, the most minor form of family planning was regarded as an attack on the powers of the countries concerned whereas if they were fewer in number and better fed they would be stronger. Since then, China and India have understood.

So, Mr President, whatever Parliament thinks about the brief comments I have made or about past or even

future debates, Europe, the benefactor, faced with today's disasters, must reflect, in order to decide what its conduct is to be, on the question which towers above all the others: is it responsible for all the intercourse in the universe? And what, in conscience, is Europe's reply?

I am going to suggest that you adopt the following motion for a resolution but I would not be surprised if you refer it to committee. The European Parliament, aware of the need for immediate aid to families suffering from starvation, nevertheless asks that the Community should define its policy of aid to the Third World in relation to its own resources, about which we shall finally be informed, with due regard for human rights and Europe's right to exist and to progress, and therefore postpones its aid to countries whose attacks on our fundamental freedoms would thereby be strengthened and requires that human rights and the monitoring of their application be included in any future cooperation agreement.

As regards past agreements, these should be amplified by open talks in which the representatives of the aided countries, in return for the rightful use of Community funds, would be invited to see, in their turn, how human rights are applied in the Member States. I think that this experience would have some educational value. The motion would also recommend that, bearing in mind the absurd situation of UNO, in which the cost is largely borne by a democratic minority and the activities decided by an anti-European, non-paying totalitarian majority, the Community should embark on any hunger relief action in the said conditions in its own name. It would further recommend that the Community should organize its aid, not in ignorance of national measures of the same kind but in cooperation with them, noting that increased resources is just as important as the sexual education of people suffering from an overpopulation they do not know how to control, and finally that, should action be necessary, an order-maintaining force of European inspiration should intervene to save as many human lives as possible.

President. — I call Mr Skormand.

Mr Skovmand. — (DK) Mr President, about 150 years ago there was a terrible famine in Ireland; the potato crop failed, and almost 2 million people died of hunger, while another 2 million were forced to emigrate to England or the USA. In England, which of course at that time ruled Ireland, there was a great deal of discussion about what could be done. Large quantities of corn were sent to Ireland, and people argued about how Irish agriculture should be improved. But only a few people concerned themselves with Ireland's main problem: the fact that most of the good land was in the hands of rich landowners, and that in the midst of the famine these landowners were

Skovmand

sending large quantities of corn out of the country for consumption in England.

It seems to me that the debate on world hunger taking place here in the European Parliament is ignoring the real problems in much the same way. However, some good background material has been prepared, and I read Mr Sablé's working document with particular interest. It touches on many fundamental problems. On page 123 for example, Mr Sablé discusses the fact that about 85 % of the calories are wasted when cereals are used to produce animal products. On page 124 he states that 12.5 % of the EEC's animal production is only possible with the aid of feeding-stuffs from abroad. In this context he asks whether it is really appropriate for the developing countries to export feedingstuffs to the rich countries instead of producing food for themselves.

Mr Sablé does not describe the extent of these exports. But as far as one can tell from the Community's statistics, the EEC imports 13 to 14 million tonnes of feedingstuffs from the developing countries every year — a far greater quantity than the 2 to 3 million tonnes of cereals which people are now talking about the EEC sending to the developing countries. One reason why the EEC imports so much is that there is a levy on cereals, but no levy on feedingstuffs from the developing countries. The feed companies in the EEC countries are therefore buying more and more of their feedingstuffs in the developing countries. Tragically, a large proportion of these feedingstuffs is completely wasted, because the EEC's agricultural system leads to over-production of animal products. In other words, the EEC's agricultural policy itself plays a part in increasing hunger in the world. Unfortunately neither Mr Sablé nor Mr Ferrero tackles this problem, and their attitude reflects one which is common in the EEC's institutions. So history is no doubt going to repeat itself, with one important difference. The Irish, after all, had a choice between starvation and emigration. People in the developing countries have no such choice.

President. — I call Mrs Focke.

Mrs Focke. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, eleven months ago, during our first debate on the fight against hunger in the world, we sounded the alarm, we began to mobilize public opinion and we set ourselves an assignment. The result of this work is now before us in the form of Bruno Ferrero's report and motion for a resolution, a result which permits and requires a debate different from that held eleven months ago. It places the subject of the fight against hunger in the world in the general context of development, North-South problems and the whole question of the new world economic order. But it concentrates the proposals on what is more closely, more specifically connected with the fight against hunger in the

world. It proves that this can be done and — just as Willy Brandt emphasized this morning — it stresses that this must be done and there must be no waiting for a solution to the more comprehensive general problems.

The resolution is an instruction to act. It is not a further addition to the existing pile of analyses. The attempt has been made to make use of everything others have already thought, said and proposed and to form a package of measures for practical action. This has successfully produced a large number of assignments which are specific enough to be put to the test.

I contend that the motion for a resolution and the programme of action it contains are *realistic*, in the sense that they are not Utopian, wishful thinking, taken out of the blue, but a *minimum* rather than a *maximum* programme for solving the known problem. It is a *European* programme, because it is based on the terms of reference, the instruments of the European Community, on its powers to act and take decisions, if only in terms of European development policy, the agricultural policy, the commercial policy or European political cooperation. It is *feasible* with — I would say — no more than an average amount of political goodwill. It is *financially* acceptable with a little more imagination used on new forms of financing, particularly a more automatic system of financing, as Willy Brandt and his Commission have proposed, and especially when the consequential costs arising if there is a further increase in hunger are realistically calculated, to use the very cold language of finance ministers.

It is *negotiable* with, and indeed acceptable to, the Group of 77, because it is in the mutual interests of the industrial and the developing countries. Finally, ladies and gentlemen, I hope that for all these and many other reasons it will also find the support of a *majority* of this Parliament, a large, broad majority who will approve this motion, a majority who will refrain from transforming it with a large number of minor amendments which in the final analysis have little to do with its general content.

I can refer to only a small part of the package of cohesive measures. I will concentrate on the link between rural development, agricultural development and food aid. The primary requirement, according to the proposals, is that the developing countries should be able to meet their own food needs from domestic production. The motion for a resolution naturally assumes that this primary requirement is in the interest of the developing countries themselves and that they are setting themselves this objective, and indeed there are many indications that they have already done so. But we are also aware of the following, and the motion for a resolution refers to this several times: if this overriding objective is to be achieved, the industrial countries must provide a great deal of technical and financial aid to rural development, for example by donating additional resources to the International

Focke

Fund for Agricultural Development. We can give quite specific figures in this respect: we want the sum to be tripled, we want to see this fund initially having \$ 3 000 m, and we want to see a title in the European Community's budget. We propose that additional technical and financial aid should go to the establishment of food strategies, food security plans for the developing countries, since they are essential if we are to achieve the objective in cooperation with the developing countries more quickly and more purposefully than in the past. We propose — as Bruno Ferrero's motion very clearly states — that, for example, more technical and financial resources should be entered in the big chapter entitled 'Storage' for storage extending from the village level up to emergency reserves, which must be held in case another disaster occurs. These are just a few specific proposals, some of which — I would repeat — include figures and which would enable a far greater and quicker transfer of resources from the industrial countries to rural development as part of the 0.7 % objective to speed up and intensify the financing of development. In this I fully agree with what Willy Brandt and Mr Vergeer have said. In the past I have encountered far too much pessimism with regard to the possibility of speeding up rural development. No one, in my view, has the right to adopt an attitude of resignation and pessimism in this way before the attempt has been made to provide the necessary funds and resources for the developing countries.

(Applause from the left)

I will not at this stage go into what is actually involved in the rural agricultural development we seek. I would point out that normal food aid is a reasonable solution and should be granted in the long term only if it is linked with such rural development based on food security plans to be established by the developing countries as early as possible.

The important thing is to raise the level of self-sufficiency, and to grant a decreasing proportion of food aid as long as it is needed, and we know that it will be needed for some considerable time. We would even say that for the time being food aid will have to be stepped up.

It is essential that we avoid the mistakes of the past. In other words, food aid must not discourage and hamper self-supply.

Food aid can must be given in a form which accelerates and increases self-supply. It must therefore be granted under food-for-work programmes, the work being performed on rural projects, or the money obtained in the markets of developing countries from the sale of the food we provide — and this how things are usually done — must be invested in specific, planned parts of rural development projects. That is one task.

I realize — and Mr Cheysson was quite right — that this is possible only if we can plan our food aid several years in advance. The committee and, I hope, when it comes to the vote on the resolution, the whole House will endorse the request he has made in this respect.

But the other important task is that the developing countries should not be sent food which differs from what they themselves can grow, conflicts with their traditional diets and therefore runs the risk of becoming part of their daily diet. So we need budgetary funds for red beans and rice and not just for cereals, of which we ourselves have a surplus. This is the second demand which must be given very strong emphasis — triangular trade, as it is known.

It is also far more important now than it has been in the past that we should be able to grant food aid for storage purposes as well. If I refer to the disaster in the Sahel region, I probably need say no more. The resolution mentions this and also the elimination of considerable deficiencies in the Commission, in the transport system and many other aspects. I cannot go into detail on this.

In praise of the Commission, I can say that in the eleven months of work on this subject in committee it began to pull itself together and remove some of these deficiencies and to submit to the Council a number of good proposals, especially on international negotiations on the subject of food.

The position the Commission proposed the Council of the European Communities should adopt in the global negotiations in New York largely anticipated our resolution, and in this regard there was also a very large measure of agreement. The failure was due to procedural questions. Now that this has happened, I can do no more than regret that agreement was not reached on the agenda and the question of procedure and criticize the governments of my own country, the United Kingdom and the USA, for adopting a position which was excessively concerned with preserving the status quo and jeopardized the consensus.

(Applause from the left)

Instead of shutting themselves up in a fortress, the International Monetary Fund, these three countries would have done far better to put forward practical, constructive, forward-looking proposals on how such controversial institutions might be reformed and how cooperation between the UN and special institutions might be improved in the future.

But all is not yet lost. In New York too, the work continues. After this debate we must certainly ensure that our Governments do what we have called on them to do here. It is up to us in many ways. Public opinion must be repeatedly and increasingly mobilized. We must check and ask how far what we have demanded

Focke

here has been translated into reality, and we must also stick by what we have said. I fully agree with what Mr Irmer has just said. It is not simply a question of adopting this resolution now. We shall have to show our true colours tomorrow and the day after — when it comes to decisions on the budget, decisions on the reform of the agricultural policy, the generalized system of preferences, such mundane things as the reduction of the sugar quota and the question of the future form of a European Community code of conduct for the multinational companies. Good work has been done, and I believe we now face the test of showing how far we are able to adopt and maintain a credible, consistent European position.

Ladies and gentlemen, I hope that this resolution will find wide support and that a consistent attitude will be adopted towards the decisions to be taken in the future.

President. — I call Mr Poniatowski on a point of order.

Mr Pontiatowski. — (*F*) Mr President, several times today we have heard speakers refer to the discussions which took place at the United Nations in New York. The fact is that these debates are closely related to the subject we are dealing with today. My suggestion is that tomorrow we take advantage of the presence of both Council and Commission to ask them to tell Parliament, before the meeting of the ACP which is to take place in the next few days, about the work that has been done in New York and its results, and the problems that are likely to arise for the future.

President. — I call Mr Cheysson.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (*F*) Mr President, in the second part of the debate on world hunger — planned for Thursday — the Commission intends to give the Assembly a full report of what it knows about the debates in New York. Obviously there will be no point in that if the Assembly decides to have a separate debate on the subject.

President. — The debate is suspended.

6. Urgent procedure

President. — I have received five motions for resolutions with requests for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure:

- by Mr Bayer de Ryke and others, on protecting the site of Tyre (Doc. 1-380/80);
- by Mr Penders and others, on the persecution of the Baha'is in Iran (Doc. 1-390/80);
- by Mr Lalor and Mr Israël, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, Mr Klepsch, Mr Vergeer, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group) and Mr Scott-Hopkins, Mr Purvis, Mr Prag and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group, on the persecution of members of the Baha'i community in Iran (Doc. 1-397/80);
- by Mr Fanti and others on the coup d'état in Turkey (Doc. 1-392/80);
- by Mr Glinne, on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group) and Mr Bangemann, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on events in Turkey (Doc. 1-396/80).

The reasons supporting the requests for urgency are contained in the documents themselves.

I shall consult the House tomorrow morning on these requests for urgency.

7. Withdrawal of a motion for a resolution

President. — Mr Glinne has informed me that he has withdrawn his motion for a resolution on behalf of the Socialist Group on the political situation in Poland (Doc. 1-379/80).

8. Agenda for next sitting

President. — The next sitting will be held on Wednesday, 17 September with the following agenda:

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

- Decision on urgency
- Dankert report on convergence of the economies of the Member States
- Penders report on human rights in Poland

5.30 p.m. to 7 p.m.: Question Time (questions to the Council Foreign Ministers)

The sitting is closed.

(*The sitting was closed at 7 p.m.*)

SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 17 SEPTEMBER 1980

Contents

1. Approval of minutes: <i>Mrs Bonino; Mr Pannella</i>	110	7. Deadline for tabling amendments	142
2. Documents received	110	Point of order: <i>Mrs De March</i>	142
3. Decision on urgency: <i>Mr Glinne; Mr Klepsch; Mr Bangemann; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Klepsch (EPP); Mr Glinne; Mr Lomas; Mr Arndt; Mr Pranchère; Mrs Le Roux; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mr Frischmann; Mr Bangemann; Mr Dankert; Mr Pannella; Mr Klepsch (EPP); Mr Rogers; Mr Fanti; Mr Bangemann</i>	110	8. Human rights in Poland (continued): <i>Lord Bethell (ED); Mr Ansart (COM); Mr Haagerup (L); Mr Israël (EPD); Mr Capanna; Mr Romualdi; Mr Fergusson; Mr Galluzzi; Mr Bettiza; Miss De Valera; Mr Almirante; Mr Antoniozzi; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Tindemans; Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission; Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council</i>	142
Points of order: <i>Mr Sherlock; Mr Scott-Hopkins</i>	115	9. Situation in Turkey — Motions for resolutions by <i>Mr Fanti and others (Doc. 1-392/80)</i> and by <i>Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch on behalf the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) and Mr Bangemann on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group (Doc. 1-396/80)</i> : Point of order: <i>Mr Spicer</i>	153
4. Welcome	116	<i>Mr Segre; Mrs Gredal (S); Mr Lemmer (EPP); Mr Scott-Hopkins (ED); Mr Frischmann (COM); Mr Beyer de Ryke (L); Mr Israël (EPD); Mrs Bonino; Mrs Dekker; Mr Glinne; Mr Spicer; Mr Martin; Mr Capanna; Mr Romualdi; Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council</i>	153
5. Regulations on structural problems affecting the United Kingdom and setting up a financial mechanism — Report by <i>Mr Dankert on behalf of the Committee on Budgets (Doc. 1-273/80)</i> : <i>Mr Dankert, rapporteur</i>	116	10. Urgent procedure	161
<i>Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Schinzel: draftsmen of opinions</i>	118	11. Question Time (Doc. 1-366/80) (continued): Questions to the Council of the European Communities: Question No 63, by <i>Mr Purvis: Election of the President of the Council of Ministers by universal suffrage</i> : <i>Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council; Mr Purvis; Mr Thorn; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Thorn; Mr Fellermaier; Mr Thorn</i>	161
<i>Mr Fich (S); Mr Notenboom (EPP); Mr J. M. Taylor (ED); Mr De Pasquale; Mr Rossi (L); Mr Ansquer (EPD); Mr Bonde; Mr Gendebien; Mrs Castle</i>	120	Point of order: <i>Mr Spinelli</i>	162
Point of order: <i>Mr Boyes</i>	130		
<i>Mr Konrad Schön (EPP); Mr Howell (ED); Mr Baillot; Mr Paisley; Mr Coppieters; Mr Hume; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Buttafuoco; Mr Lange, Chairman of the Committee on Budgets; Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission; Mr Dankert</i>	130		
6. Human rights in Poland — Report by <i>Mr Penders on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee (Doc. 1-219/80)</i> : <i>Mr Penders, rapporteur</i>	138		
<i>Mr Glinne (S); Mr Blumenfeld (EPP)</i>	139		

Question No 65, by Miss Hooper: Communi- cation of Parliament proposals to the Council: Mr Thorn; Miss Hooper; Mr Thorn; Mr Radoux, Mr Thorn	162	countries, State-trading countries and devel- oping countries: Mr Thorn; Mr Lalor; Mr Thorn	170
Question No 66, by Mrs Scrivener: Meeting of the Council of Environment Ministers: Mr Thorn; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Thorn; Mrs Lizin; Mr Thorn; Mrs Weber; Mr Thorn; Mr Sberlock; Mr Thorn; Mr Michel; Mr Thorn	163	Question No 78, by Miss De Valera: Youth employment: Mr Thorn; Miss De Valera; Mr Thorn; Mr Marshall; Mr Thorn	171
Question No 67, by Mr Sayn-Wittgenstein- Berleburg: Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea: Mr Thorn; Mr Janssen van Raay	165	Question No 81, by Mr Battersby: Future relations between the Community and member States of Comecon: Mr Thorn; Mr Battersby; Mr Thorn	171
Question No 68, by Mr Seligman: Arab tele- communications satellite project (ARAB- SAT): Mr Thorn; Mr Seligman; Mr Thorn	166	Questions to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation: Point of order: Mr Seligman	172
Question No 69, by Mr Seal: Commercial cooperation agreement with India: Mr Thorn; Mr Seal; Mr Thorn	166	Question No 104, by Mrs Ewing: Discrimi- natory wage rates paid to Asian seamen on British ships: Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers; Mrs Ewing; Mr Thorn	172
Question No 70, by Sir Frederick Warner: 1982 UN Assembly on the elderly: Mr Thorn; Sir Frederick Warner	167	Question No 105, by Mr C. Jackson: Situa- tion in Somalia: Mr Thorn; Mr C. Jackson	172
Question No 71, by Sir John Stewart-Clark: The micro-electronics industry: Mr Thorn; Sir John Stewart-Clark; Mr Thorn	167	Question No 106, by Mr Israël: Peace initia- tives in the Middle East and 108, by Mr Newton Dunn: EEC proposals for peace in the Middle East: Mr Thorn; Mr Israël; Mr Thorn; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Thorn; Mr Seligman; Mr Thorn; Mrs Lizin; Mr Thorn	173
Question No 72, by Mrs Le Roux: Boarding of lobster fishing vessels: Mr Thorn	167	Question No 107, by Mr Van Miert: Minis- terial meeting on political cooperation of 3 July in Luxembourg: Mr Thorn; Mr Colla; Mr Thorn	174
Question No 73, by Miss Quin: Principle of additionality with regard to the ERDF: Mr Thorn, Miss Quin; Mr Thorn; Sir Bran- don Rhys-Williams; Mr Thorn; Mr Paisley; Mr Thorn; Mr Adam; Mr Thorn; Mr von der Vring; Mr Thorn	168	Question No 110, by Mr Lomas: Indonesian occupation of East Timor: Mr Thorn; Mr Lomas	174
Question No 74, by Mr Adam: Coal invest- ments of multinational companies: Mr Thorn; Mr Adam; Mr Thorn; Mr Selig- man; Mr Thorn; Mrs Lizin; Mr Thorn	169	Question No 111, by Mrs Lizin: Mr Thorn's visit to the Middle East: Mr Thorn; Mrs Lizin; Mr Thorn	175
Point of order: Mrs Lizin	170	12. Agenda for next sitting	175
Question No 77, by Mr Lalor: Convening of a meeting of EEC, OPEC, industrialized		Annex	177

IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

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

President. — The sitting is open.

1. Approval of minutes

President. — The minutes of proceedings of yester-
day's sitting have been distributed.

Are there any comments?

I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — (I) Mr President, I note that page 6 of the minutes gives details of requests for urgent debate, among which is the request for urgent debate on events in Turkey, tabled by Mr Glinne, Mr Klepsch and Mr Bangemann. But I also note that the document includes a request for urgent debate on a motion for a resolution relating to the Macciocchi case, to which I and, I think, another 30 Members of this Parliament are signatories, and which we tabled yesterday for forwarding to the translation services, at 3 p.m. exactly, i.e. at least two hours before the Glinne, Klepsch and Bangemann motion for a resolution was tabled, since the meeting on Turkey ended at about 6 p.m.

Mr President, I hold that all Members have equal rights, whatever their names! I also know, Mr President, that the Fanti motion was ready and had already been distributed and that subsequently the idea of combining the two documents arose. I do not object to the fact that the motion tabled by Mr Glinne and others was announced yesterday; I simply regret — and protest against — the fact that the motion for urgent debate tabled by us three hours before that of the other Members, among whom Mr Glinne's name appeared first, was not announced.

I repeat, Mr President, that I do not in any way object to the fact that the motion on Turkey was announced. I regret, and protest strongly against, the fact that the request for urgent debate on a motion for a resolution signed by so many Members — whose names are different, but I don't think that is a crime — was not announced yesterday so that it could be voted on this morning.

President. — Mrs Bonino, I have been informed in the meantime that your text is still being translated. The request for urgent debate will be put to the vote tomorrow morning, when all the Members will have had a chance to read this text.

Mr Pannella. — (F) Mr President, we are grateful to you for this information, but allow me to point out that the documents were handed to the translators at 3 p.m. and 6 p.m. respectively. This means, Mr President, that behind the scenes in this Parliament rules are being set up which are becoming more and more annoying. And since we are on the subject of institutional life, I would point out that the document in question bore the signatures of President Rumor, Mr Glinne and others.

President. — I shall see to it that this text is available as soon as possible.

Since there are no further comments, the minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. Documents received

President. — I have received various documents, details of which will be found in the minutes of proceedings.

3. Decision on urgency

President. — The next item is the decision on the urgency of a number of motions for resolutions.

I have the following two motions for resolutions on *the persecution of the Bahais in Iran*:

- by Mr Penders and others (Doc. 1-390/80)
- by Mr Lalor and Mr Israël on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) and Mr Scott-Hopkins on behalf of the European Democratic Group (Doc. 1-397/80).

The motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-372/80/rev.) has been withdrawn.

Since they deal with the same subject, I propose that the House should vote on these two motions together.

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (F) I should like to point out that there is — or at any rate there was yesterday — a consensus on a joint text to which my group was a party, but I see no mention of my group in the document.

President. — That is the motion by Mr Klepsch, Mr Lalor and others.

Mr Glinne. — (F) But there is no reference to the Socialist Group, nor to other groups which agreed. I do not think we have the right version of the final text.

President. — So the Socialist Group also wishes to be a signatory to the motion. That is noted, Mr Glinne.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) I should just like to withdraw the Penders motion for a resolution in favour of the jointly agreed text.

President. — That makes matters even simpler. The Penders motion for a resolution is thus withdrawn and

President

Mr Glinne wants it clearly stated that his group associates itself with the joint motion (Doc. 1-397/80).

I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Mr President, it seems to be a morning of technical hitches. However, to reassure Mr Pannella and Mrs Bonino, so that they do not feel they are the victims of political persecution in this House who deserve to have a request for urgency tabled in their defence, I should like to point out that neither is any mention made of the Liberal Group in the motion for a resolution on the persecution of the Bahais, even though we also helped to draw it up and it has our support. I would ask for the name of our group to be added.

President. — I am pleased to note Mr Bangemann's desire to be associated with the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-397/80).

I call Mr Lalor.

President. — I call Mr Chambeiron.

Mr Chambeiron. — (F) Mr President, I shall not speak about the consensus, because we French members of the Communist and Allies Group are not a party to it. I should like to point out that it looks as if the tradition is becoming established or even strengthened according to which, at every part-session, this Parliament deals with violations of human rights which are being or might be committed somewhere in the world.

This desire to transform Parliament into an institution responsible for handing out praise or blame according to obvious selective criteria leads me to remind you yet again of the position of principle consistently adopted by the French Communists and Allies. We do not consider that this Parliament is competent to set itself up as a tribunal on world affairs. Furthermore we note that mostly, behind the superficially displayed desire to defend human rights, there is hidden a design which is less convenient to admit, namely not to serve the interests of human rights but to use them for the purpose of political manoeuvring on the side. The authors — or at least some of them — of the motion for a resolution on Iran would enjoy greater credibility in our eyes if in the past they had not kept strangely silent over the crimes committed by the former Shah and his regime, although in doing so they were only following the example of the governments of most of the Community countries. Some of the signatories seem to have forgotten the time — albeit still very recent — when they went into noisy raptures over the sumptuous celebrations organized by the former torturer of Teheran, while thousands of political

prisoners were groaning and dying under torture in the SAVAK prisons.

With regard to Chile, may I remind you also that since the assassination of President Allende my friends and I have not ceased to draw public attention to the crimes of Pinochet and his regime and to mobilize democrats to isolate a dictatorship which has plunged the Chilean people into violence and obscurantism. And we shall continue to do so, as we have done for the past seven years, without faltering. We shall keep on condemning all those governments, including our own, which are helping to strengthen the dictatorial and antidemocratic regime in Santiago by supplying it with military equipment.

Once again we must note that this Parliament is being used as a democratic alibi for absolving from their responsibilities governments with whose policies certain groups in this House are in complete agreement in their respective countries. Lastly I would remind you that there are violations of human rights in the Community; at the same time the majority in this House refuses to discuss them and has done everything to prevent a debate on the motion for a resolution tabled by my colleague Mr Marchais . . .

(Protests — Applause from the extreme left)

President. — For the moment you are only supposed to state whether you are for or against urgency. This is not the debate.

Mr Chambeiron. — (F) . . . I am against urgency because we refuse to allow Parliament to arrogate to itself rights which are not granted to it under the Treaty. We shall abstain from the vote on urgency and from any debate which follows it.

President. — I put the request for urgent procedure to the vote.

Urgent procedure is adopted.

The debate will be placed on the agenda of Friday, 19 September.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-378/80) by Mrs Castle and Mr Lomas on behalf of the Socialist Group: Violation of human rights in Chile.*

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) Mr President, I am rather surprised at this motion for a resolution with request for urgent debate, since we were told that it would be revised and completely changed. I cannot agree to urgent procedure for the motion by Mrs Castle and others in its present version, since we do not feel that Parliament should deal in plenary sitting with questions which might suitably be discussed by the Political Affairs Committee. It is not up to us in this House to censure what the British Government states in the House of Commons. I would repeat, Mr President, that we were told that the motion would be completely revised and tabled in a version which would be acceptable to the other groups, but this has not been done. Therefore I cannot agree to urgent procedure.

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (*F*) I should just like to point out that a different version of the motion for a resolution was tabled yesterday. It is more complete in that it takes account of the farce of a referendum which has just been held in Chile and includes a justification which is slightly different from the motion itself. I note that this document has not been distributed. I must also say to Mr Klepsch, who for very valid reasons was absent when this matter was being discussed yesterday, that the colleague who took his place seemed very reserved indeed with regard to the negotiation on the new text, unlike the position adopted on the old one.

President. — I call Mr Lomas.

Mr Lomas. — Could we just establish first, Mr President, whether we are now actually debating this request for urgency? If so, I wish to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

President. — I call Mr Arndt.

Mr Arndt. — (*D*) Mr President, I should like to propose that we do not now vote on urgency but wait until the other motion has been printed and distributed.

President. — I propose that the matter be postponed until tomorrow, when the new text is available. This will give Mr Klepsch the chance to contact Mr Glinne and others.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

*

* *

President. — I have the following two motions for resolutions on *events in Bolivia*:

- by Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch and Mr Blumenfeld on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group), Mr Fergusson on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, and Mr Berkhouwer on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group (Doc. 1-382/80/rev.)
- by Mr Fanti and others on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group (Doc. 1-385/80).

I propose that, since these two motions for resolutions are on the same subject, the requests for urgent procedure be voted on together.

I call Mr Pranchère.

Mr Pranchère. — (*F*) I wish to state that we are in favour of urgent procedure, which is justified because the fascist military junta which is torturing and massacring in Bolivia is still at work. The Bolivian fascists are vying in crime with the bloodthirsty dictatorships of Chile and Salvador, where American imperialism is pulling the strings. With regard to the events in Bolivia, we are outraged at the silence of most of the governments of the nine countries of the Community and at the half-hearted attitude of a few others, who confine themselves to expressions of regret, and we note that the political groups which represent them in this House are silent on the disgraceful behaviour of their governments. What government has announced that it has made firm representations to the sinister military junta demanding an end to the massacres like those of Caracoles and to save the political, trade union or student leaders of whom at least 2 000 are in prison? What government has intervened to save the life of Simon Reyes, Secretary of the Bolivian Workers' Federation and elected representative, who has been horribly tortured and is still in mortal danger? What government? Not those in Paris, London, Bonn or Rome! As for the nine governments of the Community countries, not one has thought for one instant of recognizing the only legal government of Bolivia, that which is led by the elected President and which affirms before the whole world its presence and its authority . . .

President. — Mr Pranchère, keep your remarks on the subject itself for the debate and confine yourself to the question of urgency.

(*Applause*)

Mr Pranchère. — (*F*) . . . Mr President, I am in favour of urgent procedure and shall end by explaining exactly why. We are of the opinion that a clear position must be adopted in defence of democracy and liberty in Bolivia. In short, we wish to uphold our

Pranchère

motion because we do not want deputies like those in France who remain silent and do nothing in Paris to appear here as if they wanted to clear their name in Strasbourg. This is the main reason for our position.

President. — Since no one else wishes to speak, I put the request for urgent procedure to the vote.

Urgent procedure is adopted.

This item will be placed on the agenda of Friday, 19 September.

*
* *
*

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mr Beyer de Ryke and others (Doc. 1-388/80): Protecting the site of Tyre.*

I call Mrs Le Roux.

Mrs Le Roux. — (*F*) Mr President, we are very attached to the heritage of man, but we are also very attached to human beings who are living today. This is why we are very astonished, even perplexed, at this request for urgent procedure. Tyre is inhabited, is it not? And is it not for that reason that it is being bombed? And bombed by whom? By the Israelis. And why are they bombing it? Because thousands of Libyan and Palestinian refugees live there and Israel has decided to clear it out. What is urgent, Mr President, is that Israel should stop its aggression so that in this very region the descendants of those who built the city of Tyre may continue to live and to protect and create a heritage. This is why we are against urgent procedure, Mr President.

President. — I call Mr Beyer de Ryke.

Mr Beyer de Ryke. — (*F*) I would be loath to enter into a debate on the subject at this stage, since the only point at issue is whether urgent procedure should be adopted. The honourable Member of the Communist Group is already starting to debate the matter itself, but a political debate is in my view out of place, since this is not what my motion for a resolution is about. I therefore ask the House to adopt urgent procedure and shall wait to speak on the subject when you call me to do so.

President. — I put the request for urgent procedure to the vote.

Urgent procedure is adopted.

This item will be placed on the agenda of Friday, 19 September.

President. — I have the following two motions for resolutions on Turkey:

- by Mr Fanti and others (Doc. 1-392/80): *Coup d'état in Turkey*
- by Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) and Mr Bangemann on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group (Doc. 1-396/80): *Events in Turkey.*

Since they deal with the same subject, I propose that these two motions for resolutions be voted on together.

I call Mr Frischmann.

Mr Frischmann. — (*F*) Mr President, it had been obvious for a long time that a *coup d'état* was being prepared in Turkey. In this very House we warned . . .

(*Urproar*)

. . . of this possibility. I personally went to Turkey recently as a member of a fact-finding delegation. On my return I was able to make public the dangers which were taking shape in that country.

Yet silence reigned everywhere. The media and the right-wing parties were silent. Nothing succeeded in stirring them. Neither the declaration of martial law in a dozen regions, nor the repeated attacks on the freedom of the democratic and trade union organizations, nor the censure, nor the refusal to allow certain newspapers to be published, nor the mass arrests, nor the obstacles put in the way of lawyers, nor the tortures in the police stations, nor even the thousands of murders whose perpetrators have been left in peace.

But it is all these facts which prepared the way for and encouraged this *coup d'état*. But yesterday's logic of guilty silence has given way today to the strange campaign which involves justifying the *coup*, displaying an astonishingly indulgent attitude to these events and appealing for moderation in our reaction to them. It would be a dishonour for this House to follow those who are not bothering with the usual fuss about human rights, liberties and the right of every nation to conduct its own affairs by democratic means, i.e. those whose sham indignation disappears because NATO — that is, the United States — sanctions this criminal act by stressing Turkey's eminently strategic position.

Frischmann

This is why we propose that Parliament should state clearly its solidarity with the democratic forces struggling against dictatorships and condemn the repressions and violations of human rights which have escalated since the *coup d'état*. We ask the House to state equally clearly that it demands the immediate release of those imprisoned and freedom for the democratic and trade union organizations, the press and the elected institutions, especially the Turkish Parliament. And lastly, we want the European Parliament to demand firmly the immediate suspension of relations between the Community and Turkey for as long as the military junta is in power. Any other attitude would only serve to encourage . . .

(Uproar — Protests from the right)

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, we must observe a minimum of discipline. I defend the right of the minority to speak for three minutes, but you must not keep on interrupting the speakers.

I call Mr Bangemann.

Mr Bangemann. — *(D)* Mr President, since the Member who has just tried to convince us that the Communist Group's motion is urgent did not speak about urgency, he was unable to convince me that his motion is urgent. I therefore request separate votes on these two requests for urgent procedure.

President. — I call Mr Dankert.

Mr Dankert. — *(NL)* Mr President, I thought it was customary in this House to consider 'urgent procedure' as relating to the urgency of the subject and not the content of the resolutions themselves. If we vote on them separately, we risk creating a — to my mind — dangerous precedent.

President. — I did not fully understand whether Mr Bangemann meant that we should only speak on urgency and not on the subject itself.

I call Mr Dankert.

Mr Dankert. — *(NL)* Once or twice problems have arisen — to my mind deservedly — on past occasions when urgent procedure was adopted for one motion and not adopted for another one on the same subject. We have always observed the rule that urgency refers to the actual subject and not the content of the resolution. In my view, since both these motions for resolutions are on the same subject, we cannot vote on them separately.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(F)* Mr President, I am obviously in favour of urgent procedure, and this for a reason which I could not have foreseen two days ago. It seems incredible to me that after three days the European Parliament — pardon me, Assembly, since we must not use the word Parliament here! — has not yet dealt with the problem of Turkey. So urgency is also required for the dignity of this House. We urgently need to take formal note of the fact that in Turkey democracy and the Parliament have been overthrown by the military, which not only violates laws but also tortures people.

Mr President, I want to have an urgent debate, but let us not delude ourselves. We are perfectly well aware that there will be nothing more than a debate, and a debate for the majority.

The Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members will not have a single second to speak on this subject, since it has been allocated only 11 minutes for the debates on Poland, Turkey, the Dankert report and the statements by the President of the Council: 11 minutes for the whole group for the whole day. It is obvious that we shall not be able to speak in this House, but since we have the misfortune to belong to it for the moment, we think that it should deal with this subject urgently.

President. — Ladies and gentlemen, I would even propose that we debate this subject today, since the Council is present.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — *(D)* Mr President, I should like to address a request to Mr Bangemann. I can understand his annoyance, since the gentlemen's agreement we made obviously no longer applies if anyone who tables a request for urgent procedure which he knows will be adopted uses his speaking time to make a political speech on the question of urgency. Then, of course, the gentlemen's agreement to which Mr Dankert referred cannot be upheld. I therefore have every sympathy with the comment by Mr Bangemann. But I should like to ask him to agree to our adopting once more the procedure referred to by Mr Dankert. I should also like to ask the Chairman of the Communist Group, Mr Fanti, to see to it that this gentlemen's agreement is not stretched to breaking point. If all the authors of the motions had wanted to speak on urgency just now, the discussion on urgent procedure alone would have taken an hour. If the agreement that a single vote on urgency should be taken for more than one motion on the same subject is to apply, then such — if I may call them so — slip-ups must be avoided.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

President. — I call Mr Rogers.

Mr Rogers. — Mr President, on Mr Bangemann's suggestion that the two motions be separately voted on: You stated at the beginning that the motions dealt with specific subject-matter. The President did exactly the same thing yesterday with lots of other motions.

The point is, as Mr Dankert and you yourself have already said, Mr President, that what we are discussing is whether Turkey is a matter of urgency. We are not discussing the content of the resolutions. To divide the resolutions and vote on them separately would implicitly be saying that there was more in one resolution than in another and the subject-matter would go by the board. So I think we must vote on them together.

President. — The Bureau has adopted a rule to the effect that various resolutions dealing with the same subject should automatically be grouped. So let us not enter into a legal discussion on the matter.

I call Mr Fanti.

Mr Fanti. — (I) Mr President, I must express serious criticism of the way in which the proceedings are being conducted in this House. There is not a majority and a minority in this House, since all the chairmen of the groups are equal, whatever the size of the group. We must adhere to this principle.

I have asked to speak soon after Mr Bangemann in order to ask him to withdraw his proposal for a separate vote, because this request would give rise in this House to a very dangerous precedent which would force our group to employ all the means available under the Rules of Procedure to see to it that democracy is fully observed. The agreement was that a single vote is to be taken when requests for urgent procedure deal with the same subject. This is the case for the motion for a resolution before us, and I do not see why we should now depart from what has been laid down. I therefore repeat my request to Mr Bangemann most insistently and ask the President to put the matter to the vote.

(Applause from certain quarters on the left)

President. — Mr Fanti, I shall consider what you have said as a point of order invoking the Rules of Procedure. I accept your remarks in this sense.

I call Mr Bangemann on a point of order.

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Mr President, you know that I very rarely raise points of order because I really do not want to hold up the proceedings. But what is at

issue here is a question of fundamental importance for a reasonable debate on urgency, a question which will come up time and time again.

It is true, Mr Fanti, that after an incident in which urgent procedure was adopted for one motion and rejected for another we agreed in the Bureau that as a rule a single vote would be taken in such cases, since in any case in the subsequent debate and decision on the substance it can be decided separately which motion to adopt and which to reject. But this is — as it is so nicely described — a gentlemen's agreement, and I have already spoken in this House, with an eye on your group, about keeping to such agreements. You were very annoyed at the time, but if you as a gentleman consider the speeches by two of the members of your group this morning, you must admit — objectively — that they did not speak on urgency but on the matter in hand. So if we come to a gentlemen's agreement here, everyone must keep to it. This means that . . .

(Applause)

. . . your group must speak on urgency and not on the actual subject. And this is why I have . . .

(Applause — Interruption)

. . . my remarks are not addressed to you personally but to you as chairman of your group . . . What is more, I would say to Mr Klepsch that his suggestion that I was annoyed only shows that he has never seen me in that state. Mr President, I shall not now uphold my request so as not to complicate matters, but I would ask you to point out to the group chairmen in the enlarged Bureau that the gentlemen's agreement we have concluded and which, furthermore, is not provided for in the Rules of Procedure can only be maintained if in this debate on urgency everyone actually does confine his remarks to the question of urgency.

President. — I therefore put the request for urgent procedure to the vote.

Urgent procedure is adopted.

As already announced, this item will be placed on today's agenda after the Penders report on Poland.

I call Mr Sherlock on a point of order.

Mr Sherlock. — Mr President, with regard to the decisions on urgency I wish on a point of order to question the effectiveness of our matutinal session of ineffectual and undignified drivel. Do any of those censured ever reply? If so, may we see those replies, even if they are very discouraging or even just plain rude?

President. — Mr Sherlock, your group is at liberty to ask the Bureau to change the procedure.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins on a point of order.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — May I have an assurance, Sir, that Question Time even though you have added to the agenda, will take place at 5.30 p.m. this afternoon and will not be put back, causing us to lose time. May I have your assurance that we will start Question Time at 5.30 p.m.?

President. — Yes, at 5.30 p.m.

4. Welcome

President. — I have the honour to welcome to the official gallery the Portuguese Secretary of State for European Integration, Mr Rui Almeida Mendès, who is paying his first visit to the European Parliament in Strasbourg.

On behalf of the House, I extend a warm welcome to him and wish him much success in the talks he has during his visit.

(Applause)

5. Regulations on structural problems affecting the United Kingdom and setting up a financial mechanism

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Dankert (Doc. 1-273/80), on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on

the proposals from the Commission to the Council for

- I. a regulation instituting supplementary Community measures to contribute to the solution of the principal structure problems affecting the United Kingdom and hence to the convergence of the economies of the Member States of the Community
- II. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1172/76 of 17 May 1976 setting up a financial mechanism.

I call Mr Dankert.

Mr Dankert, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, it has been claimed before in this House that the EEC is sick, but apart from certain incorrigible anti-marketeters, I have never heard anyone claim that the EEC is incurable, so you can imagine my surprise on hearing that the Commission is now proposing euthanasia as a suitable course of treatment. Of course, no-one would deny that there is such a thing as a British problem, one which goes further than a simple case of 'I want

my money back', one which is centred on the fact of the — on average — lower United Kingdom gross national product together with the high level of unemployment and a disproportionately high British contribution to the Community budget. All this must be seen in the light of what I mentioned earlier and of internal British political problems regarding membership of the Community. These are all things we must bear in mind and for which we must seek solutions. I shall refrain from criticizing the agreement of 30 May, although there is one comment I must make in passing. It seems to me that over the last few years, United Kingdom Government members of the various Councils of Ministers have not exactly done their best to reform the Community budget to ensure that contributions to that budget are rather better balanced. Let me remind you here — with a dash of bitterness — of the attitude adopted by Mr Lawson in the debate on the budget.

However, be that as it may, and disregarding the question of whether we should assume the United Kingdom to be trying to be in the Community and outside it at one and the same time, the central problem is of course whether the agreement of 30 May will harm the Community more than it benefits Mrs Thatcher. My inclination is to reply in the affirmative, and I have a number of reasons for doing so. Firstly, the British agreement has shown that the policy of blackmailing the Community works. I expect that the current financial and economic crisis within the Community will tempt certain Member States to follow the United Kingdom's example and that it will put ideas into the heads of certain applicant States. That is a highly dangerous development for the future of the Community.

Secondly, the British deal amounts to interference with the financial autonomy of the Community and is difficult to reconcile with the recently established principle of financing the Community budget from own resources, something which was achieved only after a great deal of toil and trouble.

Thirdly, the British deal means that the Community will hit the own resources ceiling at least a year earlier than was expected. It is therefore highly likely that the Commission's proposals for reforming the budget will come too late to assist in the necessary process of restructuring the budget, in which case the Commission will be at the mercy of the Council, a Council which, by means of the decision of 30 May, has politically eliminated the United Kingdom from the discussion on budgetary reform. To cut a long story short, we have witnessed a shift in the political balance within the Community, whereby the United Kingdom has effectively been banished to the sidelines.

Fourthly, the British deal means that the United Kingdom, after adopting a special position *vis-à-vis* the European Monetary Scheme, has now done the same with regard to the budget. Finally, the British deal means that the European Parliament has again been

Dankert

left out of the European decision-making process. So much for the Council, which is in itself bad enough. But what is really beyond my comprehension is the fact that the Commission — which an ever-decreasing number of optimists still regard as the guardian of the Treaty of Rome — still thinks it has to use the draft regulations it submits to us as a means of keeping us in the dark as to what is really going on. As regards these draft regulations, I can only protest that the present Commission is jeopardizing European cooperation more than it is furthering it. Let me illustrate this point. It was the Commission which — at the Council's request — introduced the concept of net contributions to the budget. Mr President, this concept cannot be applied to the benefits and drawbacks of EEC membership for the United Kingdom in the same way as, say, the mesh size of fishing nets or sugar production in the EEC. This holds true not only because it is impossible to calculate such a thing as a net contribution, but also because this concept fails to reflect the overall economic and budgetary advantages bestowed on a country by its membership of the EEC. To take the last point first, it must be said that the Netherlands enjoys considerable advantages from the Common Agricultural Policy, but let me also point out that I have used a German car for the last twelve years because the Dutch automobile industry has pulled out as a direct result of the free market within the Community. Agricultural policy does indeed form an integral part of the Community budget, but nowhere does the budget concern itself with my German car or the restructured Daf company.

But even those elements which are reflected in a country's contribution to the budget do not give any firm indication of what a country's net contribution is. Let me give you two examples of what I mean. Because West German farmers receive more for their agricultural produce than their Dutch counterparts, Dutch powdered milk is mainly bought into intervention in Germany and thus appears in the German profit and loss account. By the same token, goods coming into Europe through Dutch and Belgian ports are subject to levies and customs duties for the Community's account, but because these levies are collected by the Netherlands, they appear in the Dutch account. The whole idea of a net contribution is therefore pointless because it is at variance with the concept of a Common Market. The fact that the Commission thought it necessary to introduce such a concept unfortunately says more about the position of the Commission than the state of the Community. The criticism of the concept of a net contribution applies even more to the draft regulations submitted to us by the Commission in connection with the problem of the British net contribution. Instead of simply claiming that a net contribution redress was necessary as a fairly arbitrary basis for giving Mrs Thatcher most of her money back — a political deal we shall have to live with and which I would not criticize as such — the Commission now seeks to place this political deal on a false basis by embroidering the facts with all this twad-

dle about structural problems and economic convergence, with even a new financial mechanism being dragged out as well.

To begin with the regulation setting up a financial mechanism, the Council last week said before the Committee on Budgets that, in the Council's opinion, the system should be operated as proposed by the Commission up to 1983, which would mean removing certain limitations, and that this mechanism should be applied only to the United Kingdom. This convinces me all the more that this solution bears no resemblance to an objective settlement of financial problems facing the less well-off Member States and was adopted solely to provide a part of the British money. However, even with the pressure released from all the brakes, it will only be possible to find part of the required amount, hence the need for the so-called 'supplementary Community measures to contribute to the solution of the principal structural problems affecting the United Kingdom and hence to the convergence of the economies of the Member States of the Community', as the Commission's proposal has it.

The regulation could of course have been entitled 'Repayment of part of the British contribution for which we have found no suitable instrument in the Community's range of policy measures'. At any rate, this draft regulation has nothing whatsoever to do with economic convergence. Repayment of the British contribution will not bring the United Kingdom any closer to the Community. At most we can expect this regulation to ensure that the United Kingdom drifts away from the EEC rather more slowly. As regards the solution of the outstanding structural problems, the Commission's proposals do not contain any watertight guarantee that the money repaid will be used for the specified purpose because the Commission's draft regulation in its present form in no way provides for the necessary element of control at the end of the regional development programmes at a time several years following the checks carried out by the Commission or the Court of Auditors. In other words, no-one can check whether the advances of up to 90 % of the EEC's share of the year's expenditure on a certain programme, paid at the beginning of the year, and the additional 10 % at the end of the year have actually been used for that programme or for some other purpose entirely. It is only at the end of a multiannual programme that a check can be made as to whether the programme has been carried out or not and whether the funds earmarked for that programme have actually been used for that purpose. I am grateful to the Court of Auditors for pointing out this fact and for presenting an opinion — which was rejected by the Commission — calling for the incorporation of the necessary guarantees. I am extremely disappointed that this kind of critical opinion from the Court of Auditors should not be passed on to us by the Commission if the Commission chooses to ignore it. It is right that a watchdog body like this Parliament should only be able to get the information it needs to

Dankert

enable it to do its work by underhand means. That is just by the by. My main point is that there are insufficient guarantees to convince us that the supplementary Community measures will genuinely contribute to the solution of what are indeed serious structural problems affecting the United Kingdom. In other words, we seriously doubt whether these measures bear any resemblance to the kind of regional policy we should be pursuing. Moreover, how can a structural policy as part of a regional policy be reconciled with compulsory expenditure? Fortunately, Mr Tugendhat said last week before the Committee on Budgets that the Commission took the view that the Advisory Committee on Regional Policy should be brought in on this issue. The Commission's willingness to bring in the *ad hoc* committee proposed by us indicates that the Commission will not insist on the supplementary measures being of an explicitly regional policy nature and should not be confused with such measures.

Mr President, with one eye on the clock, I should like to draw a number of conclusions. The Committee on Budgets rejects the substance of the Commission's draft regulations regarding the United Kingdom's contribution to the budget. This is clear from the proposals we have put forward. We can do nothing — and do not wish to do anything — to nullify the financial content of the agreement of 30 May, in which case there is no point in simply expressing a contrary opinion on the proposals. We would then have gone as far as we can in our advisory function in this matter. We therefore propose that you urge the Commission to accept our amendments to the draft regulation and put our case to the Council. If the Council accepts our amendments, we can rightly say that we have done our best to steer a clearing-house operation in the direction of a structural policy. But this must mean structural policy in the sense of non-compulsory expenditure. If the Commission refuses to champion our amendments or if the Council refuses to accept them, we can still institute a conciliation procedure, which is open to us in all cases in which the point at issue is a Council decision with significant financial consequences. In view of the fact that the Council itself has so far failed to solve the problem of the content of regulations resulting from the decisions taken on 30 May — indeed, I understand that the Council is having to contend with considerable internal problems with regard both to the amounts agreed on with the United Kingdom and the substantive nature of the policy to be pursued — I trust that a time-consuming conciliation procedure will not be necessary.

That does not mean to say that I am any less gloomy as regards the consequences the agreement of 30 May will have for the Community, because the fact remains that this agreement conflicts with the principle of the Community's financial autonomy, exacerbates the problem of own-resources, places the United Kingdom in a special position vis-à-vis the other Member States and sets a precedent which may very soon be followed

in other Member States. The agreement runs counter to the aim of economic convergence, and may set a precedent for other sectors of Community policy, especially in the discussion which is just beginning on restructuring. Moreover, it has — despite denials — introduced the principle of *juste retour* into the Community budget. The West German cabinet is now considering a ceiling which would be at variance with the principle of the unity of the market. As a result of this agreement, the necessary structural reform of the budget has been rendered more difficult, the European Parliament has been banished to the sidelines and the Commission has, in my opinion, allowed itself to be manoeuvred by these draft regulations into a position which ill becomes it.

(Applause from certain quarters on the left)

President. — I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman to speak on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning.

Mrs Kellett-Bowmann, draftsman of an opinion. — Mr President, my Committee welcomes these proposals as a realistic attempt to solve the problems of one of the Member States within the framework of Community policy, and I was dismayed to hear the remarks made by Mr Dankert just now, although I had heard part of them in the Committee on Budgets earlier last week.

My Committee feels very strongly that these proposals do not constitute a long-term solution either to the problems of the United Kingdom — and in that we do agree with Mr Dankert — or to those of the Community, and therefore we in my Committee await with the greatest of interest the Commission's proposals for structural change which they have been asked to present by June 1981. My Committee does not share Mr Dankert's view that the proposals now put forward by the Commission in any way imperil those that will be put forward next year: we regard these proposals more as what we would call a holding operation.

My Committee appreciates that these supplementary measures are aimed at the fulfilment of programmes, and this is so vitally important that we must fix our mind on that particular point. They are fixed on programmes rather than on isolated projects, and we attach particular importance to the Commission's insistence that these supplementary measures must — I repeat, must — fit in with existing Community policies, especially with regional policy, and be directed to the regions with the greatest structural imbalances. That is why I found some of Mr Dankert's remarks so puzzling. He appeared to think that these proposals were not really aimed at those parts of the United Kingdom which are in the worst structural balance and most in need of bringing into convergence with the rest of the Community.

For many years, the Regional Policy Committee has stressed the need for the close coordination of all

Kellett-Bowman

Community instruments if economic convergence is to be achieved. They do not, therefore, wish to see the creation of any new legal frameworks such as are contained in the proposal for a regulation, Doc COM (80) 333, except in a quite specific short-term situation such as this is. The proliferation of funds and instruments cannot, in general, lead to that greater coherence in Community policy at which we must all aim, and on this point, at least, we would agree with Mr Dankert.

My Committee is in full agreement with the aim and range of the projects covered: the renewal of urban areas by the improvement of economic infrastructure, with especial emphasis on those things which my Committee have always sought — transport and communications, energy transmission, water, sewage, advance factories, the servicing of industrial sites, and so forth — and investments to improve the exploitation of coal resources at a time when the Community is so short of energy. Surely it can only be in the interests of the whole Community that the money thus provided should be used in these particular ways — ways in which this Parliament and this Chamber have long sought that money should be spent.

My Committee also feels, as it has always felt, in respect of the Regional Fund itself that this money should be clearly seen to represent additional expenditure in the regions concerned; but they are satisfied, unlike Mr Dankert, that this can be achieved by the Commission's proposals, in particular by Article 7 (1), whereby the UK must make available to the Commission all information required and accept supervision and on-the-spot checks — unlike one Member State, which is very keen on avoiding on-the-spot checks — because I believe, and my Committee believes, that these on-the-spot checks are perfectly proper where public money is being spent. The Commission also has the power to suspend payments if they are not satisfied with the way that programmes are carried out. Now surely this is a reasonable tool for the Commission to expect to have and a reasonable tool for this Parliament to wish it to have and under paragraph 4 of Article 1 of the financial mechanism they do not make the final payment until they are so satisfied and all the evidence is in their hands.

All in all, although it would be perfectly true to say that my Committee regrets that the need arose for such measures, the measures put forward by the Commission are fully in accord with the principles of regional policy for which our committee has always stood and they therefore give them their support.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

President. — I call Mr Schinzel to speak on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs.

Mr Schinzel, draftsman of an opinion. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, speaking on behalf of

the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, I should like to begin by informing Mrs Kellett-Bowman that I cannot go along with her views when it comes to the vote. I can, however, add my voice to the essential points made by Mr Dankert on behalf of the Committee on Budgets.

The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs welcomes the fact that agreement has been reached between the Member States, thereby defusing a situation which seriously threatened the cohesion of the Community. When one reads the title of the Commission's proposal, aiming to 'contribute to the solution of the principle structural problems affecting the United Kingdom and hence to the convergence of the economies of the Member States of the Community', one may be forgiven for hoping that the Community is really setting out to tackle one of its most important political aims, namely the elimination of the regional disparity within the European Community by means of an active and forward-looking structural policy. But if we have a good look at the proposal itself, the title turns out to be a mere facade which has nothing whatsoever to do with structural policy in the United Kingdom or with economic convergence in the Community as a whole. What the proposal is concerned with is nothing more than a pure financial transfer. The fact is that neither the corresponding programmes exist, nor are there any criteria whatsoever for such programmes or mechanisms for implementing such criteria or any way for Parliament to create such mechanisms.

This, as far as the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs is concerned, is the essential point. We are against issuing *carte blanche* to any Member State on the grounds that, although such a step may avert a short-term danger to the Community, it will in the medium and long term serve to weaken the Community and place limitations on the political means whereby this House can earmark more resources for a policy of greater convergence and a reduction of unemployment in the Community.

Let me be brief then and simply point out that this project will set a dangerous precedent and will be a retrograde step in the development of the Community, and I have in mind here not only those countries which will shortly be joining the Community, but also those Member States which are currently facing serious economic difficulties, such as Belgium and Italy. I wonder what our reaction will be if these countries come along with an unjustifiable demand like the United Kingdom government.

Secondly, the measures proposed by the Commission and the Council will lead to a system of *juste retour* and thus — and this is not a new point I am making now — to the capitulation of all of us who want to see a common European policy for workers and employees implemented at long last in important sectors such as industrial, energy and structural policy. We shall thus be throwing in the towel before we have even

Schinzel

made any serious attempt to tackle this kind of policy, which is of the utmost importance for the future of the Community.

Finally — to end on a personal note — we are handing over this money to a government which is producing growing unemployment as a means of remedying its economic problems. Given the level of unemployment throughout the Community, that is quite a staggering achievement.

The Council claims that the proposed measures will remain in force for only two years, but no-one is prepared to say how we propose to make a soft landing and introduce a sensible system to the budget in two years' time. In other words, there are no serious documents which could persuade us to vote for the proposals. That being so, we support all the supplementary checking measures proposed by the Committee on Budgets to ensure that the funds will be allocated at least roughly to those areas which the European Parliament — politically at least — thinks desirable.

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

Mr Fich. — (DK) Mr President, the Socialist Group was never very much impressed by the decision reached by the Council on 30 May. In fact we were amazed that it was regarded as a solution. There had indeed been many problems during the spring and everyone here knows how anxious they were, how the possibility of the Community being crippled or even falling apart loomed so large. However, it was, in our view, quite a leap from this situation to calling the decision reached on 30 May a solution. As we saw it and continue to see it, all this decision in effect meant was that the problem could be put off for a while. We are still convinced that this is the way things stand. We are convinced that no solutions were in fact found on 30 May but that the problem was simply put off. Why should this be? The obvious explanation is that the entire debate at that time was based on a fundamentally wrong approach. The trouble with the approach was that people did not understand the own-resources system and accepted what Mrs Thatcher said to the effect that customs revenue was money belonging to a particular country which was subsequently transferred to the Community. Nobody questioned the fact that this was called a British contribution — in spite of the fact that it had been explained time and time again for the benefit of the Council and everyone else that the system just does not in fact work that way and in spite of the fact that it had been explained that if goods were imported into the Community through a different country, e.g. France or Denmark, this situation would never have arisen and in spite of the fact that this was demonstrably merely something which happened on paper but had nothing to do with the real economic transactions.

At the same time it was accepted — this was another aspect of the wrong approach — that the Community budget reflected the benefits or drawbacks arising from Community membership for a particular country. If this idea was accepted, it was obvious that, for example, the Federal Republic had made the largest contribution. But as we all know, the Federal Republic has profited enormously from the Community for the simple and obvious reason that only a very small proportion of the economic transactions between the Member States have anything whatsoever to do with the Community budget. For this reason, the entire problem of a net contribution had been misunderstood, and since the solution was based on this misunderstanding, the solution itself was obviously also mistaken.

Thus we now have a provisional solution which is to apply for two or three years. Let us hope that it is very provisional, since if this principle manages to take a hold, we will, as Mr Schinzel rightly pointed out, come up against the problem of *juste retour*. If it means that limits will be set for payments which a country can receive from or pay into the Community budget, this will provide a direct route to protectionism in Europe and there can be hardly anybody who wants this to happen as we know from experience what this can mean.

In our view, the financial arguments underlying the Council's decision were mistaken. We realize, of course, that there were certain political facts which had to be taken into account and forced the Council's hand in this situation. Basically, we can fully understand these political considerations, but we do not think these arguments should have been used.

A further consequence of this is that our Group does not intend to reject the Council's decision of 30 May. We will not reject the postponement of the problem agreed at that time. In fact, we are somewhat surprised that other groups want to try and get something of this kind rejected. I strongly suspect that the French Communists or the Danish Peoples Movement against the European Community want to try and bring about a rejection of this measure designed to return certain amounts to the United Kingdom — which is somewhat surprising as these groups do not normally take the view that Parliament should be able to overrule Council decisions. However, they appear now to have adopted a different attitude to this question. We, on the other hand, will accept the Council's decision for a limited period, but with the following four clear reservations.

Firstly, we should like to stress most emphatically that this has nothing to do with convergence. This is purely and simply a financial transfer which does not even contribute very much to structural development. The question is whether or not this is simply a matter of reducing British foreign credit. I have heard at any rate that this is the view that Mrs Thatcher takes on it.

Fich

Why is this not a solution to the convergence problem? The reason is quite simple, namely that the agricultural policy occupies such a dominant position in Community policy as a whole and as long as it continues to do so, there will never be an automatic channelling of funds from the Community back to the United Kingdom. I should thus like to stress the wish of the Socialist Group for a reduction in agricultural expenditure so that the funds can in future be distributed in a more rational manner.

Our second major reservation is that this decision is unclear. As Mr Dankert himself states very clearly in his report, not many people in fact know exactly what was decided. What did the Council in fact decide? Did it decide what the United Kingdom's net contribution should be? Or did it decide what the Community should pay back to the United Kingdom? What were we supposed to do if the estimates proved to be incorrect? All these questions remain to a certain extent unanswered, and it in fact strikes us that the Council has made very bad decisions in this field.

Thirdly, our Group insists that this should be classified as non-compulsory expenditure. We cannot simply make out a blank cheque to a government and say, 'here you are, you can use this money for whatever purpose you like — tax reductions or anything you feel like'. This is not something we can go along with.

The funds which are to be returned to the United Kingdom come from the Community coffers and should therefore be subject to the maximum possible control by the Community, i.e. those who contribute to these funds. We therefore insist that this should be non-compulsory expenditure, which means that we agree with the Labour members who feel that this money should be used in the fight against unemployment which is so obviously called for in the United Kingdom. This will only be possible if it is classified as non-compulsory expenditure. It is essential in this context that we must insist on control of the way the money is used. This is not simply a question of reporting, it is also a question of how the payments are made, i.e. what system of control is applied. Mr Dankert also stressed the need for this in his report.

My fourth and final point is that this must not be allowed to set a precedent. We have already heard rumours to the effect that other countries might feel inclined to introduce similar arrangements and, as has been pointed out, the countries in question are not only applicant countries, but also existing Member States. We cannot accept this, as it would be tantamount to planting a bomb under the entire financial mechanism. If this is what people want, they should come straight out with it and say so. However, if they wish to maintain the existing financial system, this must not be allowed to set a precedent.

I should like to conclude by saying that, in our view, this is a very shoddy piece of work on the part of the

Council. As we see it, the Council has postponed the problems but, in the current situation, we do not see any possibility of changing the Council's decision of 30 May. We will, therefore, try to improve on it. This, we think, can only be done by supporting the Dankert report together with a proposed amendment regarding the combating of unemployment.

(Scattered applause from the left)

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

Mr Notenboom. — *(NL)* Mr President, on behalf of my Group, I shall refrain from using the kind of language used just now by the rapporteur, Mr Dankert, to underline his outstanding report, which incidentally we support. We shall be voting for the motion for a resolution, but I feel that we should be well advised to refrain from using extreme language to express our concern and irritation. The position adopted by my group is independent of the question of which government is in power in the United Kingdom. I very much approve of the views advanced by Mr Schinzel on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, but in his speech he referred at one point to a certain government. I do not think it wise for this House — and certainly not the committees — to pass judgement on the internal politics of this or that Member State. That, after all, is what national Parliaments are for. Our views, which are entirely in line with those espoused by Mr Schinzel, were arrived at regardless of the question of which government is in power in the United Kingdom. I just wanted to make that point, Mr President, to avoid any misunderstandings.

I shall try to stick to the facts and adopt as unemotional a tone as possible. I find it difficult to express the feelings and views of my group on this report. As I said before, we support the Dankert Report and we shall be voting for the motion for a resolution.

When the financial mechanism was introduced in 1975, the old nominated European Parliament merely took note of the development. However, the silence which greeted its introduction concealed a wide range of sentiments. Actually, Mr Dankert is doing precisely the same thing by saying neither yes or no. What he is very rightly trying to do is to have changes made to various articles.

On the previous occasion, we were presented with a *fait accompli*, and the same holds true more or less this time. The motion for a resolution does not express our approval, but does set out objections and requests for amendments to be made. This we believe to be as it should be, and the text of the resolution points out the grave danger inherent in the way in which the present compromise was brought about in the Council, a compromise designed to redress certain complaints,

Notenboom

which were to some extent justified. The compromise does not solve the structural problem, but merely offers a certain temporary consolation. But at what price?

The high price which has been paid is that the system of financing the Community by own-resources — achieved after so much toil and trouble — can now be tampered with. And what is the significance of that? Not everyone — and certainly not the public at large — realizes that the money for the European Community budget comes not from government coffers, but straight from customs levies, agricultural levies and a proportion of VAT revenue. These funds are not provided by the Member States' governments, and it is simply wrong for them to be presented as originating from government budgets.

The money that comes directly to the Community is a proportion of the taxation paid by the taxpayer. If this principle is tampered with, we shall at the same time be tampering with the principle of the Community's financial autonomy, and thus with the powers of the European Parliament. That is the grave danger the rapporteur rightly pointed out and which I have briefly underlined. A number of speakers have already commented on the danger of setting a precedent. The same point is rightly made in the report. We must be on our guard against setting a precedent for new and existing Member States. After all, why should one be denied what has been granted to another?

It is also a fact that this large amount of money will act as a brake on the preliminary draft budget for 1981, a very powerful brake which will probably result in the own-resources ceiling already being exceeded in 1981. The repercussions of all this will become clear to us over the coming months when the rapporteur, Mr Adonino, begins his work in this House on the 1981 budget, and we shall get a foretaste of what we can expect next week when the Council meets to settle the draft budget for 1981. And then there is also a danger of other ceilings for such things as incomes, receipts from and payments into the Community kitty, whereby the status of the budget within the Economic Community is seen totally out of perspective, because the benefits and drawbacks of membership of the Community are reflected only to a minor extent in the budget, as we have heard so often in this House.

In the opinion of my Group, the great danger here is that if large sums of money are committed in this way, it will take years to break down the resistance on the part of certain governments to the essential increase in the ceiling for own-resources. Those governments are really in favour of raising the ceiling, but only for very specific pro-Europeans aims. There are therefore a fair number of drawbacks to this system, major drawbacks which are rightly reflected in Mr Dankert's motion for a resolution.

I should just like to comment on a specific point in paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution. Speed is of

the essence in the process of examination and submission by the Commission of proposals designed to improve the structure of the budget to create a better balance. This is a highly important matter, and the Council expects the work to be completed by 1 July next year. That being so, the Commission must stop claiming that it is not its job, as it did last week to the amazement of all of us in the Committee on Budgets. Of course, the present Commission will no longer be in office in July 1981, but it should do the necessary preparatory work. If the new Commission, whose members will first of all have to get to know each other, has to start from scratch in January, it cannot possibly complete its work by 1 July 1981, which is late enough as it is. It therefore follows that the present Commission must do the preparatory work, and I hope that this debate will help to convince the Members of the Commission that this is indeed their job.

Mr President, I can go along with the report and the motion for a resolution tabled by the rapporteur. There can be no doubt that the major drawbacks of this compromise outweigh the advantages. I should like to point out that I have great respect for the work done by the Commission's officials who have shown a great deal of inventiveness in trying to reconcile this compromise as well as possible with the established views on regional policy in Europe. The cynical comments which have to be made on this compromise in no way detract from our respect for the work which has been put in. I hope that this will bear fruit in the form of the convergence of the Member States' economies.

Finally, I should like to comment briefly on an amendment. The first paragraph of the motion for a resolution refers to surpluses. To avoid any misunderstanding my Group would like to see this changed to 'structural surpluses'. I think the rapporteur will go along with this suggestion, but others may disagree. Agricultural surpluses are a perfectly normal phenomenon, as are occasional shortfalls, but that is not the point at issue here. What we want to see are structural measures aimed at the kind of policies which, year in year out, produce permanent major surpluses. We hope this amendment to paragraph 1 will be adopted.

(Applause from the centre)

President. — I call Mr Taylor to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr. J. M. Taylor. — Mr President, it is not often that I speak either in the Committee on Budgets or in this Chamber at odds and in disagreement with Mr Dankert. But I feel that today, and in his paper, he is wrong in his opening appraisal; he is wrong in his treatment and in the way he introduced the financial mechanism and the supplementary measures and the proposed regulations to deal with them.

Taylor

He devoted some of his opening remarks to problems in the United Kingdom and problems in Europe — problems that are very serious — problems of unemployment and regional imbalance, problems often expressed in the global word convergence. The tone of his comments, like the tone of much of his paper, is that these monies we are now considering are in some way intended exclusively and directly for those purposes in the United Kingdom.

Well, I hope they can in fact find their way to application to help with those problems in the United Kingdom.

But — and this is the important point, a point he has missed — these monies we are talking about now are simply being paid to the United Kingdom because the United Kingdom was paying far too much.

There has crept into Mr Dankert's document — but I hope not into his personal attitude — a certain meanness of approach that one did not discern before. Whether this is some post-rapporteurship reaction I am not sure, but the meanness of tone is certainly there. And also, if I may so, a certain emotiveness of language — although this may have something to do with the translation of his report. I heard him say — certainly in English — that it showed that blackmail could pay, the May agreement demonstrated that blackmail in the Community paid.

Now, you know, this will not do, Mr President. If any other country in the Community is paying in three times more than it is taking out, which was the UK position — 1 1/2 billion in and a half billion out — then clearly something is wrong. If it was Mr Dankert's country that was in that position I would want his country to have some money back as well.

I would want his country to have redress because the Treaty says it should. I have got the words of 1976: ... 'concern any country that is obliged to bear a disproportionate burden in financing the Community budget'. The way our structures work at the moment, the industrial and agricultural balance of the different countries, and the way we raise our revenues have resulted in the United Kingdom's paying considerably too much, and now this redress returns money to the United Kingdom, at it should, and as I would wish to see it do so were another country in the same set of circumstances.

Emotive language! He talks about camouflage, Mr President; camouflage indeed in the Commission's proposals. Well, the Commission's proposals are available. We can read them. They have been published, and for that matter the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning seems to be able to understand them. Mrs Kellett-Bowman did not say that they were camouflaged. She said that her Committee was reasonably content. I think she said that she was content. Mr Dankert himself, following through presumably on his presumption of camouflage, decided to write to the Commission expressing his anxieties. What did the

Commission do, Mr President? The Commission replied in writing. The document has been published. It is PE 67.020. These are patent, obvious, clear, transparent answers to Mr Dankert's anxieties. So much for camouflage!

Net contribution: he suggested that this was some kind of intractable mystery which he personally could not fathom. Not at all. Mr President, the question of the British redress is not a marginal quibble about *juste retour*. We are talking, as I said before, of a country that is paying in three times more than it takes out. That is not a marginal matter of *juste retour*. That is the very set of circumstances which the Treaty and the Acts of the Council from time to time have regarded as unfair and in need of treatment.

Mr President, Mr Dankert said that the Commission document offered inadequate guarantees. In those remarks he also missed the point, I regret to say. He seemed to be treating the financial mechanism and the supplementary measures as though they were an extension of the Regional Fund. Mr President, they are not. He told us that the committee for which he was speaking, the Committee on Budgets — which incidentally was not unanimous on this matter — rejects the Commission's proposals. My Group, Mr President, does not. He says that he asks that there be progress now towards conciliation. I say that this is a waste of time; it is not needed. The amounts are agreed, and programmes are being put forward by the recipient government and the matter should frankly be dispatched.

Mr Schinzel suggested to us that the Commission's proposals represented, in the English translation, 'a capitulation'. He also said that the measures were intended to run for a maximum of two years. Mr President, I can only take these observations as being in some way related to the fact that he was not present in the Committee at the relevant times and that his Committee was somewhat pressed for time. The report states, and I quote, 'in view of time constraints and the absence of the draftsman' — I believe that this is the Member in question — 'the committee voted to adopt some sections of a previous document as the basis for its opinion'. I do not find that very weighty or persuasive, nor indeed do I regard the Member's contribution as one that should be particularly persuasive in this debate.

Mr President, I speak as one who, in my own country, has been as keen as any to support regional arguments as against national centralism. I speak as one who was elected to this place because I believe in the European Community, I believe in the advancement of the Community and its concept of regional policy, and I believe in the role of the Parliament. On this occasion, Mr President, I think we must look at the realities. The Council has taken a decision to redress the balance in favour of one Member State. The financial consequences are obligatory. The financial mechanism

Taylor

is obligatory and the supplementary additional monies must be seen in the same light. What we have here, Mr President, is the Parliament understandably being zealous. Parliament is keen to take an interest in the destination of these monies. That is understandable. But I am not quite sure that it is justified, because it is not the Regional Fund, although the document from the Commission allows that there should be regular appraisals of progress. I think there should be. I think they should also be communicated to this Parliament for its comments.

Mr President, let me conclude my remarks in this way: my colleagues and I believe in the attempt to achieve convergence. But convergence is far more than what we are talking about here today. Convergence is urgent. It is important and it is much bigger than the topic we are now debating. What we are now debating is merely a short-term palliative. It is merely a three-year redress for one country that pays too much because of the way in which we raise our revenue, and because there is an urgent need to overhaul the way we raise our revenue and get a better balanced and more logical and sensible system. Until we have a better balance and a more logical and sensible system one country is paying too much by a factor of 3 to 1, so it will get some of its money back. What is wrong with that? That is not the real problem, it is short-term correction and the important thing is to despatch this, get it out of the way. Give the United Kingdom its money. Don't mess about. Get on the real issue which is the economic convergence of the European Community.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

President. — The President-in-Office of the Council, who has been in conference with the Political Affairs Committee since this morning, has just joined us. On your behalf, extend a very warm welcome to Mr Thorn.

(Applause)

I call Mr De Pasquale to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

Mr De Pasquale. — (I) Mr President, I think the solution found to the problem of the British contribution mirrors the crisis in the Community. It entirely reflects the inadequacy of the present Community structures in the face of any problem of internal balance or convergence — so much so that, in this case, in order to cobble together a precarious, temporary solution it was necessary to modify both the financial mechanism and the Regional Fund procedures.

The agreement reached in May has solved nothing. Everything has been postponed, and this postponement was not accompanied by any useful suggestion

on how to overcome the present difficulties in the course of time. Indeed, the imbalance in the British contribution to the Community budget is a real and serious problem which nobody in this Parliament has ever underestimated, and therefore the request for its correction, being entirely legitimate, had to be met. But in what way? The right way was indicated by this Parliament on various occasions and even through spectacular action. It was a question of placing the imbalance in the British contribution in the wider context of budgetary reform, of correcting the agricultural price system, of increasing resources and creating new common policies. It was a question of regarding the British problem not as a difficulty to be patched up, but as an opportunity to tackle the most urgent questions of integration and convergence. This was and is the right road not only for Great Britain but also for all the European countries to take, but governments have not even taken a timid step along it. Instead of providing a strong political solution for a financial problem, they have confined themselves to providing a weak financial solution to a political problem.

I think one can say that the compromise reached arose from the intersection of two negative approaches — on the one hand, that of the British Conservative Government, rooted in a purely quantitative concept of its relationship with the Community, one of gains and losses — consistent moreover with the whole of its economic and monetary policy, which denies any need for planning; and on the other hand, the approach of the other European governments, concerned to avoid introducing any new elements into the present tottering Community edifice, so as not to oppose the very strong protectionist tendencies in the national economies.

For these reasons the view taken by the Italian Communists can only be extremely critical, and for the same reasons we shall vote in favour of the motion for a resolution, since it confirms this view, confines itself to taking note of a *fait accompli* and proposes changes which are in line with our thinking.

There is no time to examine the substance, and therefore I shall make three brief observations. Firstly, in this matter, once again, the powers of the institutions have not been respected in practice. The Council has done everything and the Commission has been relegated to the role of a technical annex whose sole task is to clothe the decision in Community garments, while Parliament has been ignored on an essential budgetary question. Secondly, the procedures contained in the Regulation instituting supplementary measures show that, when one wants to act with a modicum of speed and effectiveness in monitoring regional programmes, the present structure of the Regional Fund is of little or no use. It must therefore be reformed within the deadline envisaged, in the interest of all the weaker areas of the Community, not

De Pasquale

only those in Great Britain. Thirdly, it is not certain that the change in the financial mechanism is valid only for Great Britain and only for the next few years. The development of the crisis can have unforeseeable effects on the budgets of the Member States, and for that reason it is essential quickly to bring about a reform which would rule out the very idea of Community refunds directly related to the budget of an individual Member State, since the alternative would be the disintegration of the Community.

Mr President, the Council has committed itself, in its usual ponderous way, to solving these problems by 1982 through structural reforms. While we are not questioning anyone's good faith, this postponement seems an obvious sign of uncertainty and confusion bordering on ill will. We hope that Parliament and the European democratic forces will not passively await events and deadlines, but will do everything they can in this decisive year to help bring about true integration. We Italian Communists, for our part, will do our best towards that end.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

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

Mr Rossi. — *(F)* Mr President, I should first of all like to stress that it is not our job, as Members of the European Parliament, to discuss in this debate the merits of the agreement reached on 30 May last, but what we must do is to pass judgement on the Commission's proposals for regulations to implement the measures decided in May, first by the Heads of State or Government, and then by the Council of Ministers.

I shall therefore restrict my remarks to this aspect of the question and consider the two main problems it raises, that is the financial mechanism and the supplementary measures for the United Kingdom.

On the first point, I share Mr Dankert's point of view entirely, and I must take this opportunity to tell him how much I appreciated the good judgement and high quality his whole report displays. For my Group, it is quite clear that the provisions of the 1976 settlement — and I think this should be pointed out — are in no way altered, but that certain arrangements are being allowed which apply only to the United Kingdom. These arrangements consist of suspending — and not abolishing — the graduated system used to define the amounts to be repaid, and in the same way I would remind this House that the clauses concerning the balance of payments and the ceiling for contributions have been suspended and not abolished. I should like to point out to Parliament that the suspending clauses have only been firmly decided upon for two years, and that if one looks beyond 1980, from 1982 onwards the

mechanism of the 1976 settlement will again come into force. Any extension of the decision of 30 May last to cover a further year requires the unanimous approval of all governments.

Naturally, we approve point 8 in Mr Dankert's motion for a resolution which, resulting from the Court of Auditors suggestions, requests that, should estimates for this item be revised, the institutions be authorized to recover payments made.

I now come to the supplementary measures which, I must remind you, are not a second and separate part of the agreement but an integral part of the whole settlement reached on 30 May, since that settlement was comprehensive in nature and included measures to aid the United Kingdom, the fisheries problem and the sheep-meat problem. Once again I agree with the terms of Mr Dankert's motion for a resolution, and I am particularly obliged to him for having had the parliamentary reflex which requires any elected assembly to interest itself in the control side of an agreement, and this interest is made very clear in the amendment to Article 7 which we approved.

What now remains to be considered are the terms of the approval of the special infrastructure programme. On this subject, the Commission explicitly referred to the methods used by the European Development Fund to define qualifying categories and the zones they concern.

I personally am much more in line with the rapporteur's opinion, when he states in point 12 of his motion for a resolution — and I quote:

the Commission's proposal can in no way be considered as falling within the framework of Community regional policy.

The conclusion that I draw from the above, ladies and gentlemen, is that the supplementary measures scheduled to be granted to the United Kingdom are quite specific in nature and may in no way be considered as part of regional policy. To support this view, I should like to reiterate that all the measures we are faced with here are quite exceptional and that, as a result, an approach must be found which corresponds to their exceptional nature, and we should not necessarily seek to apply mechanisms which already exist in the Community. This is why we feel that the regulation should merely define some simple criteria aimed at guaranteeing that the supplementary measures are fully in line with Community interests. Let me give at random, as examples of possible criteria, that these measures be compatible with Community policies, that they be sectoral in nature, that they lead to a varied development of infrastructures and naturally that they have no effect whatsoever on competition. It was with these notions in mind that I approved in committee — and that we shall presently approve — Mr Dankert's amendment suggesting the setting up of an *ad hoc*

Rossi

consultative committee representing the Member States, to deliver an opinion before the Commission actually decides on each programme. Personally, I do not see how this opinion could be purely formal or consultative.

These, Mr President, are the views I wished to express — I hope in clear and succinct terms — on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

I should just like to conclude by making two very brief remarks. Firstly I should like to restate that the settlement of 30 May last is quite exceptional in nature and may not be applied to other Member States for the sake of convergence. I should also like to point out — and I am sure we will have the chance to discuss this point more fully in our debate on the budget — that these measures are now a very important element in the Community's budgetary activities, since they will represent a burden of 1 600 million units of account in a budget which this year will total between 16 and 17 thousand million, and as a result they are likely to hamper — or even cripple — some common policies which are already operating or common policies which are being drawn up. All of this leads us naturally enough to consider the question of own-resources, which I hope will also be the subject of a later debate.

This is the conclusion I should like to draw from all this: when I consider how financial considerations hem us in more and more, I wonder, Mr President, if there has not been a shift in budgetary planning which has escaped our notice. Let explain what I mean by this. Up to now, the Community's principle has been to devise a policy and at the same time provide itself with the financial resources necessary for such common policy. This is what happened in the case of the common agricultural policy. Now however, we are trying to fit new common policies which we want to set up or encourage into the framework of existing resources.

It is obvious that by doing this we can only harm existing policies. This is why I wonder if, rather than engaging in a hard struggle to increase income from existing own resources, we would not do better to look at the problem from a different point of view and begin by proposing one or two common policies, by defending them and supporting them, by fighting to ensure that they are adopted and then demand new resources for these new common policies. Mr President, this will be the theme of a later debate, but we must be aware that all future debates in this House will be haunted by the fear that one of the Community's main acquired rights, its control of the budget, may vanish.

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

Mr Ansquer. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, after the 30 May settlement, the Commission presented two draft regulations. One related to the adaptation of the financial mechanism decided on in Dublin, and the other provided for supplementary expenditure for the United Kingdom.

No doubt the first question which springs to mind when we see Parliament consulted on this matter, is to wonder of that real use it may be, as all the decisions have already been taken. Nonetheless, given that the Council has tactfully delayed the formal adoption of these proposals and requested Parliament's opinion, we hope that our views will be of some use.

The Brussels agreement is a political compromise and like all compromises it has its good and bad side. For us, the bad side is that which tends to distort the principles and spirit of the Community. This compromise in fact means introducing into the system of broad balance the notion of 'juste retour' and institutes measures for Community aid specifically meant for one Member State, measures which go against the common policy approach. In addition, this precedent may harm relations in Parliament and the Community institutions. And lastly, it means that a large slice of the Community budget will go to the United Kingdom — approximately 8 % of the 1981 budget — whilst transport policy, together with industrial policy and energy policy, only make up less than 2 % of our budget.

On the other hand, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this compromise provides a basis for settling before the end of the year such ticklish questions as fisheries or sheepmeat and this is the plus side of the Brussels agreement. It should be made clear that this agreement is global in nature and that these regulations may only be formally adopted when some solid results have been achieved on the other wide-ranging and urgent problems we are all aware of, and in particular on the fisheries question. It is with this aim in view that my Group tabled several amendments, and in particular an amendment to be placed before paragraph 1, which restates the nature of the settlement reached on 30 May.

The Group of European Progressive Democrats does not approve everything in Mr Dankert's report and especially does not agree with his demand that the budget be substantially reformed, since this reform would lead in our opinion to the complete dismantling of common policies, in particular of the common agricultural policy, and probably in the long run to the destruction of all that the Community has achieved. However, my Group does support the strengthening of control measures which the rapporteur recommends, in other words we share Mr Dankert's misgivings.

As for the regulations relating to the supplementary measures proposed by the Commission, we approve

Ansquer

Mr Dankert's draft modifications. Nonetheless, Mr President, the Group of European Progressive Democrats, whilst not wishing to disqualify from aid any particular type of investment, is against aid specifically aimed at exploiting Britain's coal reserves. Four draft modifications to the Commission's draft regulation have been submitted with the intention of excluding this type of investment. Our assessment of the problem, which is close to Mr Dankert's, is based on two factors. Firstly, aid aimed at exploiting coal resources should be part of a general energy policy, a general scheme for the Community. And we have long demanded on this subject, as have others amongst you, ladies and gentlemen, a real common energy policy. It is not in the interest of the Community in this particular field to begin granting aid for such a purpose to one Member State.

Lastly, how in the present situation could we get public opinion in Community countries to accept the idea that we finance the mining of coal only in the United Kingdom? This is why ladies and gentlemen, we should like to see our motions, which are very reasonable ones, adopted by this House and why we seek your support. The Group of European Progressive Democrats' amendments tend, we hope, in the same direction as that which the rapporteur is following and since it is impossible to avoid this financial and political compromise which doubtless holds some danger for the future of the Community, we should like to see this House closely following the application of this compromise so that it may be in the best interests of Europe in general.

President. — I call Mr Bonde.

Mr Bonde. — (DK) Mr President, the regulations we are discussing here today are aimed at keeping the United Kingdom in the European Community against the will of the English, Welsh, Scottish and Northern Irish people. If we are to believe the opinion polls, there is a firm majority in Britain in favour of withdrawing from the Community, just like in Denmark where the majority of the population is also in favour of pulling out. What these regulations would mean is that the Danish taxpayers, over half of whom are opposed to continued Community membership, would, against their will, have to pay towards keeping another country within the Community contrary to the wishes of the people of that country. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the members of the People's Movement against the European Community intends to vote against these regulations.

It can hardly be claimed, literally, that the expenditure to keep the United Kingdom in the Community is compulsory expenditure, since it is not expenditure arising from the Treaties. However, there is no logic underlying the distribution of expenditure between the two categories — the Council simply has the last word

over one lot and Parliament has the last word over the other. In the Council each Member State has the right of veto, but in Parliament Denmark and Greenland have only 16 members while 206 votes are needed to form a majority for the purposes of the budget.

This is why we are strongly opposed to the idea of increasing non-compulsory expenditure and, in particular, the wish of the majority in the Committee on Budgets to make the contribution to the United Kingdom a non-compulsory item, as it is by means of tactics and techniques of this kind that the possibility for the Danish voters, for example, to influence matters is almost daily being undermined. I might perhaps quote some figures to illustrate this gradual transfer of power from the Council to the Parliament: in 1974 13.9% of the total expenditure was non-compulsory. By 1975 this figure had become 16.3%, by 1976 17.5%, in 1977 and 1978 the proportion was 18.5%, in 1979 20.5% and in 1980 24.1%, and it is within this non-compulsory section that Parliament has its own allocation which Denmark is powerless either to reduce or increase. The amount available to Parliament has quadrupled since 1975. The possibility for Danish voters to exert influence is being chipped away bit by bit and I must say, therefore, that I was somewhat taken aback to hear Mr Fich insist that the expenditure necessary to keep the United Kingdom in the Community should be a non-compulsory item, on which Parliament has the last word, as this is not only out of keeping with Mr Fich's special opposition programme but also at odds with the Social Democratic candidates' joint electoral programme, which advocates keeping power as far as possible with the Council and avoiding a transfer of power to this Assembly, and it is somewhat surprising that Mr Fich should be criticizing the members of the People's Movement for voting along the lines advocated by the Social Democrats in their own electoral programme.

IN THE CHAIR: Mr de FERRANTI

Vice-President

President. — I call Mr Gendebien.

Mr Gendebien. — (F) Ladies and gentlemen, we have already seen Europe in the hands of business, now we see it in the hands of accountants. We have now reached a stage never before reached in political haggling. The decisions taken on 30 May last in Brussels were dominated by a climate of blackmail, shortsightedness and an obvious lack of courage.

Let me be understood however. I agree to the principle of special and temporary aid to Britain because of the

Gendebien

serious difficulties it is now undergoing. However — and this is what rankles with me — this decision was taken outside the normal budgetary and regulatory procedures. It was taken on the basis of the principle of 'juste retour', a totally unacceptable principle which only a few months ago was almost unanimously rejected by this House. It is my belief that the future will see such measures as those taken for Britain becoming the norm. What in fact is to prevent those States which are net recipients from having their position modified in future in a way which we can easily guess at? This would not solve the basic problem of the Community's budgetary crisis. What it would do is encourage those people in several Member States who demand that their government withdraw from the Community. In addition, the content and the wording of the decisions taken on 30 May show that the European budget is less and less an instrument of common policy and is successively reduced to the status of a compensatory fund. The special aid for the United Kingdom will be distributed outside normal budgetary and regulatory procedures. What is to stop one of the new Member States or even one of the present Member States from demanding that similar measures be applied to them? There is, therefore, a real risk of creating a precedent.

The rapporteur and the Commission feel that there is no reason for considering the measures aimed at Britain as covered by the non-quota section of the Regional Fund. I disagree. Together with a few other members of the Committee on Regional Policy, I feel that the two regulations, one on the British programme and the other on the non-quota section should be merged or at least to a great extent coordinated. The same is true for the management and control of these two Funds because, without this, the whole scheme would have no Community significance at all. So, both on principle and for reasons of efficiency, the two Funds should be managed in the same way.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my conclusion will be clear. Faced with national and Community budgetary crises and the upsurge in isolationist and deflationist tendencies, and especially when faced with the enlargement of the Community, everything points to the fact that the Community will not be able to save itself from disaster by the cheap-jack methods we are urged to ratify. It is only by improving once and for all the tone of our dealings with each other that we can weather the gathering storm. If we don't go forward, then we must go backwards. A status quo situation would mean the end of Europe. If we are to solve the Community's budget problems then we need a strong political will, a 'grand design'. This objective will not be reached by building on existing common policies alone, but also and above all by implementing new common measures, in particular in the field of political cooperation. But — and this will be my conclusion — we must first discover whether all our partners in

Europe really wish to consolidate what has been built in Europe and if they all really want to see a European Europe rather than a trans-atlantic one.

President. — I call Mrs Castle.

Mrs Castle. — Mr President, I am glad there is common recognition in all the documents that are in front of us that the United Kingdom's complaint about her net contribution to the Community budget was justified. The Socialist Group has always been sympathetic to the United Kingdom's argument. I cannot say other parts of the House have been equally so. I think it really is a reflection on the inability of this Community to adapt and reform itself that it has taken so long to get even this partial redress of what was clearly an outstanding injustice to one member of the Community.

I am glad there is no suggestion in the Committee on Budgets' report of questioning the May 30 settlement either as to its period of operation or as to the amount — indeed it would have been very odd if anybody had questioned the amount, because of course Mrs Thatcher's victory was only a partial one. She never got the 100 % balance for which she asked. Britain is still the second largest contributor, although we are the third weakest economy in the European Community.

What we are discussing today is how this settlement is being applied. That is why I am moving, on behalf of the Socialist Group, amendment No. 2, which I think has been circulated. I would like to read it to the House: 'Parliament notes the dramatic increase in unemployment in the United Kingdom to over 2 million, with further increases to come as a result of the United Kingdom Government's deliberate deflation of demand in obedience to its monetarist policies. And insists that the resources being made available to the United Kingdom under the supplementary measures be used to reduce the intolerable levels of unemployment in the United Kingdom by expanding public expenditure'.

Now the rapporteur for the Committee on Budgets, Mr Dankert, was absolutely right. The whole of this regulation in front of us today governing the supplementary measures is an elaborate farce. Because what was the idea behind the May 30 settlement? It was that Britain's contribution was out of balance, partly on the revenue side, but mostly because so little was being spent in the United Kingdom by the Community.

Now as we all know, agricultural spending takes the bulk of the budget, and last year the United Kingdom only got 5 % of it. That is why the Commission proposed that two-thirds of the rebate Britain is to get — and that two-thirds amounts in sterling to 550 million pounds — should be in the form of

Castle

increased spending in Britain by the Community on the sort of schemes Britain needs to strengthen her economy.

When this news came through, hopes were raised in Britain's hard-hit areas, in her depressed regions among the industries where unemployment is mounting so rapidly. 550 million pounds to be made available for spending on the schemes on which the British Government is savagely cutting back! Look at the list in the Commission's documents — to be spent on industrial development, the building of advance factories, urban renewal, public housing, health services, schools, roads, energy supplies, sewage works. These are the sort of schemes which the depressed areas of Britain are desperately anxious to spend money on. And hopes were raised, too, in my own region, the North-west, which has just had its status as an intermediate area entitled to help under Britain's regional programmes cancelled from August of this year. They thought that perhaps at last some money can come back under this new proposal for expanding Community expenditure.

Now I have some news for this House: none of the local authorities, nor the public authorities providing the services I have just listed, are going to get one penny more as a result of this settlement.

I will give you my evidence for that. In announcing the settlement, Mrs Thatcher, our Prime Minister, told the House of Commons that the money would not go to increase public expenditure, but to reduce the government's borrowing requirement.

A few days ago, the British Government sent a circular to the local authorities telling them not to bother sending in applications for this money, not to put forward any projects for a bit of this 550 million, because they would not get any of it at all.

I have here a letter given to me by my colleague, Mr Griffiths, a letter from the Secretary of State for Wales, Nicholas Edwards, in reply to Mr Griffiths' enquiries about this expenditure. The letter said that the Community assistance now available will afford the Government greater room for manoeuvre in pursuing its medium-term economic and financial objectives, which were described by the Chancellor in his budget statement in March without the need for further major cuts in public expenditure which might otherwise have been necessary.

Well, I am sorry. I agree with the House of Commons' practice of interruption, but it does not seem to be a practice here, and if I gave way, it would be taken out of my time.

Perhaps we can get the procedures reformed so that we can have some.

That letter was written on 15 July. Since then the money supply in Britain has risen by 8 % despite the restrictive measures of that mad monetarist who leads Britain.

You are not going to tell me that even with this Community money she is not planning any further cuts in public expenditure, because of course Mrs Thatcher does not believe in expanding Britain's economy, but in deflating it.

Public expenditure has been, and still will be, cut back savagely. Wages are being held down. Manufacturing industry is being ruined by the fall in home demand and by catastrophically high interest rates. Exports are being lost by the artificially high exchange rate for sterling these policies have produced. Unemployment in Britain has jumped to over two million and no-one, not even the Treasury, denies it is going up higher still.

In one day alone in Britain, only a week ago, 400 people lost their jobs, many of them in firms where workers had taken a cut in pay to save their jobs. In my own Euro-constituency, where I was a few days ago, the announcement came through, in one day, that five factories had been closed down.

Mrs Thatcher's policies are making Britain an economic and industrial desert and she intends to take this money to continue to pursue those restrictionist policies. The employers' association in Britain, the CBI, predicts that manufacturing output will fall this year by nearly 7 % with a further fall next year. Last week a deputation of top industrialists went to see Mrs Thatcher to plead with her to relax her monetary stranglehold on British industry.

This is how the business section of *The Times* reported their views, and I quote: 'New measures are urgently needed to stimulate industrial growth and to ease unemployment because of the unexpected severity and rapidity of the recession in manufacturing industry.'

Well, here we have the money for those new measures: £ 550 million. But Mrs Thatcher turned down the CBI. She has now found that her monetarist policy is not working even in reducing the money supply. So she intends to turn the screw still tighter.

This Parliament is fooled if it thinks one penny of this £ 550 million is going on new projects for industrial or regional development. I suggest that when the Commission does its monitoring as to how the money is spent, it finds out if the measures are new, or rather as we know will be the case, if they are measures already planned for which this money will be earmarked in order that it can in effect be pocketed by the British Government.

I was surprised at Mrs Kellett-Bowman's complacency in introducing the Committee on Regional Policy and

Castle

Regional Plannings report. She did not even mention the fact that it demands that this money be additional. Can she really say that this money is going to be spent additionally? Of course not. She said it was to be all in keeping with the regional policies.

Naturally the British Conservatives have come into line behind their own government, so we can discount everything Mr Taylor says. But we, the rest of us, have a chance to judge the situation objectively, and when we vote this deal, we are voting to give money to a government which is deliberately creating unemployment.

All right, that is a political problem with which the British people have to deal. It is their responsibility. But at least by supporting the amendment I have read out, let this Parliament show it knows what is happening. The job of this Parliament is not to dictate to national governments. That has never been my view. But it is our job to monitor, to expose and so to influence.

We cannot be unconcerned when deals are struck which make a mockery of our own regional policy. We cannot be unconcerned when Community money is spent in ways which actually make convergence worse.

It is the rise in unemployment and the heavy cost of unemployment benefit which has inflated the government's borrowing requirement more than anything. The government is borrowing to keep people out of work, and Mrs Thatcher wants this Community money to help her afford the unemployment her monetarist policies have made inevitable.

I believe that the kind of camouflage we have had in the Commission's reports, in some of the speeches we have heard today — not all of them by any means — the camouflage that Mr Dankert exposed, does make the fundamental restructuring of the budget far less likely. I do not believe for a moment that there will before June 1981 be proposals before this House to curb the spending on agriculture and redistribute resources to regions and industry. I do not believe it. The political will is not there. The political will is not in the British government to develop any kind of effective regional policy. So let us show we have not been fooled. Let Parliament pass this amendment and retain its dignity.

(Applause from certain quarters on the left)

President. — I call Mr Boyes on a point of order.

Mr Boyes. — That was a very important speech by the leader of the British Labour Group on this particular problem and I am very concerned that neither Mr Tugendhat nor Mr Jenkins were present to listen

to it. I am wondering. Mr President, if this debate is going to go on all day, Mr President, without Mr Tugendhat or Mr Jenkins listening to the contribution.

President. — You must specify the rule under which you are raising your point of order.

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

Mr Konrad Schön. — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have naturally never had occasion to take part in a debate in the House of Commons and this is why I was hardly able to believe my ears when I heard how our British colleagues squabble over their domestic politics. This has given me food for thought. Even though my Group and I subscribe wholeheartedly to the views expressed in the Dankert report, I should like to raise in all seriousness the question of whether it might not be necessary in certain cases to examine the Treaty interdict on aid for national sectors, in particular for the supplementary monies to be granted in this case to Britain.

As for the rest, Mr Taylor, we approve the decision taken in Luxembourg out of solidarity with Britain or, to couch it in more Community terms, out of solidarity with the Community. But one cannot argue that one wants to pursue a common policy and then be unwilling to have this policy, which would be a common policy applied in Britain, monitored as it should be.

A further point is that the rapporteur warned us against setting a precedent. If what we are talking about are Community policies in the sense of regional, structural and social policies then this expenditure cannot possibly be from the quota section. It must be from the non-quota section and in that case Parliament must insist that we exercise some control over such expenditure.

I also warmly welcome the proposal for an *ad hoc* committee, because up to now expenditure of this type has always been made in Member States on the basis of projects which were beforehand examined and indeed which could be examined beforehand individually. Now I hear people speaking in terms of overall programmes. I have nothing against programmes, and nothing at all against national programmes, but they must be Community programmes which should also in general include some kind of declarations of intent. On these objectives — as we have just discovered in this debate — our British colleagues, both Conservative and Labour Members, are clearly not in agreement. And so this once more raises the question of whether the programme is an integrated set of specific measures which we can assess prior to its

Konrad Schön

application or not. This question must in my opinion be answered both by the Commission and by the Council representatives.

I am grateful to Mr Ansquer for having raised a further question. Clearly some of us are toying with the idea that sectoral policies might be included in these programmes, for example in the coal sector. It sounds very pro-Community to say that the Community is in the middle of an energy crisis and so we are doing something in Britain in order to ease this crisis. If however this merely means boosting the British coal sector then this is not pursuing a Community policy and we will certainly meet with demands from other regions for similar support, and perhaps also in the coal sector. This would be against the Treaty. And so this programme must be examined so that we can be certain that a Community policy will indeed be pursued in this case. I have not doubt that the speakers from Britain — they have stressed this several times — will willing to cooperate in examining this project, so that a real Community policy can be pursued, especially — and this is the most interesting point in the plan for financing this programme — as 90 % of the money will be paid prior to and the remaining 10 % after completion of the programme. So even the method of financing the programme is not one which has been normally applied up to now.

And so I should like to explain on behalf of my Group — and I shall conclude with these remarks — that we wholeheartedly approve the report and that we shall examine all the amendments to the motion for a resolution from the other Groups and Members in order ensure they will not help these measures for the United Kingdom to create a precedent, which instead of leading to convergence in the Community could only lead to divergence.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Howell to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Howell. — Mr President, it has been my experience that the last year has been exceedingly difficult. It has also been an exceedingly sad year, not only for this Parliament which is facing a tremendous problem in one Member State, but also for us in this group and indeed in the United Kingdom as a whole.

I am the first to say that I am not proud at all to be in a position of being a supplicant to this Parliament. Neither am I proud of the fact that my own government finds itself in the position, as Mrs Castle put it, of being the third weakest economy in Europe. Therefore, I accept and say to this Parliament that many of the problems faced by the United Kingdom at the moment are of our own making; that the United Kingdom itself must bear the blame for the majority of

the problems it faces. Nevertheless, it was made clear, and it is a fact, that it was highly unjust for the United Kingdom to pay three times more into the Community than it got back. That in itself was its own fault. The fact that the economy of the United Kingdom notwithstanding all the oil it has in the North Sea, was not able to meet the requirements and the projections laid down in the Treaty and in the negotiations for entry into the Community. The fact that we did not come up to scratch in our economy was the result of bad management by successive governments of the United Kingdom. It was the result of the inability to increase our growth rate and our gross domestic product that has led us into a position of finding ourselves paying more in than we get back. It is right, therefore, that we have to come — not in a sense of boasting, not in a sense of good will but with a feeling of depression — to the Community again to ask for refunds and repayment. We have got these on a temporary basis.

I find Mr Dankert's report rather misleading on the way the operation is to go forward from here. His tone is exceedingly mean. He talks of precedence; he talks of Britain becoming anti-European; he talks of United Kingdom blackmail, of Britain putting itself in a position of default in European decision-making; he says that the United Kingdom is not part of the European Monetary System and is now in a unique position within the Community. He talks of Britain and the British contribution problem causing the VAT ceiling to be reached sooner. I would tell him that if Britain was not paying three times as much in as it was getting back the VAT ceiling would have been reached much sooner. It is right, therefore, that we in this Parliament accept the 30 May Agreement together with the proviso that this agreement is only of a temporary nature.

The thousand million pound problem, as we called it in the United Kingdom was, of course, an effect and not a cause. The fact that we did pay a thousand million pounds to the Community as our net contribution was the effect of European policy and not a cause. Therefore, any temporary measure to reduce that amount, as we have now, can only by definition be temporary and we still have not hit at the root of the problem. The problem, of course, is that of the policies which are still bedevilling the Community at the moment. Here I can again be critical of my own government. In my own view there is a tremendous lack of forward planning, of positive thinking, concerning how Britain can become more Community orientated or what Britain wants; whether it wants indeed a common agricultural policy. I would ask it and other Member States to be more forthcoming on this. But the important point now is that this Parliament has to settle down and to start to reform the budgetary procedures and the policies of the Community before it is too late. That, of course, is the major part of the agreement of 30 May, that we start to resolve the problems of agriculture, surpluses and the vast cost to the exchequer of this Community.

Howell

Last December we voted to reject the Community budget in recognition that the Community was going off the rails. We put it off the rails in recognition that the Community of the 1980s and the Community of the 1990s could not be one based solely on agriculture and agricultural surpluses and that we had to move forward into areas of greater concern. Today we are facing the consequences of a Community which has lost its direction, and we have to fight once more within this Parliament to be positive and put forward positive suggestions.

I have great sympathy with much of what Mrs Castle says and much of what Mr Dankert says. As a European I would love to see European projects promoted. All of us have our own areas. I look in my own constituency of Norfolk to an ability to trade with the continent and, therefore, to increase our infrastructure development, our roads and our ports to allow us and the Continent to trade together much more. But I do not consider that incompatible with the government's requirement to reduce public expenditure. And, Mrs Castle, I would ask you just what the record of your own government was in terms of inflation and the people you were supposed to be helping in your particular period of office?

Mr President, it is therefore important that this Parliament today does not push this particular proposal from the Council too far. Therefore, I would like now, Mr President, to move the amendments put down in the name of this group to reject the Dankert amendments and to carry forward the present proposal of the Council and Commission, so that no further delay can take place from this Parliament and that we can start once more to get a better feeling among public opinion in the United Kingdom and play a better role as members of this Community and start to work to new policies which are going to help the Community once more into the 1980s and the 1990s.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

President. — I call Mr Baillot.

Mr Baillot. — (F) Mr President, the report which Mr Dankert has submitted to us considers from a purely technical point of view an important political problem, which is that of the financial benefit which Britain will receive from the Community in respect of its contribution as a result of the compromise of 30 May last.

It would doubtless be worthwhile to discuss the solutions put forward by the Commission which are often ingenious and raise many problems. For example, the draft regulation revives the old controversy between supporters of European integration achieved by financial and budgetary mechanisms and supporters of the upholding of the rights and prerogatives of each of the

Member States of the Community. There is also another attack on the common agricultural policy which was the focal point of the compromise.

However, in our opinion, this is not the crux of the matter. Our debate is far from being academic. And contrary to what certain speakers have said during the debate, the French Communists and their allies feel that the window dressing which the Commission is proposing, however attractive it may be, does not disguise the fact that it is mere window dressing, aimed at covering the implementation of a political decision of prime importance: the compromise decision reached during the Council meeting of 30 May last. A compromise from which Britain gains the most, a compromise whose financial consequences will be borne by the German and French tax payers, a compromise which is considered in France as a surrender by Mr Giscard d'Estaing to the pressure exerted on him by Mrs Thatcher.

As the rapporteur has just stated in this debate, the United Kingdom is in an exceptional position which it is quite impossible to defend, even though the logic which led the rapporteur to draw this conclusion is different from ours.

By this compromise, the Council decided to reduce the British contribution to the Community budget for two or three years by a considerable amount, approximately 15 thousand million francs for 1980 and 1981, a little more than 4 thousand million francs of which will be borne by France. To counterbalance this, the problems of sheepmeat and of fisheries were supposed in effect to be solved in a way which benefitted French farmers and fishermen. Well, this is not the case. Quite the contrary is true; the situation in the French sheep breeding industry has considerably worsened and it is sheepmeat producers who are footing the bill. As for the fisheries question, events in France underscored as they are by the struggle of the fishermen, show just how much the situation has deteriorated.

This compromise will ultimately have proved to be a swindle, except for Britain. The British government succeeded in having the other countries of the Community assume responsibility for its problems, whilst at the same time refusing to share the benefits which the United Kingdom receives from its privileged position, for example in its relationship with some of the Commonwealth countries — I am thinking in particular of New Zealand — or where energy is concerned, since Britain together with Holland has large oil reserves which mean that it is self sufficient for its supplies.

I should like to say in conclusion, and given the short time available to me, that we are in total disagreement with the decisions taken on 30 May last by the Council and we cannot approve them, much less amend a report whose sole aim is to give legal form to an unpalatable decision.

Mr Paisley. — Mr President, the proposal that the United Kingdom's hitherto excessive budgetary contribution should be reduced in part by the Community providing extra financial aid to the United Kingdom for improved economic and social infrastructure, and in particular for the regions, is in principle an excellent and wholly acceptable idea. Experience, however, has taught us that in practice it may well remain for the regions of the UK a mere dream.

Firstly, let me say that Northern Ireland's dire social and economic situation should make it a prime candidate for such a large slice of aid. The Commission has indicated that aid for the transmission of energy is one of the schemes it has in mind; on this score there is no more needy or deserving part of the UK than Northern Ireland. The incredible price of our energy puts us at tremendous industrial and social disadvantage. Our electricity prices are 21 % higher than the average in the rest of the UK; our coal, all of which has to be imported, is 9 to 12 pounds per tonne dearer and our gas, the supply of which will soon be terminated because of the refusal of the UK Government to allow us a share in North Sea gas, is three times dearer. So if the Commission is making extra money available for the transmission of energy, then Northern Ireland should have a prime claim upon it.

However, unless the Commission is able to keep a very strict watch on the expenditure of any money it allocates for schemes in Northern Ireland, then I fear that the advantage of this extra financial assistance to my province in real terms will be almost nil. The problem quite simply is that when the EEC makes allocations for Northern Ireland, only about one-third of that money comes to Northern Ireland as aid additional to that already committed by the UK Government. The UK government has been using money given by this Community for expenditure in Northern Ireland to offset its own planned spending in our province. In a series of questions to the British House of Commons I elicited the information that of the £ 86.69 million received for Northern Ireland for regional, social and agricultural purposes from 1973 to 1979, a mere £ 28.2 million was passed on by the UK government as a direct cash addition to the Northern Ireland economy. The remainder, £ 58.49 million, was retained by the UK government to offset its own expenditure in Northern Ireland.

This is a scandal with which the Community should be ashamed to be associated and which it must henceforth avoid and guard against. If such a thing is allowed to happen with this money, then Northern Ireland will reap little real benefit and the good intentions of the Commission in making the allocation will come to nought. If we in Northern Ireland are really to benefit from these new provisions, then any monies paid to the UK Government for schemes in Northern Ireland must be made conditional upon their expenditure in Northern Ireland as additional aid, and the Commission would need to take steps to strictly moni-

tor the entire operation. Additionality is the key to real economic assistance for the depressed areas of the United Kingdom.

President. — I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, this debate on the Dankert Report touches on the fundamental philosophy behind the Community Treaties, those Treaties which were referred to so often in the election propaganda put out by certain major political groups: the Treaties, and nothing but the Treaties! It would now appear that such is no longer the case. Mr Dankert has produced what we may call a gloomy report on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, but it is one which receives my full support because it accurately reflects the basic elements of criticism. The British problem is a political problem, and certainly not one of projects or programmes. The solution which was found on 30 May 1980 was essentially a political solution. Let me repeat the question put by Mr De Pasquale: on what basis was this political solution reached? The Commission obviously thought it necessary to camouflage the whole thing or at least dress it up in European array.

I shall not go into the technical aspects, for which the time is simply too short, but I should like to associate myself with the proposals for amending the regulation put forward by the Committee on Budgets. At the same time I really wonder what to make of the attitude of the Commission, which is something that has concerned me before. What happened to the Commission's role as the motor of the Community in this matter concerning the United Kingdom? The Commission is after all supposed to be the motor and guarantor of the Community aspects of European affairs. Let me repeat that some Members of the Commission have indeed been highly industrious in this matter. I myself come from a small Benelux country, and I should like to appeal to the new Commission and to its future President, who likewise comes from a small country. I should like to see the Commission put up stiffer resistance to the pressure exerted by the larger countries to ensure that the Community as such does not lose out to harmful political alliances between certain leading heads of government. I would call on the Council not to create any more precedents of this kind. What matters is the Treaties, and nothing but the Treaties! I am a convinced federalist. We should be prepared to go much further than the Treaties. We said in the election campaign that the Treaties themselves are inadequate, for which remark we received a reprimand. This debate clearly shows that even the major political groups are no longer loyal to the Treaties.

President. — I call Mr Hume.

Mr Hume. — Mr President, I rise to support the amendment tabled by Mrs Castle, which is designed to see to it that the Commission carries out its stated intentions. The monies we are talking about today, which are going to the British Government, are supposed to be spent on industrial development, infrastructure development and rural programmes. We know as we stand here that that is simply a charade. We know that not one job will be created by this £ 550 million. The Commission will destroy its own integrity if it participates in such a charade. This amendment is designed to say from this House to the Commission, 'Stand up and be counted; insist that your intentions, your European intentions, are put into operation and that these monies are used to reduce the unemployment that exists in all the regions of Britain and Northern Ireland today and to develop industry and agriculture'.

My own region underlines more than any other the charade that is going on in this regard. The unemployment figures in Northern Ireland today are 15.3%. Some towns have figures as high as 29% — higher than anywhere else in Europe! In our basic industries, textiles and man-made fibres, thousands of jobs have been lost in the past 12 months. The government's response, in a situation where there is such dire poverty and deprivation in a region, has not been to increase public expenditure but to stop it in its tracks. The only public building being constructed in Northern Ireland today is a prison, a new prison, and there is no more savage commentary on the priorities of a government than that!

Mr President, the Commission has responded with sympathy to the problems of our region. It has suggested that the city of Belfast be one of the first areas for a new integrated action programme and that there be a small-farm programme for the rural areas of Northern Ireland. What has been the response of the British Government? It has been to simply put in a list of proposals that are already in operation, in other words, a totally dishonest exercise which is not going to bring one extra penny to that deprived region to reduce unemployment. Not one new job will be created.

The amendment proposed by Mrs Castle asks the Commission to insist that these monies be used in public expenditure in the regions of Britain and Northern Ireland. If the Commission does not insist on this, then its integrity and that of the institutions of this Community will be further weakened. It has an opportunity to stand up and be counted, and in supporting this amendment I ask this House to call on it to do so.

President. — I call Mr Newton Dunn.

Mr Newton Dunn. — Mr President, I have listened carefully throughout this debate, and there is a very

great confusion in many speakers minds. There has been a confusion between symptoms and the real disease. The 30 May agreement is only a symptom, not a disease. The disease, Mr President, is the grossly swollen share that agricultural spending takes in our Community budget, and the United Kingdom is merely the chief victim of that disease. Instead of putting the blame on the patient in the hospital who is the chief victim of the disease, we must identify the problem and see how we can cure the disease!

Speakers have described the 30 May agreement as a waste and a disaster. Mr Dankert, the rapporteur, said that the whole balance of the Community would be jeopardised by it. But, Mr President, the opposite is true. It gives the Community a chance of survival. It is neither good nor bad; it buys time. If, in two to three years when this agreement runs out, there has been no reform of the waste in agricultural spending, then I must warn colleagues that a rising tide of opinion in Great Britain may well, against the wishes of my colleagues in the European Democratic Group, take the United Kingdom out of the Community. And not just the United Kingdom only, because I believe that other countries will follow. You will remember that three countries joined together. If more than one country leaves the Community, that will be the end of unity in Europe and the end of the Community as many of us wish it to be.

So, Mr President, we have bought a little bit of time. The situation is still extremely serious. I urge colleagues to get at the root of the problem and to use this short period of two years to cure the real disease.

President. — I call Mr Buttafuoco.

Mr Buttafuoco. — (I) Mr President, I would like to express briefly my satisfaction and that of my colleagues that we are now debating this matter, regardless of the merit of the report, with which we agree in many respects. Our satisfaction arises from the fact that the difficult political phase which the European Parliament and Europe as a whole went through seems to have been overcome, as does the danger of disintegration of the Community structure which was so greatly feared before the approval by Parliament of the 1980 budget — leading people to fear that Europe would lack the ability to tackle and solve its problems, thereby compromising the credibility and validity of any internal or international policy. We must acknowledge that this new situation is due partly to a limitation of the United Kingdom's demand for a fixed ceiling for its contribution. This limitation stems from a realization on the part of the United Kingdom that it cannot avoid the risk of an increase in its real deficit in relation to present forecasts, and from its agreement to make greater concessions on sheep-meat and fisheries, thus demonstrating a constructive approach.

Buttafuoco

With regard to agricultural prices, one can say that the results are favourable for the other eight Member States. Italy, in accepting what is clearly a modest increase in the Regional Fund, is partly compensating for the greater burden represented by the compromise reached on the British contribution. It is a compromise, and this compromise is valid because it provides the breathing-space needed to tackle in a positive and practical way the problems of convergence which have the effect of slowing down the development of European integration.

With regard to the supplementary measures providing for expenditure in favour of the United Kingdom, it is necessary to impose greater convergence on the economies by reforming the Community budget, in order to solve in the long term the problems arising from an imbalance in the distribution of the resources of that budget. Obviously this convergence cannot be brought about by the special and temporary measures under consideration, which, apart from the danger that they may turn out to be mere palliatives, threaten to create a dangerous precedent for the approval of provisions specifically related to the budget contributions of a Member State.

We hope that the disagreements on procedural aspects will be clarified and overcome, and we take the view that where it is not possible to agree on the Commission proposal, the Belgian proposal for a compromise designed to overcome the obstacle should be accepted.

We have no reservations about the sectors for aids — e.g. urban renewal or a possible strengthening of coal-mining activities. However, we confine ourselves to suggesting a more precise formulation, so that the aids do not take on the character of a subsidy and so that protectionist temptations may be avoided.

President. — I call Mr Lange.

Mr Lange, Chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to take this opportunity to say a few words in the presence of the Member of the Commission, and give him the chance to reply to my comments if he thinks fit.

Let me point out once again that there is full agreement in this House on the need to relieve the United Kingdom of part of its budgetary burdens. Let us be quite clear, though, about where we stand. First of all, it is wrong to talk about contributions at all in the European system of the Community's own resources. What we are really talking about are burdens imposed on the various Member States and discharges granted to the Member States. In other words, this whole thing has nothing to do with contributions in the meaning of the Treaties.

It is also worth making the point that all the Member States — including those which joined on 1 January 1973; indeed, especially those — have declared their acceptance of the Treaties and the legal projects and their effects resulting from the Treaties. However, let me add that if a specific financial development results in a Member State being placed in an intolerable position and that Member State is granted certain concessions, it is up to us to examine the matter. However, that should have happened before now; indeed, it should have happened as early as 1975/1976, in which case we should not be faced with this situation today.

We have pointed out in earlier debates the possibility of such difficulties arising, and I especially recall a number of complaints which were made earlier from various sides, including the United Kingdom. However, nothing was done at national or European level to bring about any change in the situation, and now we are faced with this problem. Let me remind you that in November last year this House urged that any financial relief granted to a Member State should be of a general Community nature and not related specifically to one particular Member State. After all, the solution we are debating today is not a general Community solution, but a specific arrangement which is not in line with the basic principles of Community policy and which is not designed — and in this respect we support the criticism voiced so far — to restore balance to the Community budget.

Bearing in mind the way this debate on granting the necessary financial relief to one of our Member States has been conducted in the various Community institutions — and I am thinking here particularly of the Council and the European Council — I can only say that, if the same methods were to be adopted in one's private life, they would beggar any polite diplomatic description. What we have witnessed and still are witnessing are elements of blackmail, bribery and corruption. If that kind of thing were to be repeated in a private sphere, we could easily be prosecuted. What the Commission is now proposing is not in the Community's best interests. The European Council was responsible for the political compromise, but it failed to say how the compromise should be put into effect. The Commission therefore had every chance to put forward proposals for a Community solution and Community mechanisms — if only for a transitional period.

Such, however, is not the case. What the Commission is trying to do here may possibly seriously jeopardize the future of the Community. According to the EEC Treaty, the Commission is the guardian of the Treaty, but I must say that in this case the Commission has failed in its duties at an extremely critical point in the Community's development. If I were really to push things to the extreme, I could say that such a clear dereliction of the Commission's duty as guardian of the Treaties and of its duty to protect the Community as such is sufficient grounds for tabling a motion of no

Lange

confidence. The situation really is that serious, and I hope that the Council will respect Parliament's attempts to place this matter on a Community basis and to create Community instruments.

If we were to go along with a solution related specifically to the United Kingdom — or shall we say 'a particular Member State' — we should be seriously jeopardizing the future development of the Community as regards budgetary balance and the restoration of balance between the common agricultural policy and the various other Community policies. Therefore, ladies and gentlemen — and here I am merely repeating what the rapporteur has already said — this report and particularly this motion for a resolution amount essentially to a categorical rejection of the Commission's proposals. We are in effect appealing to the Council to bear in mind all the essential Community aspects so as to prevent the Community from collapsing or growing apart in such emergencies. There are grounds for a comprehensive solution, as proposed by this House in November last year. But what is now happening — and this is something I must stress — is that the Community's own resources are being used up for something which should — as was proposed earlier — be settled by the provision of additional funds by the Member States. But such funds must be budgetized, booked and spent through the Community budget under Community supervision. Such a provision is, however, conspicuous by its absence from this proposal.

Finally, let me point out that it has so far been accepted within the Community that expenditure is of an obligatory nature when third parties are able to point to actionable legal rights. One specific example of this is agricultural price policy. For instance, if the Community acts at variance with a regulation, an agricultural producer or a group of producers have the right to appeal to the European Court of Justice. Perhaps someone could tell me whether the agreement reached on 30 May is sufficient basis for a similar appeal? The fact is that this agreement is of a political and not a legal nature. Under no circumstances, for example, could the United Kingdom appeal to the Court of Justice, because that could result in an avalanche of counter-claims. In other words, according to the standard definition of compulsory and non-compulsory expenditure, what we have here is not an actionable legal right, quite apart from the fact that the agreement rides roughshod over the Treaties as regards financial and budgetary burdens and rights within the Community.

I would seriously warn the Commission against proceeding along this path, and I would address an urgent appeal to the Council to proceed on the basis of the proposals contained in this motion for a resolution, which will probably — apart from a few minor amendments — be accepted by this House. That is the only means of guaranteeing that in emergencies we

shall find Community solutions capable of averting the danger of the Community tearing itself apart.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Giolitti.

Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission. — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I readily admit that the regulation concerning the supplementary measures for the United Kingdom — for that is what I am going to speak about — lays itself open to many criticisms, and I certainly do not claim to be able to rebut them all, especially as the time available to me is short.

I would say that it is in the very nature of this provision to be subject to many criticisms, since in a sense it constitutes an exception to the rule, given that it is intended to deal with an exceptional situation using exceptional measures. It is clear that if these measures are compared with the rules which normally govern the operation of the Community, there are reasons for concern and criticism.

We were faced with an exceptional situation, which — as Mr Lange rightly said just now — could have been foreseen and dealt with at an earlier and perhaps more timely stage, by adopting solutions which would have aroused less concern and criticism than that which these measures have aroused. Moreover, the acknowledgement of this exceptional situation and therefore of the special measures which it was necessary to take in order to deal with it — I say this very clearly and firmly — cannot in my view provide any basis for the accusation which some have levelled at the Commission of having failed in its duty to respect, and ensure respect for, the Treaties.

Obviously the position of one country in the Community cannot and must not be measured in terms of credit and debit with regard to the budget — in terms of the net contribution, in accordance with the concept, which we have always rejected and continue to reject, of the so-called 'fair return'. However, the net contribution of the United Kingdom is only one aspect of a more complex picture. It is not a new concept or criterion which the Commission has taken the responsibility of following when taking these measures.

On the contrary, the Commission, faced with a crisis situation and a political problem, for which the Council proposed and outlined a political solution, did not resign itself, because of these pressing needs, to failing to tackle the problem which we refer to in general as 'convergence' with everything that that term implies. On the contrary, faced with the need to find a solution to a pressing short-term problem — that of the United Kingdom contribution to the Community budget —

Giolitti

the Commission simultaneously committed itself to restructuring not only the Community budget also the Community policies — since that is the task which the Commission is already preparing to carry out, but clearly not to complete, since it will be up to the new Commission in the first half of 1981 to develop and complete what this Commission, in the short life span left to it can only prepare and help to develop.

It is therefore clear that, with these measures, we have no intention of creating a new policy or even of introducing a new instrument of policy. We made an effort — and, may I say, a successful one — to make the solution to the urgent problem consistent with the more long-term question of convergence. That is what the Commission has achieved. It has made the solution to this specific problem of the United Kingdom compatible and convergent with those which will have to be gradually worked out and adopted for the more complex, broader and more general problem of convergence in the Community. I should like to add that the Commission has acted in such a way as not to create a precedent, since, as I said, it has not introduced a new policy or a new instrument of policy.

However, within these narrow limits of the provision, we have stressed the planning aspect. It would have been much easier, one could say, to have used the customary system of financing individual projects. If it had merely been a question of transferring resources to make refunds to the United Kingdom budget, that would have been easy. We have done that before in the context of regional policy.

We could therefore have proceeded on the basis of projects. But the Commission made life more difficult for itself, for as we now have to operate on the basis of programmes, we have to check on the validity, consistency and implementation of the programmes, and within them, of the sub-programmes relating to the various kinds of infrastructure. We have linked this planning approach, which assists the solution of the convergence problem, with a regional element, in that the regions suffering most from problems due to delays in development or crises have been given priority.

Is all this wishful thinking? I do not think so, for we have provided ourselves with all the means needed to ensure that this will come about, and with means of monitoring developments. It is the Commission which reserves the right to choose parts of the general programmes which the United Kingdom will submit, and which in our technical jargon we call sub-programmes. The Commission has reserved the right to choose those sub-programmes to which the Community aids envisaged by these measures will go, as well as the right to cease payments, suspend them or even to transfer them should the periodic checks show that the implementation of the programme or sub-programme is not in accordance with what was decided.

Allow me, *en passant*, to compare the normal management of the Regional Fund with the type of management which we are about to introduce on a temporary and exceptional basis for the supplementary measures in favour of the United Kingdom. We have been even more demanding with regard to the latter measures — precisely because they are of an exceptional nature — than with regard to the Regional Fund, in respect of monitoring and continuous flow of information.

There is no doubt that this information, of which the Commission has guaranteed itself a continuous supply, will be transmitted to Parliament. We have undertaken precise commitments in this respect, but there is nothing to prevent an even more frequent contact — going beyond these formal commitments set out in the draft regulation — between the Commission and the Parliamentary bodies — either with the Parliament as a whole if it wishes, or with the relevant committees.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, these are the brief remarks which I felt it necessary to make, on behalf of the Commission and which correspond to the most important concerns and criticisms expressed by the rapporteurs and other speakers in this debate, all of whom I wish to thank for the contribution they have made with a view to further improvements which, between now and the end of the procedure, we can certainly still make to our proposals. In this context, we shall give our full attention to the amendments which Parliament suggests.

However, I wish to point out that there is one amendment which we cannot accept, that which relates to paragraph 4 of Article 6 and which proposes that the transfer of the balance be effected only after completion of the programme. I would say that this is technically impossible, since it contradicts the very concept of pluriannual programme. What we are concerned with is that the Community resources which contribute to the implementation of a programme — whose cost far exceeds the amount paid by the Community — that the Community resources paid in this specific case to the United Kingdom, should be entirely used for the implementation of the programmes or sub-programmes approved. What concerns us is the way in which the Community aids are used. We are not concerned with the full implementation of the programme within a given period. We are concerned — and as I was saying, we have prepared the necessary measures to that end — that the Community resources should be entirely used for the implementation of the programme.

It is impossible to check on the practical implementation of a programme. This is possible for a project — if one finances a road building project, one can physically check whether that road has been built and completed, but one cannot physically and materially check on the full completion of a necessarily complex and coherent programme — and the more coherent and complex the programme the better, since it will

Giolitti

then really contribute to solving the structural problems of the regions concerned. I repeat that what concerns us is to ensure that the use made of the Community aids corresponds to the purposes for which they were granted.

President. — I call Mr Dankert.

Mr Dankert, rapporteur. — (F) Mr President, I should like to make a few remarks in reply to Mr Giolitti. Although he accepts most of Parliament's amendments, he rejects — and I believe that this is what the debate is all about — the most important amendment, which is to ensure effective control, end-of-programme control, before disbursement. As Mr Giolitti knows very well, I did not invent this amendment, nor did the Committee on Budgets invent it: it is an amendment based directly on the opinion of the Court of Auditors, whose principal role is to ensure that responsible control is exercised over the Community's budgetary expenditure. This is an essential point.

Another point: Mr Giolitti stated that the Commission was more exacting in the case of the supplementary measures than in the case of the Regional Fund. It appears to me that he himself did not show himself to be so exacting in his brief speech. The fact is that this amendment which he rejects would enable the Community to be equally exacting in the case of programmes which differ fundamentally — and he admitted this in a way — from what is termed regional policy. Owing to the shortage of time, I will confine myself to these two remarks.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote tomorrow during voting time.

6. Human rights in Poland

President. — The next item is the report, by Mr Penders, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on human rights in Poland (Doc.1-219/80).

I call Mr Penders.

Mr Penders, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, the European Parliament is the first assembly after the Polish Diet to discuss events in Poland over recent months, and we are thereby taking a great deal of responsibility on ourselves. Of course, the situation in Poland is still far from clear and consolidated. Strikes are still in progress, interpretations differ as to the agreements reached in Gdansk and Katowice and the leaders of party and government have not yet been

able to consolidate the changed circumstances in policy terms. There is still a latent danger of outside intervention, and the Polish economy is still straining under the dual burden of a disastrous level of State indebtedness and bureaucracy and waste. Any debate at this stage must therefore be conducted with all due circumspection. On the other hand, the European Parliament would be shirking its responsibility if we failed to debate the events in Poland.

The Poles deserve our respect; they are Europeans, they have struggled for centuries for their independence and they are acquainted from their recent past with the phenomenon of foreign intervention. They have known partition, suppression, slavery, occupation and compulsory friendship. They, as signatories to the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference, are Europeans. On the eve of the follow-up conference in Madrid, it is fitting that we should be devoting our attention to developments in the field of human rights and fundamental liberties in Poland over the last few months.

The report I have the honour of speaking on today was adopted in May 1980 by a very large majority in the Political Affairs Committee. In other words, that was before the increase in the price of meat of 1 July, which gave rise to the strikes in Lublin, Gdansk and Silesia. Nevertheless, our report is essentially bound up with the strikes and subsequent agreements in Poland. After all, the developments of the last few months did not come entirely out of the blue, but followed on logically from earlier events.

After the troubles in the Radom and Ursus works in 1976, the proclaimed increases in the price of meat were retracted by the Polish authorities. But this concession to the consumer could only be paid for in terms of the Polish economy by taking up new loans, particularly in the West. Management of the new loans was, however, no better than before.

Since 1976, unrest has been spreading under the surface. The eighth congress of the Polish United Workers' Party in February this year saw a change of prime minister from Jaroszewicz to Babiuch without any real result.

A lot has been happening too in recent years in the field of human rights. The Polish Pope's visit to his own country in June 1979 demonstrated once again the unbreakable ties between the Polish people and the Catholic Church. Any régime — no matter what its origins and no matter what its alliances — will have to live with that fact. A lack of understanding between Church and Party does great damage to the Church, but is also a millstone around the Party's neck. The human rights situation in Poland accurately reflects the relationship between Church and Party.

A lot has happened in Poland over recent years in the field of human rights. Pride of place of course must go to the Committee for Social Self-Defence — KOR —

under the leadership of Mr Kuron. It was the petty hounding of members of this group which caused Mr Allen Tyrrell in November 1979 to table a motion for a resolution, and which in turn helped to bring about this debate.

Mr President, as rapporteur for the Political Affairs Committee, I must of course stick to the mandate I have been given by the committee in the form of the approval of my report. This I shall do and I shall keep my personal views to myself.

Perhaps I may be permitted though to make one brief personal remark. I said earlier that my report was essentially linked to the strikes in Poland. The events of the last few months have been characterized by the intertwining of socio-economic aspects and human rights, and that is the fascinating aspect of what has been happening in July and August. The almost unbelievable seems to be happening: a communist State appears to be accepting the existence of independent trade unions and a free trade union press. The pre-eminent role of the Party has been respected and accepted by the strikers, but the new trade unions are in no way an extended arm of the Party. Old and new trade unions are free to engage in pluralist competition. Whichever way we look at it, the fact is that an element of possible opposition has been accepted in a totalitarian State. That being so, we must ask ourselves how it has been achieved. The answer is thanks to the caution shown by the strikers themselves, who have recognized the limitations of their activities. Secondly, thanks to the caution shown by the leadership of State and Party. It is undoubtedly true that the repugnance felt throughout the world for what is happening in Afghanistan has increased the leeway for strikes in the agreement. Would it be going too far to say that the very existence of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference and the forthcoming Madrid Conference have also contributed to this process? Is it also going too far to claim that the combination of a higher level of education and the emergence of a certain degree of moderation are in the long run the major threats to totalitarian régimes?

An attempt is now being made very cautiously — and that is an important point — to differentiate between the new trade unions and the human rights movement. Let us not forget though that it was only thanks to the distributive and communicative activities of the human rights movement that news of the strikes became known at all in Poland and throughout the world.

What should our next step be? Amendment No 4 has been tabled to my motion for a resolution, which enjoys a very large measure of support in the European Parliament. That is a source of great pleasure to me. The future of Poland is primarily a matter for the Poles themselves. We condemn any intervention from whatever quarter and of whatever nature. The important thing now is to consolidate the agreements of Gdansk and Katowice, which will require economic

and financial support from the West. I am thinking here particularly of the high level of State indebtedness in Poland. A debt amounting to 20 000 million dollars is a serious burden on the Polish economy. It must be clear that the prospects for the Polish economy can only improve once a number of basic principles of efficient management have been introduced. In that respect, Warsaw would be well advised to take a leaf out of the book of the Budapest authorities.

But consolidation is only a first step. The agreements of Gdansk and Katowice may act as a guideline for other sectors in Polish society. We have only to think of the universities which will be resuming their activities on 1 October. The really important thing is to view the situation in Poland against the background of the Helsinki Final Act and the forthcoming Madrid Conference. Consolidation of what has been achieved in Poland is an important criterion for the success of security and cooperation policy in Europe.

Finally, our admiration is due first and foremost to the Polish workers, but the need for circumspection must also enjoy a high level of priority. May both of these elements characterize our coming debate.

(Applause)

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

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Mr President, Council President, ladies and gentlemen, for what is at least the fifth time since the 50's, the Polish people have, during this summer of 1980, demonstrated massively against the joint powers of State and single party: demonstrated against the rigidity, against the abuses and the distortions which are typical of the authority which claims to represent them, demonstrated against the harsh, despairing realities of the society which claims it is building for them. Fortunately, this time and so far, the workers' revolt has not been met with the steam-roller of repression. Fortunately, the government and the communist party have chosen the path of conciliation and negotiation. Hope is being reborn in Warsaw, in Silesia, and on the Baltic coast. The first wish of those of us here who represent democratic socialism is to pay tribute to all the men and women of Poland who during these last months have joined determination to calmness and courage to restraint in an admirable campaign. One old slogan, brought back to life like so many others by the events in Poland, reminds us that the emancipation of the working classes is the task of the working classes themselves. That is and will remain just as true in eastern Europe.

Now, after the first positive agreement between the workers and the authorities, we are particularly keen to know the exact wording, the legal and official terms, and the trade and territorial areas in which there will

Glinne

be the freedom which has been granted in principle to self-governing trade unions. All single-party governments fear a sharing of power, even, perhaps above all, at the level of mass movements which are all too frequently reduced to the role of submissive tools. The events of the coming months will show us the true range of the right to self-determination which the Polish workers wanted to win, far more clearly than the official statements. Meanwhile we must emphasise that the freedom of association to which we hold as socialists must be available to the Polish people as well. We must emphasise that any society which calls itself socialist must be able to take under its wing a vast range of diverging interests and that dogmatism and monolithic ideology and organisation, no matter where they are, do no service to the interests of the workers' movement. Pluralism is not just an extra benefit, it is a necessity. Geographical accident, reasons of state and the theories of limited responsibility must never, in the last analysis, prove superior to this essential requirement.

We must also emphasise that we consider that the policy of detente has, over the years, little by little, helped the Polish workers' struggle towards democracy. Armed confrontation between opposing blocks of allies can only reinforce the conservative tendencies within each. Détente on the other hand, by reducing the external threat, gradually makes it possible to seek a new path towards a better society, converts people to the idea of internal reform and creates a climate favourable to change. One of the principles of our Group is the strengthening and extension in Western Europe of democracy in its various forms, and for that reason we are particularly appreciative of the paragraph in the joint resolution which expresses the hope that the policy of détente will be continued. Our encouragement is there for those Poles and others who wish now or in the future to continue along this path, because, to us, détente is not the acknowledgment and establishment for all time of the status quo but its precise opposite, a constantly evolving process.

The demands put forward by the Polish workers, it will be observed, do not in their overall effect or in individual details call into question either the system of ownership or the country's membership of a specific military alliance. But beyond the key demands for self-governing trade unions and the legal right to strike, beyond the demands for specific reforms such as waiting time in the allocation of subsidized housing and better supplies to the home markets or even reducing the material advantages of the various bodies responsible for public order, beyond all this it was of vital importance that the workers demanded and obtained the liberation of those intellectuals who supported them, together with the relaxation of censorship.

The resolution before this House most appropriately emphasizes in that same spirit the importance of the freedom of information and communication: that it is

those things which are not prohibited which should be allowed and not the opposite, as it does the close relationship between the workers' political and social grievances. Indeed it is fortunate that the authorities recognized that the Polish workers' action was directed not against socialism but against the distortion and corruption which, as in the Szcipanski affair, deform and degrade it.

It is our hope that the liberation of those intellectuals who supported the workers is not an expedient concession but a permanent gain for human rights.

I would like to speak finally on the questions of economic and financial cooperation between Poland and the Community and its individual members. The resolution before us proposes that such cooperation should be improved. That is exactly the word because it is not simply a question of quantity and of volume, nor of supporting and strengthening the material interests of Poland's trading partners. We must go out and meet the Polish peoples' hopes for a better life based on a new institutional structure of which — we hope — self-governing trade unions will form the cornerstone. The goals of our renewed cooperation must be not the satisfaction of individual demands, decisive though they may be, but the future of the working people of Poland and the common good of people everywhere.

Mr President the workers in the 'Commune of Paris' and 'Lenin' shipyards in Gdansk, their comrades in the mines of Silesia and in hundreds of other industries have taken a courageous step forward in their country, for their country and for their own role in their country. As the resolution quite rightly says, the right to decide the future of Poland, which is by tradition a European country, lies with the people of Poland alone. But democratic solidarity is no less necessary for all that and that is the reason why we, as socialists committed to the internationalist ideal, will strive to achieve that solidarity in the four corners of the earth.

(Applause)

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

Mr Blumenfeld. — Mr President, Mr President of the Council, in taking this opportunity to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party I do so first of all in order to thank the rapporteur, Mr Penders, for having updated his excellent report under very difficult circumstances, for having recommended that we approve the decision which he had resubmitted to us and for having contributed himself to its adoption.

The European Community like all the Member States has signed the final act of the Helsinki Agreement

Blumenfeld

together with Poland. This fact in our opinion establishes a particular responsibility on the part of the European Community and of its Parliament, and it also establishes the need for us to take a direct and immediate interest in the latest events in Poland, events whose political implications cannot yet be foreseen. The EPP Group has followed with the greatest respect the struggle of Polish workers to obtain democratic rights, to improve their material living conditions and circumstances and above all to bring into existence independent — that is to say independent from the State — trade unions. Seldom since the end of the last war have political events more deeply stirred the hearts and minds of people in free Europe as those which have taken place in the last few weeks, and which have kept us in Europe intent on our television screens. The moving scenes in front of the Lenin docks in Danzig when the strikers prayed together with the priests of the Catholic church and when this group grew to become a large peaceful gathering in which, thanks to the level-headedness of all, bloodshed was avoided were a good example of what I mean.

I should also, however, during this present situation, like to remind you of the historical background against which one must consider the struggle of the Polish people for independence and freedom. Mr Penders reminded us that the Poles have been divided for centuries, have suffered occupation and seen their country submerged under the tides of wars and that they have nonetheless kept alive their feeling for and their firm resolve to obtain independence and freedom.

We must also — and it is my intention to place particular emphasis on this point on behalf of my Group — see the role which the Poles have played in the last few decades in seeking to obtain peaceful cooperation in Europe.

Please allow me to make a completely personal observation. Many of my fellow Members of the European Parliament and also many of my friends in the EPP Group have suffered tyranny and war side by side with the Polish people and with the Poles. I myself was incarcerated in Auschwitz concentration camp together with thousands of Polish citizens during the war as a prisoner of Hitler's Gestapo and the SS under inhuman conditions. I want to make clear by this example that when we speak of man's firm resolve to obtain freedom, human rights and peace we know what we are talking about. We also know that courage must be seasoned with clear-sightedness so that the developments in which the agreements made at Danzig and Katowice which represent a large step forward, may be continued and built upon just as Mr Penders so rightly said just now.

Stating these facts clearly does not mean, in our eyes, in any way interfering in the internal affairs of another state. Our citizens want to hear from us clear, plain and forthright language and this does not in any way involve interference.

The EPP Group once more calls upon all the signatories to the Helsinki Agreement to adhere strictly to the policy of non-interference as it is laid down in Article 2 Chapter 7 of the United Nations' Treaty.

The EPP Group and the European Parliament will observe this policy of non-interference to the letter and trust that the Polish people will be able to decide for itself what form its future will take. We wish much success and clear-sightedness to the Polish people, to the Polish workers and the Polish citizens in the difficult weeks and months which lie ahead of them. The Polish people should therefore know — and this is what I understood from Mr Glinne's speech — that support from the European Community is and will be forthcoming without any precondition of a political nature so that we may help people in Poland over the exceptionally difficult economic future which awaits them and make a European contribution to their welfare. For this is what the Polish workers and people want, to see Europe and Poland growing step by step closer and closer to each other.

I appeal on behalf of my Group to the Council of Ministers and to the Foreign Ministers of the European Community to direct their particular attention to developments in Poland during the preparations for the Madrid follow-up conference and intensify their efforts towards implementing the principles laid down in the Helsinki Agreement.

I should just like to add one final remark, Mr President. The EPP Group is of the opinion that what has now taken place in Poland stems from objectives which the Communist might of the Soviet Union has been strengthening for many years, that is at the same time as carrying out a policy of detente to continue the ideological and economic rivalry between the two systems — on the one hand the communist system and on the other the free market system. We have so to speak accepted this challenge in an offensive spirit and now it is becoming apparent that freedom cannot be suppressed, that it can be suppressed in none of the countries of the world. And we also wish to make this clear and to stress at the same time that should developments in Poland, that is to say the agreements reached between the Polish government and the strike committees which have been negotiated and signed by both parties, be reversed then the Madrid Conference has no longer any meaning or purpose.

I note with satisfaction that it is once more the European Parliament which has been the first to discuss an extremely up to the minute event of incalculable political significance which it is quite impossible to assess at present, and that it will now adopt a decision which has been drawn up and supported by all the democratic Groups of this House.

(Applause)

President. — The proceedings will now be suspended until 3 p.m.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.05 p.m. and resumed at 3.00 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR KATZER

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

In view of the remaining items on the agenda, I declare the list of speakers closed for today.

7. *Deadline for tabling amendments*

President. — I propose that the deadline for tabling amendments to the motions for resolutions on Turkey be fixed at 4 p.m. today.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

I call Mrs De March on a point of order.

Mrs De March. — *(F)* Mr President, I am raising this point of order to express our deep concern and to ask the Bureau to deal without losing a moment with a matter that has just been brought to my attention, namely that Mr Kim, the leader of the democratic and progressive movement in South Korea, is in danger. He has just been sentenced to death for political reasons. I have therefore just made an official approach to the Presidents's secretariat so that the Bureau can undertake moves to save him without delay.

President. — I am sure that Parliament agrees to refer the matter immediately to the Bureau.

8. *Human rights in Poland (continued)*

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the report by Mr Penders on human rights in Poland (Doc. 1-219/80).

I call Lord Bethell to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Lord Bethell. — Mr President, following that point of order, I would of course like to support all measures that aim to protect those threatened with imprisonment and death both in South Korea and in North Korea, and I hope that an early opportunity will be found to debate this important question of human rights.

However, this afternoon we are concerned with a European country to which it is particularly appropriate to devote our time in this European Parliament. Our House is a symbol of reconciliation after half a century of conflict and war on our continent: 41 years ago, it was a conflict in Poland that precipitated the outbreak of the most destructive war of our century, the consequences of which we in the European Parliament are elected to do away with. So it is a particularly emotional moment at which we find ourselves discussing the latest outbreak of violence and difficulty in Poland, one of the victims of the Second World War. It was in an effort to bring democracy to Poland and restore its independence that this continent was plunged for the last time into the most terrible war in recent memory, and our efforts to restore democracy and freedom to that country failed. Poland was moved 200 miles to the west and squashed between three not very friendly countries and the sea, and although many of its citizens would wish to apply for membership of our European Community — and I know many prominent people in political positions in that country who would like to do this — through no fault of their own, because of the system that is imposed upon them by outside forces, they cannot fulfil the criteria for membership — in particular, the April 1977 declaration on pluralism and political freedoms in our nine countries.

Of course we fully appreciate the political realities of 1980 in Europe and I know that there is no one in our Group who wishes to challenge them, to overturn them, to plunge our continent, our whole world, into catastrophe. The Yalta Agreement, rightly or wrongly, condemned Poland to the sphere of interest of the Eastern bloc, and there is no one either here or in Poland who seriously believes that in the short term that can be challenged.

I want to pay a particular tribute to the political maturity of the working people of Poland and of the professional people who have encouraged them and publicized their plight, that they have at no point tried to upset the political status of Poland within the Soviet bloc and the Warsaw Pact. At no point have they challenged the foreign policy or the defence policy of Poland; indeed they have accepted, as part of the agreement struck between the striking workers and the Polish government, that the Communist Party's control of political activities and foreign policy should remain inviolate. This is clearly quite right and quite appropriate, and no one would risk disaster by challenging this decision.

Bethell

There are, however, other questions: questions of international agreement and questions of principle. We should, I think, pay particular attention to the Helsinki Agreement, which guarantees non-interference by outside States in the internal affairs of our member nations, and many of our Foreign Ministers have made this point clear. We do not intervene, we do not intervene violently or by subversion, and we expect other countries not to intervene either. One need not look very far to see which country we are particularly thinking of — the one which has intervened so frequently in that area, in other countries close to Poland.

So the Helsinki Agreement makes this plain. It will be underlined, I hope, when the Member States' representatives meet in Madrid in November. We rely on the people of Poland and in particular on the new bodies that will be created to make sure that their own destiny is decided by their own people. By the imperfect form of government, the semi-democracy or quarter-democracy, that they have been able to establish, they will be entitled and they alone entitled to work out their own fate within the very narrow margins of manoeuvre that are available to them.

The question of principle, though, is one that we should not entirely forget. There are those, I know, who believe that East Europeans either do not want or do not need the freedoms that we take for granted and enjoy: freedom of expression and association, trade-union freedom and, of course, the right to choose one's own government. Those who believe that ordinary people in Eastern Europe are fundamentally different from us in Western Europe are quite wrong. Any one who goes to Poland or any other East European country can see how there is, if anything, a greater interest in the freedoms that we hold most dear than one can detect in our countries. Absence makes the heart grow fonder, and what they miss they miss most sharply and most tragically. Members of our Group — Mr Hutton, Mr Tyrrell — have been to Poland in recent months and have come back having noticed this phenomenon extremely clearly, and it is right that in our speeches this afternoon we should make this point — having, of course, emphasized that we can in no way interfere with the status quo by violent or subversive means.

Therefore, Mr President, I support this motion wholeheartedly; I am delighted that it has been possible to agree this motion with almost every Member of this European Parliament — with the exception of the French Communists, who are, let us face it, rapidly becoming the moral lepers of the European Community.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

And I look forward, in spite of the political realities from which the people of Poland are suffering, to the day when they will be able to fulfil the criteria and apply for membership of our Community.

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

Mr Ansart. — *(F)* Mr President, you have asked me to speak on behalf of a party which has five million electors in its own country, a party 75 thousand of whose members gave their lives during the last war to save that country.

(Applause from the extreme left)

That is what I say to that gentleman who has given himself the right — as he quite frequently does — to insult in this Assembly those whom he should be admiring for the consistency of their political attitudes and who in many respects would make an excellent example for his own group.

(Applause from the extreme left)

Having said that I would remind you that this morning Mr Penders, the rapporteur, referring to the heavy responsibility on this Assembly and speaking as he said with prudence, on behalf of his committee, said just that and then turned immediately to describe life in Poland, and went on to make a rapid analysis and some remarks with — and I hope he will forgive me for saying so — considering we were talking about a country like Poland, a quite staggering lack of concern.

The attitude which my colleagues and I share is quite the opposite. Poland is a friendly state, and we have respect for its government and its people. Poland is a country which has come a long way: barely 35 years ago it was backward, unable to support its own population who were forced to emigrate in their millions to the United States, to Canada, to Germany, to France. At that time Poland was oppressed and depressed under the yoke of the colonels. Poland was of interest to no one except the foreign capitalists who held the country in fief, exploiting a cheap labour force which had neither work nor freedom. Poland paid a high price for the war and no one has yet forgotten the six million dead, or the concentration camps and massacred Jews. Ninety-five percent of Warsaw was destroyed, and rebuilt in record time as was Gdansk too, in the style of its great days when the city was one of the great trading centres in the Hanseatic League.

During those 35 years Poland has healed its wounds, rebuilt its ruins, trained graduates, technicians, engineers and managers in tens of thousands, and built big modern production centres. Unemployment has disappeared and the country has rapidly become the tenth greatest industrial power in the world. The government of the Polish Democratic Republic has restored the Poles' independence, their dignity and their historical eminence.

Such rapid development has led to tensions, to contradictions and to problems, and resolving them is

Ansart

the task of the Polish government and workers, and of them alone.

It is intolerable that this Assembly should yet again be over-reaching its mandate, discussing a situation in which it is not concerned when it has neither the moral nor the political right to do so. The resolution which is before us constitutes interference in the internal affairs of Poland which is flagrant, inadmissible, and, as I said once before in the case of Palestine, irresponsible. We have too much respect for the people and government of Poland for the authors of the resolution to lead us into these areas.

Is there not too a certain lack of logic in this resolution which affirms that the Polish people 'alone have the right to determine the future of Poland' whilst each individual point of this self-same resolution is in the form of pretentious advice offered to an inferior people: that is an insult to the Poles. Should this assembly not be showing a little more humility at a time when in the Community's Member States the crisis is worsening and when each day tens of thousands of workers lose their jobs, when almost seven million of them are unemployed and when in 1980, 3 million of those are young people?

How can this Assembly give itself the right to judge, to accord praise or blame when for months it has been refusing to discuss human rights, as we proposed, within the Community? Many of those here who have suddenly become very excited about Poland are very much less enthusiastic when we want to defend the workers of their own countries, workers like the French fishermen who cannot go on strike without becoming the victims of police brutality and government repression. There is no lack of such examples within the Community.

And in addition, the workers of these countries have every right to tell this Assembly and the governments of the Nine to put their own house in order first. How many members who have signed today's resolution have also supported — and continue to support — those colonial wars and ventures which oppress millions, and how many of them find the present situation in Turkey perfectly normal?

I would also like to add that the Polish workers and their government did not wait for this Assembly to finish its holidays before they started, between Poles and only between Poles, to discuss and resolve the problems which they alone have the right to decide both now and in the future.

That said, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of my colleagues I ask once again as my colleague Mr Chambeiron did this very morning, 'when is this Assembly going to discuss human rights in the countries of the European Community?'

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

Mr Haagerup. — (DK) Mr President, for reasons which are obvious, we have been very preoccupied with the events in Poland and it would therefore be unnatural if Parliament were to disregard these events, particularly in view of the fact that a report on human rights in Poland already figured on our agenda following a decision reached before last week's events.

There is, nevertheless, Mr President, no need for the European Parliament to make a bombastic statement. It was the wish of my group that we should keep a low profile on this matter which we will naturally continue to keep a very close eye on. We therefore felt that the original motion for a resolution by the Socialist Group formed an excellent basis for the discussions concerning a joint decision in which I took part on behalf of the Liberal Group. We are very pleased with the fact that it proved possible to agree on a common text which reflects an attitude which has practically the unanimous support of this Parliament, apart from the exception we have just heard.

I should like to express my appreciation of all those Members also involved in the discussions which led to this joint text, including in particular Mr Claude Estier of the Socialist Group who chaired the meetings with great skill and Mr Jean Penders of the Group of the European People's Party for so readily agreeing to withdraw this original and, incidentally, quite excellent motion for a resolution on human rights, thus at the same time and in a different way making a constructive contribution towards the drawing up of our joint text.

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

Mr Israël. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, after Hungary in 1956, Czechoslovakia in 1968, it is now Poland which is the hot-spot of the Communist world. The fate of Poland hangs in the balance. Each of us is aware that one false step, one change in the Polish workers' demands, one single provocation could without any doubt result in Soviet intervention. The events of Budapest and Prague give an idea of the possible scale of the USSR's reactions. Nonetheless, the reactions of the people of Poland cannot be predicted and under the circumstances we must ask ourselves what the Community can do.

It is our view that the EEC's principal task is to concentrate on the forthcoming Madrid Conference. The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe decided on a programme of meetings to measure the progress made in détente. That, Mr President, will be one meeting at precisely the right time.

Israel

Human rights in Poland were going to be on the agenda and we shall have to bring our analysis up-to-date in the light of recent events. Thus the freedom to work, the freedom to strike, the freedom to create free trade unions, freedom from political discrimination in work, are issues which should be raised in Madrid, all the more so because — as I would remind the Communist speaker — the European Community was a signatory to the Helsinki Agreement.

Of course, it would be naive to deny that there is a political side to the discussion of human rights. Freedom of information, the free circulation of ideas, freedom of association: there is a close connection between demands for human rights and political demands, and we would not wish it otherwise.

The principle of non-interference in a State's internal politics has been mentioned. One should perhaps remember that the principle is intended to cover three particular cases: military intervention, the threat of military intervention or the organization of internal subversion in another country. Making a value-judgment on the way in which human rights are being respected in any particular country cannot under any circumstances be considered intolerable interference. Nobody can accuse us of systematic anticommunism.

There is nothing to suggest that it is historically inevitable for an egalitarian communistic regime to be accompanied by limitations on individual human rights. Is socialism with a human face a dream world? The answer to that question lies in the hands of the Communist movement and, alas, so far their reply can hardly be called encouraging. The fundamental ideas of Helsinki are winning ground. Meddling with human rights does not go unchallenged. What was initially intended to be only a verbal agreement is now turning into reality. The Final Act of Helsinki gave the people of the world great hope. Committees monitoring the observance of the Helsinki agreements have taken root in this great cleft in the communist structure. We in the West will continue to be prudent, but we shall continue to stress human rights. We are convinced that the resolution which is before you is the result of quite unprecedented cooperation within this Assembly: there is no need for me to tell you that our Group will support it wholeheartedly. It is my belief that the approval of the resolution will add dignity to this Parliament.

President. — I call Mr Capanna.

Mr Capanna. — (I) Mr President, the political mood in Europe at the moment and the recent events in Poland, represent a real watershed. Many people in both Eastern and Western Europe who comfortably believed that the working class movement was in deep slumber have been shaken out of their complacency by the workers' revolt in Gdansk and Szczecin. The

Polish workers' campaign has been intelligent, resolute and brave; it has been and continues to be a class struggle to establish and reach the goals of freedom and equality. What we are seeing here is a struggle which is reopening avenues to the construction of socialism. That is why the authorities in both East and West do not like it and why, despite the fine words, most of this Assembly does not like it.

Most of you are really afraid that this class struggle will prove contagious. Is it not true that, threatened with 14 000 redundancies, the Fiat workers in Turin have started to say they are going to do the same as in Gdansk? My own hope is that the Polish workers' fighting spirit does prove to be contagious. I have finished, Mr President, because our group had barely three minutes left to deal with all the questions arising this afternoon.

I have spoken for one minute and ten seconds. I am going to donate the other twenty seconds of my speaking time to Mr Klepsch and that of course is a token of my protest and my astonishment that we should have to work in this way.

President. — I call Mr Romualdi.

Mr Romualdi. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is my belief that the European Parliament should pay tribute as never before to the moral courage the political wisdom and the faith — faith not only in their rights but in the Church of their fathers and ours, of their civilization and ours — of the Polish workers who, during a few dramatic weeks, while the world in general and Europe in particular held its breath, led the great campaign to form free trade unions and achieved results whose consequences, though they cannot yet be predicted will undoubtedly be vital in the battle of the peoples of the world to defend their liberty and their independence from Communism and the suffocating political and military presence of Soviet Russia.

A journalist specializing in these matters has said that Mr Walesa and his colleagues in the Lenin shipyards at Gdansk have, by winning the right to set up free trade unions, virtually defeated Stalin.

Personally, I feel that Mr Walesa and his colleagues have done something more than that: they have for practical purposes opened a rift right across the Communist world, throughout its structure and down to its very foundations. They have done away with the Leninist concept of the trade union, which is fundamental to the political, social and economic structure of 'real' communism.

But precisely for this reason it would be a mistaken to think that the situation in Poland has stabilized, that Poland is rid of those grave threats and does not need

Romualdi

from us in the civilized world, from the European Parliament, the greatest attention and the most earnest commitment to keep a constant watch — as is our duty — on how the Polish government carries out the obligations towards the defence of human rights which it undertook as a signatory to the Helsinki Agreement. And at the same time we should be looking at how the other Communist countries have kept their word. We should be doing that as a preparation for the Madrid Conference which, will obviously, above all, be the occasion when we have to decide whether détente is a policy which can be pursued without endangering freedom and the independence of nations: Afghanistan was one lesson to us, and other lessons of the same kind are not far to seek. We do want détente, we do want peace, and we also want — but we want it for everyone — non-interference in other countries internal affairs. But we want all that at the same time as liberty and independence for the peoples and nations who wish to help promote that policy.

In the motion for a resolution which I have the honour to present on behalf of my non-attached Italian colleagues, we ask the Council and the Commission to take appropriate measures to give tangible aid to the people and workers of Poland in overcoming the economic and social difficulties, now so acute, which for years have been typical of the political regime under which that proud nation lives. 'Either Western aid, or, sooner or later, Russian tanks', someone has said. I do not know whether the Polish question can really be reduced to this simple formula, but the Parliament, the Council and the Commission would be mistaken and naive if they did not take it into account when making their future plans.

President. — I call Mr Fergusson.

Mr Fergusson. — Mr President, I would say at once to Mr Ansart that our moral authority to discuss Poland, which he has questioned, is simply this: we too are Europeans.

I want to concentrate in a few minutes on the form and timing of the resolution which, with the support of members of every group in the House, recalls the united concern of the free people of Europe for our fellow Europeans in the east. This resolution is no mere expression of relief and admiration at what has happened and what the Polish workers have achieved. It is equally a statement of apprehension that the gains are an illusion, that the attempt to consolidate them will be undermined and that the Polish people, in a word, will not be allowed to decide their own destiny.

Why do we worry that the Gdansk agreement will not be honoured? Why do we have suspicions that salami tactics, slice by slice, will cut back those minimum rights and freedoms which have been promised? Well,

it is not simply that eastern Europe, the Soviet satellites, have tasted spring before and never seen a summer. For three decades, the course of political seasons there, at their best, has run winter, spring, winter, winter.

We are concerned with something more — the escape clauses, written or spoken. We are concerned at the way Polish events have already been attributed by the Kremlin to anti-socialist forces inside and outside the country. We are concerned, for example, with the third point of the Gdansk protocol dealing with freedom of communication by radio, television and the printed word. How can freedom in this area yet be subject to social control? Whose control?

Mr President, may I presume to remind you, as we contemplate the chances that the Polish people will be permitted to decide their own future, of what Article 29 of the Soviet Union's own 1977 Constitution says: I quote: 'The relations of the Soviet Union to other states are based on the observance of the principle of equality, on mutual renunciation of force and of the threat of force, on inviolability of frontiers, on territorial integrity of states, on peaceful settlements of conflicts, of non-intervention in the affairs of other states, on respect of human rights and of fundamental rights, on the right of every nation to decide its own destiny'.

Is there a catch? Well, indeed there is. If there is any danger that anti-socialist elements so-called are at work, then everything lapses. The formula for waiving the rules is there. Blame anti-socialist forces and you can override everything, agreed or signed.

That is why I must refer you to the paragraph of our joint resolution that mentions our wish for east-west détente, a détente that looks less and less like an assertion of faith and more and more like a pious hope and, after Afghanistan, like a lost cause.

Poland, hardly less than Afghanistan, will be a touchstone of Helsinki, and of the indivisible global, genuine détente which we should have liked to see. Genuine détente, not merely peaceful coexistence interspersed with violent and cruel assertions of the Brezhnev doctrine, but the relaxation of world tension as a result of real and justified trust in the good faith of others.

Afghanistan, as we know, shattered that trust. Even when the invasion, not just the bombing of villages there, ceases, détente will still have a long, long way to go just to recover the ground it has lost.

And how much will the Madrid Conference really mean, for the imprisonment of the monitors of the Helsinki Agreement goes on within Russia? And what of Poland, the very first casualty of the events of August? A vital principle of the Helsinki Final Act was broken both in the spirit and the letter when the free

Fergusson

flow of information was stopped through the jamming of outside broadcasts to the Soviet Union.

We have noted and noticed that the ears of the Russian people have been stopped because their masters, their nurses, their warders, could not bear them to hear the dirty word 'freedom', freedom of association, freedom to strike, freedom to say and write and think what one believes or wants or knows to be true.

Mr President, the only anti-socialist force at work in Poland has been man's fundamental, natural, unquenchable yearning for the freedom which the system would deny them.

President. — I call Mr Galluzzi.

Mr Galluzzi. — (I) Mr President, it is our view that the Gdansk agreements represent the starting point for democratic evolution in Polish society, an evolution we always considered essential to the full socialist flowering of the country and to overcoming the alienation of the party from the people, the citizens from the organizations. The gravity of that alienation has been recognized by all the leaders of the party and of the democratic republic: by Kania and Olszowsky and by Gierek. It is our belief, Mr President, that it has been possible to write this new page of Polish history first and foremost through the merits of the Polish working classes, who had the wit to look not only to the structure but to society and to understand that the assertion of their economic and political rights was closely linked to the economic development and demographic growth of the whole country. But it should not be forgotten, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, that the Polish Workers Party added one decisive contribution to the successful outcome of the crisis, and that was to overcome the misgivings, the schisms, the closures, and to consider the Gdansk agreement not as a temporary mishap, a fault to be corrected as quickly as possible, but as an appeal for liberty and for democracy which sprang from the entire country and which had to be taken up and carried forward.

Together with the composure and the sense of responsibility shown by the Polish working people and party, we must refer to the moderation of a third protagonist in these developments, the church in Poland, which was able to resist the temptation to wait and see, and the temptation to seek confirmation, confirming the national role of the church's leaders and giving its approval to a solution which points towards renewal whilst preserving the country's continuity and unity. It is our hope that this balance, this sense of responsibility can last, because in our view it is the one condition on which the movement for renewal can advance not only in the interests of Poland but in the interests of the whole of the continent of Europe.

The success of the Polish experiment can after all open a new chapter for Europe, can help to resolve the stalemate which until now had Europe divided into two opposing systems, for it replaces the rigidity of two systems with a range of solutions and experiences from which the politics and logic of power blocks can be overcome, and from which independent European initiative can be developed. That is the reason, ladies and gentlemen, why we must help the evolutionary process which has begun in Poland. But helping the process does not just mean that we should all go and put pressure on our governments and or allies to give Poland all the help she needs to recover from her present very serious economic difficulties. It means more than anything else that we should carry on in Europe with the process of détente and disarmament. It was détente in Europe which enabled a new page of Polish history to be written and it is that same détente which constitutes the only possible way, because respect for the rights to freedom and to participate in government is spreading in Eastern Europe and being restricted in many western countries where those particular problems are still far from being resolved.

Furthermore, carrying on the process of détente implies three very specific conditions: firstly that the Soviet Union must understand that a policy of détente and disarmament such as will guarantee its security is very much more important than the doctrine of limited sovereignty, which is in any case neither valid nor appropriate nowadays; secondly that the United States of America must realize that the age of American omnipotence is over and that they must resolve the conflict between their professed willingness to reopen negotiations on disarmament and peace, and their continuing to perfect the first-strike strategy which is a consequence of rearmament and the belief that conflict is inevitable; thirdly, Europeans must understand that, as Chancellor Schmidt said recently, the defence of Europe's interests can no longer be left to the United States, and they must look to balance and stability, first and foremost here in our own continent.

Those, Mr President, are the reasons why the Italian Communists and Allies have subscribed to the joint resolution, and will vote for it.

President. — I call Mr Bettiza.

Mr Bettiza. — (I) Mr President, Council President, ladies and gentlemen, when we look at events in Poland our immediate impression is one of *déjà vu*. In 1956 Edward Ochab fell from grace as a result of a workers' revolt and Wladyslaw Gomulka came to power. In 1970, again as a result of workers' revolt, Gomulka toppled and Edward Gierek came to power. Yet another workers' revolt in 1980 and Gierek falls and Stanislaw Kania comes to power. But in this endlessly repeated cycle of events this time there has been something which was not *déjà vu*.

Bettiza

The situation in Poland, analyzed in the light of the workers' triumph and the political liquidation of Mr Gierek, appears to be inconsistent and dangerous. We have in fact observed from the wings a popular victory which for the first time in an East European Communist country has wrung out, in terms of workers' demands, the maximum possible in that part of the world.

The same thing had already been attempted in 1970 but with one difference: in 1970 the Polish working classes had identified with Mr Gierek. Gierek rose to power because Polish working classes wanted him instead of Gomulka. This time on the other hand, they do not identify with Stanislaw Kania who replaces Gierek at the very moment when the Polish workers are consolidating the advanced positions which they have quite lawfully reached. We all remember how 1970 was summed up in a single deed: Gierek, just elected to the highest position in Poland, went to Gdansk, went to Katowice, went to Silesia, went everywhere to meet the workers. And in the same way Kania, scarcely elected, has gone out to meet not the workers but those party officials whose privileges were one of the targets of the workers' strikes. Now, if that happened at that particular moment of the crisis in Poland, it was obviously because the workers and the party did not manage to reach the agreement which Mr Galluzzi spoke about so excellently. And I should say to Mr Capanna that I agree entirely that the events in Poland could spread elsewhere, including here. But automatically to draw an analogy between what is happening in the West, in Turin, and what is happening in Poland, seems to me rather far-fetched. In Italy we already have a legitimate trade union movement which lawfully represents the Italian working classes and does battle with the employers. And what do we have in Poland? We have a working class, deprived of rights, in conflict with political authority over the legalization of its trade union movement: we have the twentieth century on one hand, and the nineteenth on the other.

If I may make one further observation, it is that the problem is unfortunately not yet resolved. The 20 thousand million dollars loaned to Poland have done nothing either to reconcile the Polish people to the regime, nor to reconcile the regime to the concept of independent trade unions.

We in the Liberal Group are in complete agreement with this motion for resolution on the events in Poland. We are delighted that it should have been developed from a Socialist proposal. In particular we would like to congratulate Mr Estier who has been one of the most assiduous draftsmen of the resolution, which we hope and expect to see approved by this Assembly. In the interests of the Poles themselves we must not overdramatize the situation. We must act prudently and with critical wisdom, but we must not forget that today is the anniversary of 17th September 1939, the day that the Soviet Union and the Red Army entered Poland and divided the spoils with Hitler.

President. — I call Miss de Valera.

Miss de Valera. — Mr President, at the outset I would like to express my Group's admiration for the people of Poland who have taken such a bold step in pursuit of their human rights. We in this Parliament, and the people we represent, take for granted free trade unions, the legal right to strike and the freedom to express any religious belief. In a Communist society such freedoms do not exist. As the Soviet Union is a signatory of the Helsinki Agreement, such freedoms should be available to the people under its control. We have now witnessed the people of Poland claiming these rights. Difficulties will arise over the implementation and interpretation of the Seventh Principle of the Final Act of the Helsinki Agreement, namely, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, but the historical importance of this principle acknowledges the universal significance of human rights and their essential role in assuring the development of friendly relations between the eight signatories and bears crucial relevance to the credibility and success of detente. I am sure the Members of this Parliament, while lending full support to the workers of Poland and acknowledging that now, more than ever, human rights in Poland must be respected, will be watching and monitoring their progress with interest.

President. — I call Mr Almirante.

Mr Almirante. — (I) Mr President, although we put forward an independent document over the name of Mr Romualdi, with which I do of course associate myself, we shall vote for the joint resolution. For that reason I shall restrict myself to one short observation.

More or less all of the speakers, starting with the rapporteur himself, have mentioned non-interference. The French communists mentioned it, which was logical enough since they are the mouthpieces of their Soviet masters and for them non-interference means 'don't meddle in Soviet affairs'. But members of all the other groups have mentioned it in passing too. And if they were doing the right thing from the official point of view, I, from the practical point of view — and that is the one we have in mind when we support the joint resolution — I would like there to be some talk of solidarity. The Europe of freedom, the Europe of the Nine — civilized Europe — has wasted all its previous opportunities to get together with Eastern Europe, and those opportunities were wasted precisely because of the hypocrisy and, if you will allow me to say it, the cowardice with which we went into meetings with those who, on the other side of the Iron Curtain, were trying to produce in their own countries, by lawful means, a climate of social and above all of civil liberty. This is one opportunity which must not be missed. And that is why we should not be talking about non-interference but about solidarity: the real support

Almirante

of every type which Europe should be offering to the noble people of Poland.

President. — I call Mr Antoniozzi.

Mr Antoniozzi. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to speak on the rules of procedure which stipulate that members may not speak to oral questions separately but that they may do so in a debate on resolutions tabled on the same subject. This is neither the time nor the place to discuss questions of procedure and regulations, but it is my belief that every aspect of oral and written questions should be reconsidered so that we avoid this almost total waste and devaluation of a process which should have greater importance here — I am referring to questions — in view of the shortage of legislative and decision-making powers which this Parliament has. On a future occasion I shall ask for an enquiry to consider the experience we have gained on this subject so far.

Now, Poland. The events we all know about had scarcely begun when I asked — in an oral question — for a statement on the position adopted by the Council of Ministers and the Commission, with particular reference to the political problems and to human rights in the light of the final act of Helsinki. I then requested proposals for economic aid to meet the needs of a people who quite clearly had a great many social and economic problems.

Indeed ladies and gentlemen, practically all the political groups represented here will be interested in the events in Poland because, even though we all believe in the principles of liberty and democracy, the events in Poland have demonstrated that those principles possess such power that in the end, and by many different ways, they bring about the re-appearance and reconstitution of the ultimate human realities. A number of voices here and elsewhere have stressed, in terms which are certainly not suited to the significance of the events in Poland, demands for action which might be described as provocative and failing to respect the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other nations. Our view is that the events in Poland are of great significance both politically and in the principles they imply, since by turning upside down conflicting ideas and statements, they confirm that the suppression in Marxists states of political and other rights — including the right to form free trade unions — cannot be justified on any grounds and contravenes basic and natural human rights.

Representatives of some left wing parties have always maintained that the right to strike and a number of other rights could not be imagined in the Communist system since, because the workers themselves were the owners of the means of production, there could never be any major confrontation. That argument is refuted by the events which have taken place in so many east

European countries, both elsewhere and now in Poland. This time too it is not just the political dissidents who are involved in the struggle as was the case elsewhere and on other occasions in Poland itself; this time it is the workers themselves, and their participation has not been on a small scale but as a genuinely popular movement in pursuit of freedom, a movement towards us, towards our way of thinking and towards our principles.

What is more, this political advance towards our own ideas is taking place not only in Poland but here and there in many other countries throughout the world and even in some Communist parties, including a number represented here. We should remember, and by doing so add weight to our future political action, that opinions on human rights, opinions on alliances such as NATO, opinions on the Europe of the Communities and so on have changed radically, and have almost invariably shown that our views were correct. Those of our beliefs which were confirmed by the events in Poland should be enhanced in this debate, and we should feel real gratitude to the Polish workers and people who — and it is no coincidence — are generally Catholic, which goes to show that those who believe in the Christian virtues are closer to real human values than others and are better equipped to defend them both in spirit and in action.

The events in Poland give greater purpose particularly to us Europeans in our aim to strengthen the Community, whose principles have been so clearly shown to be well-founded, universal and closest to the human qualities in which we believe. Thus we express our gratitude to the Polish people and our solidarity with them, together with our hope that, by the most peaceful means possible, their independent action will lead them still further in the regaining of their lost liberty which, as we have seen, was not offset by social or economic progress. Such solidarity should also perhaps be expressed in tangible terms with aid, such as has already been the case with other countries from the Communist world. It is for that reason that it would be both appropriate and helpful if we worked out the best possible means of economic cooperation which will lend a hand to a people who are also oppressed because they still do not have the possibility of determining their own future in a truly democratic way.

That is the responsibility which we should take at the same time as sending our greetings to the people of Poland our message of solidarity, fraternity, gratitude and hope.

President. — I call Mr Tyrrell.

Mr Tyrrell. — Mr President, the report we are discussing is on a motion tabled by myself and others on my return from a visit to Poland last November for

Tyrrell

the anniversary of Poland's Independence Day. Ten months have passed since then, and in a sense it is fortunate that they have, because we are now able to have this debate at a crucial moment in the history of Poland and possibly in the history of Europe. The debate was on the agenda for July, and at that time I tabled three amendments to Mr Pender's report. Those amendments have been overtaken by events and will be withdrawn.

When I was in Poland in November, the Polish people were suffering from grave deprivations of rights which we here take for granted. There were, of course, no free trade unions. There were three small trade unions that were unofficial, membership of which was liable to lead to dismissal from work with no likelihood of re-employment. There was no right to withdraw labour. Those who did were liable to imprisonment. There was no freedom of information or communication. Censorship was vicious. I saw a massive pile of material that had been submitted to the censor by a leading Catholic magazine over a two and a half year period which had been excluded from publication, matters relating to Polish poetry, Polish history and Polish culture all being banned. Robotnik, the workers' magazine, was published surreptitiously. It went out once every three weeks, 20 000 copies, all unofficial, all liable to be confiscated if found, all printed on newsprint obtained through unofficial channels — a massive task, splendidly executed. Above all, of course, I put down my motion because of the arrests. 40 were arrested on the eve of the Independence Day celebrations, and that was common. The 48-hour arrest has been a feature of Poland for a long time now.

The dissidents whom I met were united on one thing, that the flashpoint in Polish society was near. What was going to happen? No one could say with any degree of assurance. What they were determined on was that there should be no violence. It is thus with enormous satisfaction that one can look back and see what they have achieved with no violence but through courage, determination, moderation and skill. If the Gdansk Charter can be implemented, it could mean freedom of speech, freedom of communication, freedom to associate, freedom to strike and, one hopes also, freedom from arbitrary arrest. If these advances can be maintained, it will be historic for Poland.

Implementation will undoubtedly be very difficult. A start has been made, and we can only watch with hope and help when we are asked to help. Genuine *détente* in Europe can be achieved only when there are in the Soviet empire the basic freedoms which we in the West take for granted. Only then can the mistrust between East and West be replaced by trust. The Polish people have pointed the way ahead. The way will be slow and hard, and rushing it would do more harm than good. I am reminded of, and would like to apply to Poland, the sentiments expressed by Lord Tennyson, the British poet, 150 years ago: 'A land of old and just

renown, where freedom broadens slowly down from precedent to precedent'. That will be the way ahead, one hopes, for Poland, and if freedom can broaden slowly down in Poland, then it can broaden slowly down elsewhere. Therein lies the future and the future hopes of this continent. We can only pray God that these hopes may be fulfilled.

President. — I call Mr Tindemans.

Mr Tindemans. — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, before setting out my own thoughts on the subject of human rights in Poland, I should like to compliment Mr Penders on his report and also express my admiration for those Members who have so far spoken in this debate. It is good to hear so many right-minded, serious and sensible things said in this House on a subject which is difficult and delicate in the extreme.

I must admit to a certain sense of apprehension in speaking in this debate organized by the European Parliament on the defence of human rights in Poland. Of course, it would be easy to give a speech on what has happened in Poland and what should happen in the future. But the workers who have been or still are on strike in Poland, and who are taking such action to defend their rights in the face of threats to their liberty or their jobs or their families are in a much more difficult situation than we here. Most of us here are following events in Poland with the greatest possible interest and concern.

Our history books tell us that throughout the nineteenth century and in the early part of the twentieth century, the workers had to fight for their right to form unions to protect their interests and their rights. For many of us, this aspect of the past was the motivating force behind our political beliefs. Now in 1980, when we thought that the age of workers' struggles belonged to the past, we are witnessing in a country not all that far from our own countries — a country which has played an important part in the history of Europe — workers resorting to direct action to obtain precisely that right of free association to enable them to safeguard their interests. Many people, including — let us be honest about this — some in this House, saw the Polish workers' struggle as an act of desperation: courageous, brave, noble, but — many people thought — ultimately hopeless. And we all held our breath as the struggle in Poland unfolded and the negotiations continued.

Ladies and gentlemen, Poland is an integral part of Europe's history and culture. We see the Poles as a kindred people, which is a point I should like to emphasize here in the European Parliament. From Jan Sobieski, the great humanist who led the allied European troops in 1683 in the Battle of Kalenberg to — and I say this not without a tinge of emotion — the

Tindemans

Polish troops who died in my own country, Belgium, Poland has played a great part in Europe, in Europe's history, for the European ideal and for liberty in Europe. And the Poles have often paid for their commitment with their lives. Centuries passed before Poland attained its freedom and independence. The geopolitical situation of the country was responsible for its being drawn again and again into the series of bloody conflicts in Europe. But the vitality of the Polish people has always withstood the test and the Polish nation has frequently re-emerged as a Phoenix from the ashes.

Poland has also made a major, unforgettable contribution to European culture, and has always been linked to our countries by ties of friendship and sympathy.

Let us in this House never forget that Poland is an essential part of Europe, and let us not ignore the Polish people when we think of extending the European Community and searching for better forms of integration. On the contrary, let us, in our search for more European integration and unity, give some thought to how we can work to the benefit of the Polish people.

A number of speakers — including Mr Blumenfeld — have said that, at this critical moment, the European Community should do more for the Polish people in their current difficult situation, and I fully support that view. Let me put it this way: in our search for integration and unity, let us not forget Poland, which is a part of Europe, and let us consider what we could do for the Poles. Let me repeat: Poland has so many ties with our own countries. It is — let me stress — a part of our Europe. The Group of the European People's Party, along with other groupings — and I am delighted at the measure of unity we have achieved so far on this matter — is pleased that a solution has been found to the conflict in which the Polish workers had taken a stand against their Government's policy, a solution which was brought about by both sides in the conflict. That was undoubtedly the best thing that could have happened for Poland itself. We hope and pray that the agreements of Gdansk and Katowice will be fully implemented, unambiguously and without pressure.

We have always taken the view that the Polish problems should be solved by the Poles themselves, and I am sure you know what I mean by that. If no agreement had been reached in Poland after the outbreak of the conflict involving strikes about basic human rights for the workers, there would have been permanent unrest in Poland, but foreign intervention would have had unforeseeable consequences. In particular, any such intervention would have made a laughing-stock of the idea of defending human rights. The spirit of Helsinki, the Final Act of 1975 which was signed by our countries and also by Poland, and the forthcoming Conference in Madrid would — and others have made this point in rather more specific language, but I shall

just repeat it in my own words — in the event of outside intervention have become pointless. If force had been used, the quest for peace and *détente* would have lost all credibility.

The Group of the European People's Party wishes to once again express its solidarity with the Polish people and pay tribute to the Polish workers, who have fought for their cause with honour and dignity in difficult conditions. The Group of the European People's Party calls on the European Parliament to investigate systematically whether or not the agreements of Gdansk and Katowice are being fairly implemented. We must lose no opportunity to let the Polish people know that we are fully aware of their struggle for justice, human rights and a genuine peace, that we are following the progress of their struggle and that we are behind the Polish workers.

The Polish people must be made aware that we regard Poland as an integral part of Europe, and that we therefore stand four-square with the Polish people. Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, at this difficult time for Poland, I am reminded of the cry of hope someone uttered at a particularly gloomy time in Europe's history: in the dark it is good to believe in the light.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

President. — I call Mr Cheysson.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) Madam President, several draft resolutions have suggested the possibility of the Commission taking various courses of action, and that is the reason for my taking part in a debate which is in reality addressed principally to the President of the Nine, since in such a serious question it is at the level of our nine governments that reactions will count.

Of course, I cannot fail to mention the Commission's own deep commitment to the respect of human rights and the feelings we all shared on seeing the calm determination of the Polish people to be heard and to be respected, and the satisfaction we felt on seeing that progress was being made peacefully against a Polish background on terms decided by Poles.

Let me return to the question of the draft resolutions. Of course the Commission will consider what economic and commercial action is possible. However, while giving this undertaking, I should stress that at present trade between Poland and the Community is

Cheysson

scarcely significant economically since Poland's trade with the Community represents no more than 3 % of her GNP. Furthermore a steadying in the balance of trade over the last few years has resulted in an almost exact balance of imports and exports. We shall, Madam President, do everything possible. In particular we shall examine with great interest the Polish Government's own proposals. But I do not think even so that we should make too much of this side of the problem: the important aspect is political and it does not concern us directly.

President. — I call Mr Thorn.

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (F) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I feel somewhat hesitant in taking part in this debate: the Council has of course not yet been able to adopt a joint statement on the question since it has not discussed Poland or reached any decision. Neither have my colleagues given me any instructions under our political cooperation arrangements on outlining their joint attitude to you today.

Even so, it is clear that there is one fundamental idea which has inspired us all and that is our concern to promote and respect human rights. No one is better suited to it than you, Members of Parliament, particularly here at Strasbourg which is the European capital of the human rights which you are defending with such ardour. On this you have my wholehearted support and I can give you my categorical assurance that the government of every member of the Community shares your concern that human rights should be respected not only within our Community but throughout the world. This has been borne out over the years by the words and actions of the heads of governments and their ministers.

I must nonetheless return to the subject of your debate, Poland. Of course, I and the other Foreign Ministers of the Nine have followed recent events in Poland with the greatest of attention. We have done so as observers having the greatest possible interest in the events of a major European country, a country which is, as President Glinne reminded us, traditionally European. Our interest has also been that of political leaders concerned by the developments in a country with which we have had excellent relations frequently, as we have been reminded, going far back through history. And we have done so with feelings of genuine concern for a country which has experienced all too many griefs over the centuries.

I will not conceal from you, that our view of the agreements which have been concluded, freely concluded this time, between the Polish workers and their political leaders, is totally positive. We are particularly appreciative of the fact that these agreements have been concluded without outside interference and

I am especially pleased that we are united here in our approval of that fact. But I believe I am interpreting my colleagues' opinions correctly if I state that it is certainly not for us to go any further in the attitude we adopt. A truly essential element is and will remain the freedom of the Polish people to reach their decisions without outside interference from any source whatsoever, as indeed Mr Blumenfeld and others have said during this debate.

I would like to join Mr Tindemans in congratulating you, and congratulating this entire Assembly on the discretion with which the rapporteur opened the debate and the dignity with which Members of all groups have spoken. It is most gratifying that within the European Parliament — especially within the European Parliament — representatives of all groups and of all countries should have spoken without any distinction being apparent between an opposition and a majority. It is particularly important that here in this vital extremely political, extremely sensitive area, we should appear as a community, committed to Community actions and Community beliefs. Let us not forget that there are some who do not see these developments with the same sympathetic view as ourselves, and who might be only too grateful for the grounds to accuse us of interfering. Have we not already heard a number of more or less explicit suggestions of this? For alas European history shows that the strict principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other countries is not always strictly observed. And the lesson we must learn from that is that we must abstain from any action which could give other people the slightest excuse for interfering in Polish affairs. The very objective, very moderate tone of your debate gives me reason to believe that the European Parliament shares our views on this subject. Poland deserves all our support. Poland deserves more than anything else to be left alone to decide her own future freely. That does not prevent the Members of this Community from considering sympathetically any requests for economic collaboration which are put to them by Poland. And of course that goes for every one of the Nine. I believe that every one of them has indicated that it would be favourable to any such requests. And since Commissioner Cheysson has already been kind enough to give the Commission's views on Poland's relations with the Community itself there is no need for me to repeat them.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

9. *Situation in Turkey*

President. — The next item is the joint debate on the following two motions for resolutions on Turkey:

President

- by Mr Fanti and others on the *coup d'état* in Turkey (Doc. 1-392/80)
- by Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) and Mr Bangemann on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the events in Turkey (Doc. 1-396/80).

I call Mr Spicer on a point of order.

Mr Spicer. — Madam President, before we begin this debate I wish to point out that an undertaking was given this morning to the leader of my group, Mr Scott-Hopkins, that Question Time would start promptly at 5.30 p.m. I am sure that is your wish as well. All I would like to say, Madam President, is that, as someone who has been involved in the affairs of Turkey for a great many years, I really do believe that in less than an hour we really cannot do full justice to a subject of this magnitude. I wonder if you could bear in mind the need for us, at a later occasion, when we have at our disposal information which we do not have at the moment, to hold a proper debate on this topic. At the moment information on what is a changing situation is arriving almost by the hour. I think that what most of us would hope to hear today is some contribution from the President-in-Office of the Council who is the only person here today who has any background knowledge of events in Turkey over the last week. But I would be grateful for the assurance that we will come back to this matter at a later date. Since I know that people in Turkey will be sadly disappointed if the only occasion on which we discussed their affairs was at a time when the situation was developing almost by the hour.

President. — If, when it is drawing up the draft agenda, the Bureau receives specific proposals for scheduling a new debate on this question, it will obviously take them into account.

I call Mr Segre.

Mr. Segre. — (*I*) Madam President, Mr President of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, the circumspection with which the Council and Commission have expressed a view — or rather failed to express a view — on the military *coup* in Turkey, refraining from clearly condemning this offence against democracy and freedom and this violation of the human rights which are enshrined in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference — which Turkey signed — is in our view a sad and bitter fact. Not only was no condemnation made, not only was there a failure to stress verbally and by corresponding decisions the incompatibility of membership of, or association with, the Community of countries where freedom and democracy have been abolished, but no more was expressed than general concern and a vague hope that at an unspecified future

date those who carried out the military *coup* may wish and be able to restore a democratic regime.

Are historical arguments about the rôle played in the past by the Turkish armed forces, from the time of Atatürk onwards, or mention of the recent tragic events in Turkey, the worsening of terrorism or the threat of economic bankruptcy enough to justify this agnostic attitude to a military *coup d'état*? Our reply, although we are not unaware of Turkey's suffering, must be firmly in the negative.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, may I speak especially as a citizen and parliamentarian of a country where it is in terms of democracy — with considerable participation by the great mass of the people, as recently shown by the response to the terrible massacre perpetrated in Bologna on 2 August by right-wing terrorists — that we fight against terrorism, subversion and the serious economic crisis. Well, this, too, is a bitter pill for us to swallow. To the Italian people, which is fighting in its own and Europe's interest to defend and develop democracy and to defeat the enemies of democracy and freedom, the circumspection and hesitations of the Commission and Council in the face of the military *coup* in Turkey seem not merely incomprehensible but also a sign of serious political insensitivity.

For that reason, ladies and gentlemen, we ask the European Parliament — in its independent rôle and in accordance with those basic principles of democracy and freedom the violation of which, if it is to be condemned, must be especially condemned when it occurs in one's own camp — to display the sensitivity which events in Turkey call for and to express a firm and clear position. We ask it on behalf of the Turkish people, especially on behalf of our Turkish parliamentary colleagues, who deserve our active support, and we ask it on behalf of our own people and in the interest of democracy and freedom throughout the world.

President. — I call Mrs Gredal on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Gredal. — (*DK*) Madam President, we in the Socialist Group have for some time now been following the events in Turkey with some concern and anxiety. Violations of human rights and murders, including murders of politicians, have been daily events in that country. This, together with the enormous difficulties with which Turkey is faced in its economy and Parliament, where it was not possible to elect a President even after 200 votes had been held, have regrettably led to the situation in which Turkey finds itself today.

I should like to stress that facts of the kind I have just mentioned do not, however, make a military *coup d'état* more acceptable. There should be no doubts as regards the attitude of the Socialist Group regarding

Gredal

military *coups*. We cannot accept this sort of attack on democracy. This military *coup* in Turkey has led to the dissolution of political parties and trade unions and the detention of a large number of leading politicians and members of the national assembly. We in the Socialist Group are deeply concerned for our Turkish counterparts in the party led by Bülent Ecevit and our Turkish colleagues in the joint delegation.

For 50 years now the way in which Turkey has been working towards establishing a tradition of democracy has been admirable. It is this tradition which has now been broken. Nevertheless, we must also acknowledge the fact that the generals have given their explicit assurance that the democratic institutions will soon be re-established and that they will respect human rights and vouch for the treatment of the people currently under arrest in one form or another. As we in the Socialist Group see it, this process must get under way immediately. We do not wish at this point to cause further problems for the people of Turkey by proposing that all aid to that country should be curtailed. We do however wish to stress that this attitude is based on the assumption that the generals' promises regarding the re-establishment of the democratic institutions and the release of political prisoners will be put into practice as swiftly as at all possible. In this respect, we are in complete agreement with the Council which has also made its decision to continue cooperation with Turkey conditional on a rapid change in the situation. For our part, we will keep a close eye on daily developments in Turkey.

Finally, I should like to add that we hope and expect to be able to meet our colleagues in the Turkish delegation to the Community as soon as possible, either here or in Turkey.

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

Mr Lemmer. — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, Turkey has unfortunately been in an extremely difficult situation for a very long time. The various governments which have succeeded each other in the last few years were unable to take the necessary measures and to have them accepted by the Turkish parliament. One of the external manifestations of this, which I offer as an example, is that in more than 200 ballots it was impossible to elect a president. Turkey's economic and financial bankruptcy is public knowledge and has so far been averted only by granting comprehensive aid. The large number of murders committed every day is reminiscent of a state of semi-civil war. Faced with this situation, the armed forces had already delivered a warning 8 months ago. This warning was not delivered out of the blue. The Turkish constitution is the only constitution which bestows on the armed forces a specific role as its guardians.

This was the basis for that warning and quite obviously also for the takeover of power. As a result, this step cannot be compared with the *putsches* which the South American generals carry out and we should not draw any such comparison. It is not the first time that the Turkish armed forces have intervened in a crisis, but whenever the Turkish army has acted in this way it has always handed back power of its own accord to a civilian government. The Turkish armed forces have once more promised to do this.

We should follow developments very closely and not allow the Turkish generals to forget their promise and their responsibility in this matter. On the other hand, we should not corner them in such a way as to render their subsequent and voluntary return to a parliamentary democracy more difficult. I thus agree with the previous speaker that we should continue our cooperation with the Turks as long as we are able to work on the assumption that they are truly determined to re-establish democracy in Turkey.

The other thing we should do is to ask the Council and the Commission to keep us abreast of further developments in Turkey. We should make any measures we intend to take in the future dependent upon this and, if circumstances require it, hold another debate in this House which is not restricted to a mere half-hour. I believe that with these measures we can help the Turkish people to overcome the difficulties they have in their country as rapidly as possible and help them quickly to return to a lawful parliamentary democracy.

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

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, I find myself in the happy position of not disagreeing with what the two previous speakers, Mrs Gredal and Mr Lemmer, have said, although I disagree with the point of view of the speaker who opened this debate.

I do not have to underline, Madam President, the seriousness of the recent events in Turkey. My Group deplores the appalling record of sectarian violence which has been a feature of Turkish political life over the past few months, indeed longer than that, and which of course has led to the reluctant assumption of power by the armed forces. It really has been a terrible series of events in Turkey and one's heart goes out to the Turkish people.

In our view, General Evren and his National Security Council have but one task in front of them, as has been said by both the previous speakers, namely to re-establish conditions in which democracy and liberty can flourish.

But, of course, events are moving with enormous rapidity, Madam President, to such an extent that it

Scott-Hopkins

would be wrong to go into too much detail now. So I recommend to you and to the House what my honourable friend, Mr Spicer, said a little earlier on: I hope that when we have more information at a later stage we shall be able to have a further debate on this very serious matter because, as I said, events are moving remarkably quickly. One hopes that the path back to freedom and liberty and democracy in Turkey will be found equally rapidly.

But I must say to the House that, of course, we will judge General Evren by his achievements, and not merely by his assurances. I hope sincerely that he will move in that direction.

At the moment I think it is right to give him the benefit of the very considerable doubt which attaches to any kind of military takeover. He surely must realize that he needs the support of this Community and this House if the Turkish economy is going to be restored to health, as we all of us hope. And I hope he will take the opportunity of reviewing the situation both internally and in the field of foreign affairs to see whether he cannot make a gesture of good will towards the Community. I believe it is important that he should.

I think, however, that the more we say now, Madam President, the more difficult matters may well become. For after all, as I have already said, it is a fast-moving scene and we do not want to make the life of the ordinary people of Turkey, which has been referred to by previous speakers, more difficult. Nor do we want to hinder in any way the return to democratic rule in Turkey.

So I hope this House will take note of the situation and come back to it when events and facts are clearer, and then be able to take a more balanced view of what should be done in the light of the circumstances as they may well be in a few weeks or months time.

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

Mr Frischmann. — (F) Madam President, since this morning's debate I have learnt of the communiqué issued by the Council of Foreign Ministers of the nine Member States which expresses the views of their respective governments and which states, with what is perhaps unseemly haste that they have noted the reassurances offered by the new Turkish rulers concerning the rapid re-establishment of democratic government in Turkey. The Council has thus decided not to break off diplomatic relations between the European Community and Turkey.

And we have also heard the first speeches in this debate, most of which display the same apparent, or rather hypocritical, innocence towards the military takeover in that country. So we now have the truth,

solid confirmation of what I wished to say this morning, that is that a military *coup* of this nature can take place, that thousands of arrests can be made, that the Turkish Parliament can be closed, that democratic and trade union organizations can be disbanded, and that all this can leave certain people with an easy conscience and with their voices suddenly hushed. All that is needed is that this *coup d'état* be announced by President Carter before anyone else and that it take place during the NATO manoeuvres in Turkey.

This is obviously a flagrant and incontrovertible example of the ever-changing and indeed false attitudes which are adopted on the question of defending human rights and democracy. Workers and democrats in all countries, and those of Turkey with cruel clarity, will draw their own conclusions from an attitude of this kind.

As for us, we uphold the wording of our motion for a resolution which unconditionally condemns the *coup d'état* carried out in this country, which is linked to the EEC by an association agreement, and our motion demands as a result that all relations between the EEC and Turkey be suspended for as long as the military junta refuses to relinquish the power it has unlawfully assumed.

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

Mr Beyer de Ryke. — (F) Madam President, I should first of all like to say that I consider it quite out of place to draw comparisons between events in Turkey and in Poland during this debate. My only reply to the Communist speaker is: 'Long live Poland!'

The Liberal and Democratic Group is motivated by the desire to avoid any confusion between the facts and the principle. On the principle, I should say that the vast majority of the Members of this Parliament — however, in saying this, my gaze is not directed to the person opposite me — are deeply attached to the principle of parliamentary democracy, a principle which was being flouted daily in Turkey — and previous speakers have reminded us of this fact —, murders were being committed every day and, Mr Frischmann, no doubt many of your comrades were murdered too and, in spite of you, and perhaps against your better nature, I am taking up their defence.

Ladies and gentlemen, it was out of the question to allow a government which could not guarantee law and order in its streets, a government which was attacked by both leftist and rightist extremists, to continue to exist, since it was quite unable to impose its power. I believe that the facts in a given situation must be fully considered. I also believe that, unfortunately for Turkey and for parliamentary democracy in Turkey, hatred existed between Mr Ecevit and Mr

Beyer de Ryke

Demirel and that this made any coalition government quite impossible. They make me think of the liner in Barres' writings which you have perhaps read, in which he speaks of that nascent, creeping hatred which shows on peoples' faces and which can be found in some parliamentary assemblies — although I hope not in ours. It was that hatred which motivated Mr Ecevit and Mr Demirel.

This is why the minority government in Turkey was quite unable to face up to the situation. And you must believe me, ladies and gentlemen, that I too am sorry that the marches heard in Turkey now do not echo Mozart and that chamber music has had to give way to military marches. But if this chamber music has had to give way to military marches, it is simply because the chamber music had become mere caterwauling.

Fellow Members of the European Parliament, we heartily desire to see a democratic and parliamentary regime re-established in Turkey as soon as possible. But I should like to say that even if there is today a new government which we have not chosen, which was forced on us by circumstances, this has had one effect, whose outcome I would not hazard to guess, but which is at any rate an immediate effect, that is that for the first time in years negotiations between the Greeks and the Turks concerning Cyprus have been restarted, and I think that this is a positive step.

Having said this, I am naturally — and in the Liberal and Democratic Group we are extremely demanding on this point — fully behind those of you in this House who are passionately concerned about defending human rights and freedom, but I do not think that the Turks were any better protected under a régime where murders were carried out daily. So, I say a wholehearted yes to parliamentary democracy, to a parliamentary democracy with responsible Members of Parliament who are prepared to accept all the responsibilities that holding power and governing imply!

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

Mr Israël. — (*F*) Madam President, it is never pleasant to wake up one morning to see troops posted at every street corner. It is never pleasant to hear that the members of a government have been imprisoned, that human rights and liberties are denied and that during the night parliament has been dissolved. Especially on this last point, the events in Turkey are extremely worrying.

However, if we look closely at the declarations of intent made by those who carried out this dawn takeover, we are forced to conclude that this is not the language normally used by dictators and power seekers. It is seldom that one hears such people say that

democracy will be immediately re-established, that human rights will be respected, and that members of parliament will not be tried for their political acts.

We should pay special attention to the situation in which this country finds itself, a country which, like Poland, is one of today's trouble spots. There was a real threat of Turkey's disintegrating, a very real threat. Perhaps I am being a little too bold if I say that one of the dangers threatening Turkish unity was that of a fanatical Islamic movement originating in Iran. What would have happened if Turkey had woken up to iranization? It is quite clear that, had this been the case democracy would have been at much greater risk than it is today.

Nonetheless, my Group felt that the situation was so complicated that no rash moves should be made. This is why, as you may have noted, we have tabled no motions for a resolution, and why I am able to tell you now that we shall abstain from the vote on the Communist text — which is much too clear cut and too brash — but we shall also abstain from the vote on the Socialist text because of the first paragraph.

What we should quite simply like to see is the European Parliament firmly stating that it is against the dissolution of any Parliament wherever it may be in the world, but above all we should like it to be reiterated that Turkey has signed and ratified the European Convention on Human Rights which lays down that individual human rights should be respected. Reiterating this fact should suffice to show that we are on our guard and that we shall not stand for the slightest attack on individual freedoms.

I should just like to make a short remark on one of the provisions of Article 25, the European Convention on Human Rights, which establishes the right of an individual to petition directly to the European Court sitting at Strasbourg. Turkey, Cyprus and Malta — and unfortunately France too — have not ratified the declaration which is contained in Article 25, and which grants the right to an individual to petition. Had this declaration been made by Turkey, then we should be far easier in our minds and we would be able to watch the situation much more closely.

Madam President, I take it upon myself to call upon this House to show great caution in this Turkish affair and to demonstrate our passionate interest and constant vigilance where individual freedom is concerned. If the promises concerning the liberalization of the country were not kept, then this House and my group would be in the forefront of those who wish to see Turkey return to its former democratic system.

President. — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — (*I*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I must say that I was shocked by the way

Bonino

in which some of the previous speakers sought to justify the *coup* — and, in particular, the Liberal speaker, who made a subtle distinction between the factual problems and questions of principle, left me not only perplexed but truly shocked.

Mr Beyer de Ryke, if we start saying that in principle parliamentary democracy is of undoubted value, but that in practice — when there is terrorism or violence — a *coup d'état* which at last ensures order can be desirable, why should we not then accept even the idea of a *coup d'état* carried out in advance in order to prevent undesirable developments? Furthermore, anyone who believes that the inevitable problems of democracy can be solved by a *coup d'état* or a military dictatorship, rather than by greater courage and more democracy, would undoubtedly have justified a Russian intervention in Poland if the Polish workers' struggle had been less peaceful and had caused some international disturbance.

Indeed, this justificatory argument is precisely the one which is used to consolidate the division of Europe and the world into two blocs within which one of the hegemonic powers intervenes in Afghanistan and the other in Turkey. There is no doubt that the *coup d'état* in Turkey corresponded to the more or less explicit wishes of NATO. There is no doubt that it is, to say the least, a violation of legality. I have no sympathy with those who produce excuses such as 'there was unemployment, there was terrorism, it was impossible to go on like that'.

Ladies and gentlemen, I think that arguments of that kind take us along a very dangerous road. Perhaps you think that a *coup d'état* would be justified in Italy if the government failed to check terrorism or if — let us say — there were another three or four attacks on Fiat personnel? There is no doubt that democracy has its problems. But it does not follow at all that a total lack of democracy and the violation of law are valid remedies.

In my view pious intentions or hopes for a speedy relinquishment of power on the part of the army in favour of the civil government achieve nothing. However, I think we have a way of hastening this transfer of power: we must take up a very firm and tough position as regards the *coup d'état*, for one cannot cooperate with those who use violence — neither with those who violate law nor with those who violate human life. For that reason we shall ask Parliament to approve the amendments we have tabled calling for the suspension of any negotiation and any agreements with Turkey.

Gentlemen, your justificatory attitude worries me greatly.

President. — I call Mrs Dekker.

Mrs Dekker. — (NL) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, in the few minutes' speaking time available

to me on this subject, I should like to say to begin with that the seizure of power by the militaries in Turkey cannot and should not give any rise to a feeling of satisfaction. However exceptional or special the circumstances and background may be in Turkey, it must be a basic principle that no regime can and should overthrow a democracy. We have therefore followed recent developments with great concern. It may be that this development was inevitable in view of the admittedly extremely worrying social and economic conditions in that country and the fact that democracy had effectively ceased functioning. In this respect, I cannot go along with the previous speaker as regards the conditions we can create to ensure that the military leadership keeps its promise of restoring democracy in the near future. I should like to give them the benefit of the doubt, but for only a short period, and I take a short period to mean weeks rather than months. We must not lose sight of the fact that this situation was precipitated by social and economic, as well as political, circumstances. I would therefore urge this House not to jeopardize the means at its disposal for creating the kind of climate in which a democratic system can once again function effectively. I do not think I need explain in this House what a democratic form of government involves.

Finally, Madam President, it seems to me that this situation — just like the debate we have just had on Poland — indicates once again the need for us in the Europe of the Nine to formulate clear principles as regards democracy, basic rights and human rights, the very principles which we think governments should abide by and which we should like to see laid down in the form of a charter.

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (F) Madam President, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, what is important is to identify the cause of last week's events correctly, and indeed there is no guarantee that they represent the climax, because today's calm on the surface may only be a sort of lull before a storm of repression.

The cause, it appears to us, is not terrorism as such, because the odious cancer which terrorism undoubtedly represents cannot grow in a politically and socially healthy body. Moreover, as early as 1978 very far-reaching repressive measures were taken in Turkey, such as the imposition of martial law in at least one-third of the territory. Since then there have been further very serious restrictions on democratic liberty, such as the refusal of the government and military authorities to authorize the latest May Day celebrations, or the occupation by the army of the central offices of the Confederation of Progressive Turkish Trade Unions, the DISK, on 30 April last, during which 23 leaders were arrested. The underlying cause of the events is in our opinion the enormity of the

Glinne

economic and social injustices which, in spite of certain efforts, still characterize Turkish life.

The Commission of the European Communities, using terms which reveal a distinct desire to be prudent, recognize this in its recent reply — not yet published, I believe — to my Written Question No 113/80. The Commission asserted that measures were necessary, in particular an increase in external economic and financial support, in order to cement the consensus between the different social groups in Turkey.

But the famous 'certain degree of consensus between the different social groups in Turkey' to which the Commission referred can only be established in a lasting manner if quite astonishing and anachronistic social injustices are abolished, and this in itself is not possible without the assistance of political and social organizations eager for change. It is therefore a vicious circle. This explains our disapproval on principle of any take-over of power by the military and our scepticism with regard to the alleged neutrality to the fundamental effectiveness of the provisional regime which has just taken over. To smother is not to cure, to wipe out the traces is not the same as eradicating an evil.

Furthermore, there is the obligation to show solidarity with democracy, based on specific international commitments. On 27 April 1977, the Official Journal of the European Communities published an impressive and very far-reaching statement bearing the signature of Mr Colombo for the Parliament, Mr Owen for the Council and Mr Jenkins for the Commission and declaring allegiance to the constitutions of Member States and similar allegiance to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. It also referred to the specific areas on the international political scene which were a matter of concern to the whole Community of the three institutions.

In addition to commitments to the Community itself — and contrary to what Mr Israël said just now — Turkey also ratified the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms; this fact is well known and has been duly welcomed. Moreover the Commission of the European Communities makes explicit reference to it in its reply to the Written Question which I tabled and which I mentioned just now.

Consequently, Madam President, we must explain why we agree with the joint resolution for which the majority of Parliament will probably vote shortly. We regard this resolution as a warning shot. The value of the text resides mainly in its first paragraph, which cannot be clearer. It reads as follows: 'The European Parliament urgently requests that steps be taken immediately towards guaranteeing for the Turkish people the enjoyment of political and trade union freedoms, within a democratic institutional framework'. The

quality of this paragraph merits a favourable vote by Parliament on the proposed resolution. This vote means that, for our part, we shall not cease to act until the day when political and trade union liberties are accessible to the Turkish people within democratic institutions worthy of that name.

President. — I call Mr Spicer.

Mr Spicer. — Madam President, as I said during my earlier speech, I have been involved both as vice-chairman and as rapporteur of our Turkish committee for many, many years, and I think the background knowledge that I have built up and the affection that I have for the people of Turkey are almost unrivalled in this present Parliament.

Mr Lima, Mr Israël and Mr Beyer, in what they have said about what we in this Parliament should now be doing and the way in which we should be acting, have struck the true note. One of the things that worry me is that in the weeks and months ahead there will be an increasing volume of orchestrated opinion from the far left determined to undermine whatever is going to happen in Turkey in the future. I am prepared to follow Mr Israël's view that the line taken by the new President of Turkey has been quite clear. He does not wish to remain in power, he does not wish the army to remain in power; he wants to hand power back to a democracy that will really work. The first steps along that road have already been taken, and, Madam President, I hope it will not be long before you, as President of this Parliament, will have the opportunity of welcoming Senator Inan, who holds the gold medal of this Parliament and who was chairman of the Turkish delegation to the Joint Parliamentary Committee for so many years.

What I am worried about is the maintenance of our links in the weeks and months ahead, and I do hope that you, Madam President, and the Bureau will look with sympathy upon the maintenance of those links, tenuous though they may have to be in the early stages — but for heaven's sake, let us not put Turkey on one side and ostracize her completely in parliamentary terms!

Secondly, may I make the plea that we follow the course plotted by both the Council and the Commission. I am the last person to follow the Council and the Commission on many things, but they do have information available to them which perhaps is not available to us.

If I may say so to Mrs Bonino, the ill-informed views that she holds about the withholding of aid to Turkey will not change matters in Turkey, except to make life more difficult for those people at the bottom of the economic pile. And this is something that none of us would wish to see happen.

Spicer

So, Madam President, I can say that I am relieved and happy at the tone in which this debate is being conducted today. I hope you will bear in mind the need for us to return again, and we look forward with great interest to hearing a few words from the President-in-Office of the Council.

President. — I call Mr Martin.

Mr Martin. — (F) Madam President, I have just received a telegram which I should like to bring to the notice of Parliament, on behalf of the French Communist and Allies Group.

Mr Noël, the Secretary General of the Commission in Brussels, that is the highest official in the Commission, has just stated to a Turkish daily newspaper, *Houriyet*, that 'We hope that there can be a return to democracy now that order has been restored by the Turkish army'. I wish to put a formal question to the Member of the Commission, Mr Natali, who is present here. Is it with the agreement of the President of the Commission, that Commission which appears to be so concerned with human rights, that its Secretary General states that the Turkish army has restored order in that country? If that is the Commission's position, what an admission and what support for the standpoint of NATO and the United States!

In the meantime, this can only confirm our opinion that this *coup d'état* war financed by NATO with, of course, the total backing of the Commission. What have you got to say, Mr Natali? We await your explanation.

President. — I call Mr Capanna, to whom I can allow only two minutes.

Mr Capanna. — (I) I thank you, Madam President, even though these two minutes are a concession. It would be better if they were an acknowledged and established right.

It has already been said that, by talking of inevitability, one can justify any historical event, especially a military *coup d'état*. The perpetrators of *coups d'état* have always maintained that their action was indeed inevitable, whether they were the Greek colonels, Pinochet, the Bolivian military or others.

Of course, in Turkey, there was right- and left-wing terrorism and a very difficult social and economic situation. History shows that all this can be overcome not by suspending and repressing basic democratic freedoms but on the contrary, by broadening and strengthening them. The history of Turkey itself and the earlier *coups d'état* show that the army failed to cope with the serious social, economic and political problems of that country.

There can therefore be no doubt that when we vote on these motions, if the European Parliament's condemnation of the *coup* is not clear-cut and if Parliament does not therefore convey to the Council the need to take as soon as possible all the necessary measures to induce the Turkish military to return to barracks, if none of this happens, it will be a truly black day in the history of this Parliament elected by universal suffrage.

President. — I call Mr Romualdi.

Mr Romualdi. — (I) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I, too, agree that the events in Turkey must arouse bitterness and sadness. A *coup d'état*, whatever the reasons for it, must be a cause for concern, and therefore what has occurred in Turkey cannot but arouse concern.

But we must bear in mind the tragic depths to which Turkish democracy had sunk, with thousands of dead in terrorist acts of every political colour, on the brink of civil war if not already involved in civil war. Let us reflect on the frightening economic situation, with inflation galloping at the rate of 150 % and a recession extending to virtually every sector. If we bear all this in mind we must ask ourselves what else could have occurred but a different kind of *coup d'état*, Mrs Bonino, or a full-scale civil war — i.e. a much more serious and tragic disaster, the most tragic of all disasters. For the moment the generals have not saved democracy but they have certainly saved the Turkish people. The future will not hold an immediate return to democracy, but at least it will be less bleak and tragic.

Like everyone else, of course, we hope that the generals will rapidly revitalize a bad constitution and a bad democracy, which have led to the tragic situation in which the Turkish people now find themselves. I repeat, we hope that they will be able to move rapidly from military government to a new and efficient democracy, capable of giving government to the country and guidance to the State, and providing all the guarantees of freedom and full respect for human rights for which we and all others hope.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the Commission is following with concern and careful attention the development of events in Turkey, indeed with the same concern and careful attention with which we followed the action of the armed forces, bearing in mind the growing economic difficulties, the social tensions which accompanied them, the widespread terrorism and all the other problems — a situation which was reaching civil war proportions, with thousands of dead over a few months.

Natali

Turkey is a large country which from January 1 next will border on the territory of the Community. It is already linked to the Community by a special association agreement and has cultural, historical, political and emotional ties with the countries of the Community. In the past, in the history of the efforts made by that country to become a secular and modern State, the armed forces have intervened a number of times and have always kept their promises to restore the democratic institutions of the country, as Mr Lemmer stressed in his speech.

The Commission therefore takes note of the assurances now given once more on this fundamental point. We also take note of the statements by the Turkish rulers on the guarantees that they mean to give with regard to the treatment of the politicians who are currently under surveillance. Moreover, the Commission will be as vigilant as possible in monitoring respect for human rights, and the treatment received by politicians and trade union leaders. In this context, I would like to tell Mrs Gredal that we are ready to associate ourselves with any steps that the European Parliament may take, including steps with a view to obtaining information and guarantees on the fate of the Turkish members of the EEC-Turkey Parliamentary Committee.

With a view, then, to a restoration of the democratic order in Turkey, the Commission reaffirms its belief that Turkey's association with the Community is based on the irrevocable criteria of respect for human and civil rights and democratic order, principles which form the basis of the very existence of the Community.

Madam President, this is the Commission's position, which moreover had already been set out in a statement which the Commission issued immediately after the events in Turkey. I am not aware of the statements to the press mentioned in this debate. I can only say that the Commission's position is that which I have just set out. Moreover, I wish to say that, in this spirit of vigilant expectation, as the Council of Ministers stated yesterday, we think we must maintain for the time being the cooperation envisaged by the association agreement, in the hope — which has been expressed from many sides in this Parliament — that the democratic institutions in Turkey will be restored as soon as possible to their normal functioning.

President. — I call Mr Thorn.

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (F) Madam President, as you know, yesterday and the day before yesterday in Brussels the ministers discussed recent events in Turkey. They did so because, quite simply, it is their duty to concern themselves with the Community's future relations with an associated country.

The debate which took place between us can be situated in the context of political cooperation. Let me say very briefly that, on the basis of the information available, discussions followed three broad lines.

First of all there was an exchange of views on events in Turkey before the military *coup*, events which themselves contain the reasons for the intervention of the General or at least the reasons given by him. I will not attempt to list the difficulties of various kinds which Turkey has experienced in recent years; some of you have just mentioned them. All this is perfectly well documented by information sources accessible to all, and will undoubtedly contribute to the future assessment of the decision taken by the military authorities. It is not up to me to assess that decision here and now.

As regards the take-over of power by the military, all we could do in the Council was note with concern the so-called 'suspension' of democracy, as you have done yourselves. It is always, and I emphasize this, deeply regrettable when, for whatever reasons, parliamentary institutions are overthrown by force.

In saying this I support Mrs Bonino and Mrs Dekker, and I believe that we are all unanimous on this point. You as members of Parliament, myself as Minister — my legitimacy is also derived from a parliament — we cannot but regret, unanimously that a situation can arise in which the democratic life of a country ceases to exist. It is therefore with all the greater interest that the Ministers of the Nine took note of the promises, one can even say assurances, given by the military authorities regarding the rapid restoration of democratic institutions. These assurances concern — and I quote — respect for human rights and guarantees as to the treatment of politicians and public figures who are under house arrest. These assurances were repeated formally and publicly yesterday evening by the present Head of State. We must be able, I would even say we must be willing to hope that these assurances which we have been given and which were repeated yesterday will be fully and rapidly respected and that Turkey will soon regain its status as a parliamentary democracy.

Let me assure Mr Frischman that we did not adopt our point of view in haste. No. We took note of these declarations, because we hope in this way to encourage and exhort the present government or the military at present in power to restore democracy rapidly. We believe that in reacting thus we have a somewhat greater chance — at least at present — of bringing back the democratic system, which is what you wish.

I have summed up for your very briefly, ladies and gentlemen, the fundamental preoccupations expressed by my colleagues and which are shared by all. The line of argument followed in our debate was that, in view of the three above-mentioned factors, we should at present opt to continue cooperation between the Community and Turkey, being aware of course that, if we acted differently, we would accentuate the crisis in

Thorn

Turkey even further. And who would we be penalizing? It would be the whole Turkish people, which is certainly not involved in what is being called here a 'coup d'état'. And need I remind this Assembly, certain of whom have compared, privately or officially, the situation in Turkey to that which existed over six years ago in Greece, that in that case we did not suspend the association before a very long period had elapsed, waiting then also for the situation to evolve. That therefore is what the Council or what the nine Foreign Ministers decided yesterday and the day before yesterday. Believe me — I assure you of this because this was the decision taken by the nine Foreign Ministers — we will follow the situation in Turkey day by day very closely. Only the future, Madam President, will show us if we should re-examine our line of action.

President. — The debate is closed.

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

10. *Urgent procedure*

President. — I have received two motions for resolutions with request for urgent procedure pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure:

- by Mr Glinne and others on the termination of Mrs Macciochi's appointment with the French university (Doc. 1-395/80)
- by Mr Calvez and others on the common fisheries policy (Doc. 1-403/80).

The reasons supporting these requests for urgent debate are contained in the documents themselves.

I shall consult Parliament on these requests at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

11. *Question Time*

President. — The next item is the second part of Question Time (Doc. 1-366/80).

We begin with the questions addressed to the Council.

I call Question No 63, by Mr Purvis (H-222/80):

Would the Council consider, during its current Presidency, the possibility of the President of the Council of Ministers being elected by universal suffrage of the people of Europe for a term of four years and with powers equivalent to a Member State so that the Community can benefit from the political leadership that such a person would encapsulate?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (F) The composition of the Council of the European Communities, the order for holding the office of President and its duration are laid down in Article 2 of the Treaty establishing a single Council and a single Commission of the European Communities.

Any amendment to that provision would require revision of the Treaties, and this is not envisaged.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS DE MARCH

Vice-President

Mr Purvis. — I should first mention that I think the French translation of this question indicates that I would be expecting that they should implement this decision within the current presidency. In fact the English original says only that perhaps they might discuss and consider the idea.

I think we have got used to the idea of the Council being very negative in its attitude to the possible evolution of the institutions of the Community, but this question is put in a positive spirit, namely how can we get more out of Europe, make it more of a symbol and get more leadership in the Community?

Would it not be true, in the President-in-Office's view, given his attitude to the future of Europe, that such a post would provide a centre of leadership and a symbol for the people of Europe? That it would provide political continuity in the ordering of the Council's business, that it might in some degree mitigate the nationalistic conflicts that can arise in the Council, that it might reach compromises and decisions a little quicker with that leadership? That it would perhaps provide a democratic check and balance to the growing power of the Parliament? Would it not be representing the people of Europe as a whole in the Council and increase the President's international standing?

Mr Thorn. — (F) I am afraid I am not able to add much to my original answer. First of all, I think it would be difficult to find the ideal person you envisage for the permanent or at least long-term Council presidency and you must also realize that, firstly, this would necessitate amending the Treaty, which secondly, is not an easy matter. It would not merely be a question of changing one provision of the Treaty but its whole spirit. The entire current system would have to be changed since the Presidency is not, as things stand, given to a person but to a Member State and we have the principle of the rotating Presidency. As I am sure you will realize, I am not here to give my own opinion although you have discreetly suggested what this might be. Things and attitudes being what they are

Thorn

in our Member States, I do not think that a change of this nature and on this scale is likely to be considered for quite some time yet.

Mr Van Minnen. — (NL) As regards the more immediate future with respect to the Presidency and the Treaty, I should like to ask the President of the Council whether he can tell us anything about the attempts which are being made to have the President of the Commission elected by the Council. The nomination of the President of the Commission has still not been confirmed and is being put off, which is a source of embarrassment to this Parliament too. I hope that my question will be regarded as supplementary enough, but I am very curious to hear how the President of the Council, Mr Thorn, reacts to being kept in suspense for so long as regards his appointment to the Commission Presidency. Does he not find this a question of even greater topicality which comes entirely within the context of the Treaties?

Mr Thorn. — (F) We were speaking just now of the President of the Council and now we have moved on to the President of the Commission. I do not think this is exactly the same subject but I can nevertheless assure Mr van Minnen that I intend to answer his question. If he asks what Mr Thorn, the President of the Council, thinks of Mr Thorn, the President of the Commission, I must say, in all humility, that I obviously have the highest possible opinion of him!

(Laughter and applause).

On the other hand, you have asked whether or not I am in a position of uncertainty. I would remind you that the nomination will not take place until 1 December, when the entire Commission is officially appointed, as the Treaty states that the President is selected from the members of the Commission. Thus the nomination will take place on the occasion of the official appointment of the Commission at the next summit. At the present stage, a prospective candidate for the Presidency has been indicated. Originally, we did not make this public and later my colleagues felt that a public announcement would be superfluous as it was already in all the papers. Thus as regards the preliminary designation, my colleagues regard the matter as settled.

Mr Fellermaier. — (D) Mr President of the Council, would you agree that the election of a President of the Council would not in itself increase the effectiveness of the Council but that its effectiveness could in fact be increased if, in accordance with the Treaties, the Council in future were not to split itself up into a vast number of Councils, but were to regard itself, in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Treaty of Rome, as a single Council of Ministers and, as such, were to act differently from a political point of view

from the innumerable specialized Councils of Ministers?

Mr Thorn. — (F) The most simple thing would be to reply in one word rather than with a lengthy speech. Yes, Mr Fellermaier, I share your view. However, I should perhaps temper this statement by saying that there is indeed a need to reinforce or stress in future, much more than hitherto, the unity or singularity of the Council. As we all realize, it is perhaps sometimes necessary to have a meeting of the competent Ministers to deal with technical matters but I think, nevertheless, and I am speaking here in a personal capacity, that in recent years we have been moving in the wrong direction and that there has been too much fragmentation and compartmentalization and that this has led to reduced efficiency as a result of the excessive number of specialized Councils.

President. — Questions Nos 64 and 88 have been withdrawn.

I call Mr Spinelli on a point of order.

Mr Spinelli. — (F) In view of the importance of the proposals contained in the Rey report, I should like to deputize for Mr Jonker who is the author of one of the questions you have just announced as having been withdrawn.

President. — I am afraid, Mr Spinelli, that this is not possible under the Rules of Procedure.

Mr Spinelli. — (F) Parliament should respect its own decisions to a greater extent. This is a really vital question.

President. — I am afraid what you propose is impossible.

I call Question No 65, by Miss Hooper (H-256/80):

What steps are taken by the Council to ensure that the proposals under consideration at Council meetings contain the amendments and recommendations of Parliament?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (F) The Council has adopted procedures aimed at taking better account of the Opinions of the European Parliament. It is laid down for all Opinions that the reports drawn up at each stage of the proceedings must indicate any differences between the proposed guidelines and the Opinion of the European Parliament, and I shall do my best to ensure that these decisions are respected.

Miss Hooper. — Would the President-in-Office not agree that this can at times be a somewhat grey area? I understand that on occasions we are discussing and amending Commission proposals when the document before the Council has already been altered by the Council's working party. Can he therefore suggest a method of at least informing us when the Council's document has been altered from the Commission's original proposals? Otherwise it seems to me that it is a waste of our time.

Mr Thorn. — (F) I hope Miss Hooper will not take it amiss if I say that I get the impression that there has been insufficient interest in various quarters — that is to say — the Council as well as perhaps even Parliament itself — as regards what subsequently became of an opinion after it had been issued. Let us say that, as a rule, the Council waits to hear Parliament's opinion — in fact in some cases it even waits for a long time, which is something for which it could perhaps even be criticized. I think that in the interests of efficiency and effective collaboration, Parliament and the Council should perhaps take steps more often to find out what has become of Parliament. I go along with you on this point, Miss Hooper.

Mr Radoux. — (F) In view of the fact that, on the one hand, on the occasion of the first enlargement of the Community from six to nine Member States, requests were made for progress as regards political unification but that nothing in fact came of this, and that, on the other hand, similar requests were made some time ago with an eye to the accession of Greece, will the President of the Council tell us what has been the follow-up to the report of the Committee of Three, which was submitted in good time, and whether we can expect other initiative on the part of the Council aimed at improving institutional procedures?

Mr Thorn — (F) In accordance with their mandate from the European Council, the Foreign Ministers meeting in the appropriate context have studied the report of the Committee of Three with a view to preparing the examination of this report by the European Council. On completion of this study, the Foreign Ministers drew up a report which they will submit to the European Council. This report was adopted at yesterday's Council meeting and the European Council will examine it on 1 and 2 December when it will either take appropriate decisions or give the Foreign Ministers guidelines on the basis of which they will be able to prepare a subsequent decision. The Foreign Ministers noted that certain proposals contained in the Report of the Committee of Three in fact concerned the competency of the European Council itself.

The Foreign Ministers managed to achieve broad agreement on a certain number of proposals contained

in the report of the Committee of Three mentioned by Mr Radoux. The points on which agreement has been reached have already been put into practice or will be implemented as soon as possible at the behest of the institutions or bodies concerned. As regards the other points, the Ministers intend to continue their study of them when they are called upon to take decisions in the fields concerned, possibly in the light of the guidelines which we hope will be forthcoming from the European Council in December.

President. — I call Question No 66, by Mrs Scrivener (H-280/80):

On 30 June the Environment Ministers of the Nine examined a report on various proposals drawn up by the Commission on problems relating to the environment.

Was the Council able to reach agreement on a set of clear priorities and on measures to combat pollution and to finance the Community environmental protection policy?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (F) At its meeting on 30 June 1980 the Environment Council approved the Directive on the quality of water intended for human consumption, the Directive on air quality limit values and guide values for sulphur dioxide and suspended particulates and a Resolution on transboundary air pollution by sulphur dioxide and suspended particulates. It held a detailed exchange of views on the future development of Community policy on chlorofluorocarbons in the environment, and established, pending the Opinion of the European Parliament, a view favourable in principle to the prohibition of commercial imports of whale products.

The Council examined the Commission report on the rational use of land from the point of view of Community environment policy and noted that substantial progress had been made on the proposal for a Directive on the major accident hazards of certain industrial activities.

Mrs Scrivener. — (F) Could the Council explain precisely what it means by 'substantial progress' regarding the draft directive on risks of major accidents in certain industrial activities and tell us whether financial measures have in fact been provided for with a view to implementing this Community environmental policy which is something to which the public attaches great importance?

Mr Thorn. — (F) The Council of Environment Ministers has not yet dealt with the questions of financing the Community environment policy, which is in fact perfectly normal as this matter should be discussed within the context of the budgetary debate.

Mrs Lizin. — (F) Does the Council of Environment Ministers intend at its next meeting to discuss the

Lizin

regulation on the Community consultation procedure regarding the construction of nuclear power plants at frontiers — which has for the time being been suspended, particularly as a result of one of the Member States.

Mr Thorn. — (F) This problem is still under discussion and will probably be dealt with not by the Environment Council but by the Energy Council before the end of the year.

Mrs Weber. — (D) Mr President of the Council, the decision on the so-called Seveso Directive which you have just mentioned, was in fact delayed at this meeting because the French representative refused to accept the passage in which Parliament required trans-frontier information and participation. Is it true that, as we read in the September editions of the International Environment Report from Washington and ENDS from London, France intends to oppose this request at the October meeting too? What attitude does the Council intend to adopt and will it accept France's assurance that it prefers bilateral negotiations to European agreements on questions of this kind, when at the same time, as in the case of Cattenom, it is patently obvious that neither Luxembourg nor the Federal Republic were adequately informed?

Mr Thorn. — (F) It is very difficult for me to predict what will happen in October. All I can say, without, as it were, confirming what you have just said in so many words, is that certain of the difficulties you have mentioned have in fact arisen. There have been serious difficulties this month and I do not know if it will be possible to overcome them in October but I genuinely feel that we are getting closer to agreement and that our differences are not quite as big as the reports which have appeared in the press would suggest. All I can say is that, for various reasons including those you have mentioned, the Presidency will do what it can to bring about agreement.

Mr Sherlock. — It seems fortuitous, perhaps, that Questions Nos 65 and 66 in their underlying probing for the truth are striving to get an assurance from the Council that it recognises — indeed I would say, must recognise — that the voice of this Parliament is truly representative of and reflects the voice of the people of the nine Member States of the European Economic Community. That it is only through this body, as you have seen from all sides today, that the concerns and anxieties of its inhabitants can truly be reflected. It frequently seems to those of us who toil in this vineyard that our efforts are indeed unheeded. Can you, Mr President, assure us that our labours, well directed as I am certain they are, will indeed be increasingly heeded in the infrequent meetings of the Council of Ministers responsible for environmental matters?

Mr Thorn. — (F) Obviously, I cannot give you any undertakings regarding the future actions of the various Councils and the nine national delegations, but I can assure the honourable Member who has just put this question and indeed all the Members of this Assembly, that the opinions and resolutions submitted to all the various Councils are in fact examined, distributed and taken into consideration. I might add that the importance which you attach to this question, for example, will not go unheeded in the Council. You can rest assured that, to put it bluntly, it will always suit at least one delegation to take every opportunity of stressing that Parliament had insisted that this or that opinion should be taken into consideration. As regards the point raised by Mrs Weber and others just now, I can tell you that full account was taken of the opinions issued by Parliament in the course of the discussion in Council. It is indeed true that this is not always sufficient to bring about a unanimous agreement between nine national delegations, but this does not mean that Parliament's opinion is disregarded.

Mr Michel. — (F) Madam President, I put a similar question to the Commission regarding new nuclear facilities at Chooz, on a previous occasion. I received a fairly evasive reply from the Commission who said that this was rather a question for the Council. A survey has been conducted with a view to ascertaining the views of the people directly concerned and we do not know whether the results have been communicated to the Commission which says that its knowledge of this survey is very limited. This is why we put this question to the Council, and we should also like to ask it, since it is in the position to do so, to ensure that Parliament is informed of the results of this public survey.

Mr Thorn. — (F) The honourable Member was quite right in addressing the Commission since it is in fact that institution which is responsible for matters concerning the installation of power stations. As I said just now to another Member of this House, the Energy Council will examine this problem from the point of view of general principles. However, if the Council only agrees to discussing general considerations, and not questions of the type or siting of the various power stations, these then are matters for the Commission. I think, for the rest, that it is true to say that various questions have already been put on this matter, and all I can do is repeat the perhaps unsatisfactory answer which I gave just now, i. e. that the problem will be discussed again at a general level by the Energy Council before the end of the year. It is certain, however, that the Council will not go into the question of the individual plants in various places within the Community, as this falls outside its competency.

President. — I call Question No 67, by Mr Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berleburg (H-337/80, formerly 0-26/80), for whom Mr Janssen van Raay is deputizing:

President

Given that further negotiations on the law of the sea are to take place, in particular at the forthcoming session of the Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea in July and August in Geneva;

drawing attention to the continuing urgent need to coordinate the positions of the Community partners on amendments to the existing negotiating text of a future UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, in order to define a position which takes into account the interests of all the Member States of the European Community;

whereas extra time would allow all the Member States of the European Community to take concerted action on all matters concerning the law of the sea and its

economic aspects at the international negotiating table, with an eye to the EEC partners adopting a more determined approach to the outer limit of the continental shelf, protection of the marine environment and deep-sea mining (in particular the competence of the International Seabed Authority as regards resources policy);

regretting the lack of agreement, despite a number of undertakings by participants in the conference, on the question of granting to organs of the European Community the right — which under Community law falls within the competence of the Commission — to accede to the Convention;

having regard

— to the potential benefit for the majority of the Member States of the Community of committing their existing technology and financial resources in the field of deep-sea mining, despite the lack of access to these resources hitherto for those without sea zones of their own;

— and, in this respect, to the advantages of reaching agreement on a regional basis on interim laws to safeguard resources prior to any arrangement under the new system, we request the Council to answer the following questions:

1. What conclusions has the Council drawn from the meetings of the European Council in Venice and the world economic summit of the leading OECD countries as regards the approach to the Third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea?
2. Does the Council agree that it is not appropriate at the present stage of the negotiations to support a formalization of the so far informal negotiating text, as this makes progress towards further important talks unnecessarily difficult?
3. What steps has the Council taken or does it intend to take to coordinate at Community level, and if necessary with the United States interim rules for deep-sea mining currently contemplated by, among others, the United Kingdom and the Federal Republic of Germany?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council.

— (F) During the August session, considerable progress was made in the negotiations for the future Convention on the Law of the Sea, particularly as regards decision-making by the Council of the Authority, where the introduction of the consensus

procedure for the adoption of certain important decisions will enable those Member States which are members of that Council to oppose any decisions which are unfavourable to them. Less progress has been made as regards the financing of the enterprise. However, the new text provides Member States with a better knowledge of certain aspects of their financial obligations. Finally, the question of the financial clauses in contracts, the transfer of technology and the limitation of production continue to give rise to difficulties in the view of some of the industrialized countries.

Under these circumstances, and in accordance with the decision taken by the Conference at the plenary sitting marking the closure of the 9th session, the revised text of 29 August has not been formalized and, although entitled 'draft Convention', is an unofficial negotiating text subject to informal debate and open to amendments via the same procedure as in the past. At the general debate in the last week of the session, all the delegations requested that it be studied in detail in the capitals, particularly since the next session is to examine the problem of the Preparatory Committee and the status of investments during the period up to the entry into force of the Convention.

The Member States, co-ordinating their positions either within the Council or in political cooperation depending on the subjects dealt with, as they have been doing since the start of the Conference, will examine by the next session any improvements which might still be made to the text of 29 August.

Finally, as regards the insertion in the future Convention of a participation clause enabling the Community to become a party to it, this hitherto relatively new idea, since this will be the first time that the Community has participated in a codifying Convention of the United Nations, has made some headway among all the Community's interlocutors.

Contacts have been made with the regional groups, particularly those of the developing countries, in order to obtain their reactions to the text proposed by the Community. Solutions are being worked out in this connection, and the problem will, we hope, be resolved favourably in the spring of 1981.

Lastly I should like, if I may, as a member of the Government of the Grand Duchy, to express my gratitude to the Netherlands delegation, and particularly to its head, Professor Rippager, for all the hard work and extreme perspicacity which they displayed at the Geneva session when they deputized for us in the Chair.

Mr Janssen van Raay. — (NL) I should like to give my special thanks to the President of the Council for answering the three questions put by Mr Sayn-Wittgenstein in such detail. In view of the major interest

Janssen van Raay

which all the Member States of the European Community has in the exploitation and exploration of the resources of the seabed — which was the central issue in my questions — I have at any rate understood from the answer that the Council is very interested in the possibility of cooperation and the attempt to arrive at a unified position with a view to preventing the Member States' drifting apart on this point.

President. — I call Question No 68, by Mr Seligman (H-272/80)

What steps has the Council taken to ensure political benefits of closer contact between Arab and European peoples through involvement of Community firms and Community finance in the implementation of the Arab Telecommunication Satellite Project, now that the Arab Satellite Communications Organization is issuing a new tender later this year?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council.

— (F) The Council recognizes in general terms the advantage of participation by the Community and its Member States in the implementation of regional projects such as the one referred to by the honourable Member, as this could only strengthen cooperation links between Europe and the Arab world. However, no proposal concerning the project in question has been placed before the Council.

Mr Seligman. — Does the President-in-Office not agree that better relations between the EEC and Arab peoples would benefit both sides not only in the supply and price of oil, but should also benefit general commercial and cultural relations, including especially giving the Community's space technology firms a stronger competitive position?

Other powerful nations, such as the USA and Japan, do not necessarily distinguish between their political and their commercial interests and they often give substantial financial assistance to their exporters. Why should the EEC Council not give a lead in the same way by giving some sort of assistance to our space technology firms in this matter? I think they should not wait to be pressed on this by certain special interests.

Mr Thorn. — (F) I repeat what I have just said, i.e. that in our view, cooperation of this kind could be of some interest to the Community, but that no proposal or request has as yet been placed before the Council and that I am therefore unable to say as a matter of general principle on behalf of the Council whether or not it would be in favour of granting aid. Broadly speaking, however, I repeat that I share your opinion to the effect that the question is one of general importance and interest for the Community and should like to stress that, for example, in the context of the Euro-Arab Dialogue, we have already considered coopera-

tion in this field — this idea dates back to the Copenhagen Summit. We hope that it will be possible to deal with the question with which you are concerned as part of the planned resumption of the dialogue which is planned for the coming months.

President. — I call Question No 69, by Mr Seal (H-193/80).

Will the Council, having finally after over a year issued a negotiation mandate on the commercial cooperation agreement with India, say specifically how the report on this agreement, approved by this Parliament, has been taken into account in preparing this mandate?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council.

— (F) On 22 April 1980, the Council adopted negotiating directives for the conclusion of a Cooperation Agreement with India. To a fairly large degree, these directives correspond with the proposal made by the Commission in this area in 1979 which served as a basis for the interim report by the honourable Member. These directives reflect the Community's desire to extend and strengthen its links with India by means of an enlarged framework agreement covering both the commercial and economic field. They therefore comply with the guidelines laid down in the interim report in question.

In accordance with the procedure governing relations with the European Parliament in the sphere of trade agreements, the council informed Parliament in detail of the content of the negotiating directives in a letter dated 23 April 1980.

Mr Seal. — In spite of the answer I have been given, it would appear to me — and I stand to be corrected on this — that not a lot of notice has been taken of the deliberations of this House. Because of that, and this follows on from a question which was asked earlier by Miss Hooper, would the Council not agree that unless the Council takes notice of the deliberations of this Parliament, this is yet another indication to this House of the low esteem in which it is held by Member State Governments. Would the Council also not agree that, this being the case, perhaps political parties throughout the Member States who are at present formulating policies on the EEC should take this into account?

Mr Thorn. — (F) We must not lose sight of the fact that this is a question of negotiations and that the proper procedures must be observed. On conclusion of these negotiations and before the agreement is signed, the Council will, in accordance with your wishes, inform the competent Parliamentary committees regarding the substance of the agreement — and I might add that we often classify information of this kind as confidential and unofficial. Finally, if the Commission proposes that the conclusion of the

Thorn

agreement should take place on the legal basis afforded by Article 235 of the Treaty — which is generally the case with this kind of agreement — consultation of Parliament will then be required before the agreement is concluded by the Council.

President. — I call Question No 70 by Sir Frederick Warner (H-321/80; formerly 0-28/80):

In view of the importance of securing identical or converging policies for the aged within the Member States of the Community would the Council consider discussing and perhaps laying down guidelines for an approach to be adopted by representatives of the Nine attending the 1982 United Nations Assembly on the Elderly?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council.

— (F) Insofar as questions which come within the province of the Community are discussed at the 1982 United Nations Assembly on the Elderly, the Council will not fail to examine any suggestions which may be forthcoming from the Commission on the attitude to be adopted there.

Sir Fred Warner. — That sounds like a very satisfactory reply. I would just like to point out that the average age of people in Europe is increasing quite rapidly and that we shall soon all be rather old. Furthermore, it is important that we should standardize as far as we can the treatment — the social benefits accorded to the less fortunate members of our Community. So I hope that all organs of the European Community will give full attention to this very important problem.

President. — I call Question No 71, by Sir John Stewart-Clark (H-224/80):

Bearing in mind the need for a coordinated Community action programme in the microelectronics industry and taking into account the industrial and social consequences of new and accelerating technological developments, what action does the Council intend to take, particularly following the publication of Commission document COM (79) 750 final entitled 'European society faced with the challenge of new information technologies — a Community response'?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council.

— (F) In November 1979, i.e. at the Summit held at the end of last year, the European Council to which the Commission communication on European society faced with the challenge of new information technologies had been submitted, stressed the importance it attached to consideration of the action to be taken in this field, placing particular emphasis upon the desirability of discussion at Community level on a strategy for developing technologies of the kind mentioned by Sir John Stewart-Clark.

The direction which the Council would like Community action in this sector to take has already been defined in the multi-annual data-processing programme currently being implemented.

With more specific reference to the Community schemes to promote microelectronics technology, the Council, in its Resolution of 11 September 1979, called upon the Commission to submit specific projects at Community level, taking into account the criteria and fields defined in the Resolution. The Council has just received the awaited Commission proposal. It will commence examining the proposal as soon as the European Parliament has delivered its opinion.

Sir John Stewart-Clark. — Since tabling the question the following Commission proposals have come into my hands. They are, firstly, new information technologies, first Commission report, secondly, first proposals for Community action in the field of microelectronics and thirdly, recommendations on telecommunications. I assume that these are the same proposals to which the President-in-Office refers.

May I congratulate the Commission on their work to date; it is a first good step. We welcome the Council's request that this Parliament should deliver an opinion, and our own group intends to take a firm initiative in this regard. Will the Council give me their assurance that they will act concretely and expeditiously once the opinion is received, in view of the paramount importance of quick, sensible and unified action in the fields of telecommunications and microelectronics?

Mr Thorn. — (F) I still remember the discussions at the 1979 summit and the interest shown by the Heads of State and government. I can only assure you of their very favourable attitude and hope that Parliament will now issue its opinion as quickly as possible so that it will be possible for us to open discussions on the matter under the Luxembourgish Presidency.

President. — I call Question No 72, by Mrs Le Roux (H-243/80):

In recent months the British Navy have boarded several Breton lobster fishing vessels, causing them to lose several days' work and imposing heavy fines on the owners.

Does the Council not consider this matter to merit early consideration? In view of the ICES recommendations, which are based on a number of scientific studies, carried out by official bodies, has it not delayed possible amendments to the regulations on mesh sizes? Does the Council intend to consult scientific and fishing experts before reviewing these regulations?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (F) This question is primarily the Commission's responsibility. I would, however add that the Council

Thorn

is perfectly aware of the serious problems which fishermen may face as long as the Community does not adopt a policy for the conservation of stocks and, in particular, regulations on mesh sizes for nets.

The Council is endeavouring, on the basis of Commission proposals, to work out solutions which, while based on scientific opinion, will not ignore the vital needs of the various categories of fishermen.

As regards more particularly the case of meshes applicable to lobster fishing, the Council has before it a new Commission proposal which — following the most recent scientific opinions expressed by the International Councils for the Exploration of the Sea and the Community's Scientific and Technical Committee on Fisheries — confirms the validity of the previously proposed provisions aimed at gradually introducing a uniform 70 mm mesh size for the major part of Community waters.

At its meeting on 21 July 1980, the last meeting before the summer recess, the Council held an initial discussion on this proposal, at the close of which it noted that the timetable for introducing this mesh size in various zones required more detailed examination, which is a diplomatic way of saying that there were various difficulties. The Council therefore agreed to return to this question at the end of this month, i. e. on 29 September.

President. — I call Question No 73, by Miss Quin (H-294/80):

Has the Council discussed recently the application of the principle of additionality by Member States with regard to the European Regional Development Fund, and have there been any recent changes in the attitude of Member governments towards the administration and use of the European Funds?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (F) In the opinion of the Council, it is for the Commission to ensure that the principle of additionality is applied in the implementation of the Regulation establishing the European Regional Development Fund.

Miss Quin. — I would still like to say that the operation of the European funds is very disappointing and that perhaps we ought to see things for what they are and give the Regional Fund its true title, which seems to be that of the National Fund, since all too often it is simply used as a convenient source of financing for national government.

My question is this: is the Council aware that in the UK there is a direct negative correlation between government spending in certain areas and EEC funds? In other words, the EEC Fund has increased the

amount available in recent years, while at the same time the UK Government has actually been decreasing regional spending overall.

Mr Thorn. — (F) I can understand your views regarding Community or national regional policy, and might in fact share your opinion. However, in my capacity as President of the Council, I am not permitted to comment on this question. I must stay within the limits of my institution and say that Community policy being what it is, with the various shortcomings which you might feel that it has, the correct implementation of the principle of additionality is a matter for the Commission and I cannot, at this stage, comment on behalf of the Council.

Sir Brandon Rhys-Williams. — Would the President-in-Office agree that the severe limitation on the usefulness of the Regional Fund is that it has to be considered on an annual basis and that therefore it is not possible to take into consideration at all major projects which would really transform the economies of Europe's regions such as the Severn Barrage or the Channel Tunnel, which inevitably require finance to be spread over a period of years? Will the Council of Ministers therefore devote themselves to lengthening the time span of decision in the spending plans in the European Regional Fund and other major investment funds, so that we do not labour under this Stone Age limitation that everything has to be done and completed within an annual budget framework?

Mr Thorn. — (F) It is indeed true that, as Members of Parliament will have noticed, the system of annual budgets does pose certain problems. Nevertheless, I do not think one should take too severe a view and think that we specify exactly what must be spent each year. There are various programmes in existence which cover periods of over one year and I think that you will have occasion during this very week to consider the problem and discuss it with people who know more than I do on this matter. It is then true that the annual budget framework causes problems, but it would be wrong to say that we only consider matters on a year to year basis since we obviously also give consideration to programmes which overlap different years.

Mr Paisley. — Is the President-in-Office aware of the great concern in Northern Ireland at the fact that in the British House of Commons recently it was announced that only a third of the grants received from the Regional Fund is actually going to Northern Ireland to these particular projects and that the British Exchequer is keeping two-thirds of these grants? What is he prepared to do about that, bearing in mind that Northern Ireland has the worst unemployment in the whole of the Community?

Mr Thorn. — (F) I am familiar with problems as serious as these from my colleagues. Since — as the honourable Member is aware — Northern Ireland forms part of the United Kingdom, this is a matter for Her Majesty's Government.

Mr Adam. — Is the President-in-Office aware that unless the problem of additionality is resolved and the Regional Fund deployed in addition to the programmes we already have locally, the problem of unemployment in the part of the world that I come from, the North-East of England, is not going to be alleviated by the activities of the Fund, though that is what the Fund is for?

Mr Thorn. — (F) Personally, I am convinced that this is one of the major problems of regional policy and that, if no solution is found to it in the relatively near future, the development of our regional policy will not be something for us to be proud of.

Mr von der Vring. — (D) I should like to congratulate the President of the Council on the diplomatic clarity with which he expresses his views and, in particular, the way in which he justified Miss Quin's objection to the effect that it was in fact the principle of complementarity which applied but that not much was actually done in practice by any of the governments. I should like to ask him, however, whether or not it is in fact high time that the Council took steps aimed at least at removing the veil of secrecy surrounding the Regional Fund so that the regional bodies will be able to ensure that this principle of additionality is observed.

Mr Thorn. — (F) I am a little surprised that you make such a big issue of secrecy or 'confidentiality'. I am not aware of there being all that much secrecy. There is in fact a certain amount of publicity, perhaps not enough, and it is up to the competent bodies to disseminate the information. For the rest, I think it would be a better idea if you were to take this matter up with the Commission which will no doubt be able to give you information in the course of the debate to be held this week. I do not, however, think we should exaggerate the secrecy surrounding the various dealings involving regional policy.

President. — I call Question No 74 by Mr Adam (H-303/80):

One of the major objectives of Community energy policy is reduced dependence on imported oil with subsequent increasing reliance on imported coal. Considering the growing and extensive investment by international companies in coal production outside the Community, have the Foreign Ministers examined this trend, which could pose a threat to the Community's long-term security of supplies, in that these companies may be in a position quite soon, to establish an international coal cartel?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (F) This subject has not been discussed by the Council.

Mr Adam. — I find the President-in-Office of the Council's answer most disturbing. We have been told very many times in the Committee on Energy and Research and in this Parliament that we have got to reduce our dependence on oil. It follows from this that we would be increasing our dependence on coal, and mainly, it would seem, imported coal. However, we are told that this is alright because coal is owned by so many different sources that we would not be under the same threat as we are with oil. Now coal fields outside the Community are increasingly being cornered by the multinational companies. I find this most disturbing, and it worries me that the Council has not discussed it. Are we really to believe from the President-in-Office of the Council that the Council should not concentrate on this coal interest and find out exactly what is happening, because it could surely threaten the energy strategy of the Community which we have only recently agreed? Could I further ask that when the Council does carry out this investigation it will also look at a further trend, namely, that having bought up the interest in some of these coalfields outside the Community, the multinational companies, instead of exploiting them, are, as it were, putting them into cold storage. I find both these trends quite alarming and I hope that the Council will give an assurance that it will look at these matters.

Mr Thorn. — (F) Might I point out to Mr Adam that it is first and foremost the Commission which is responsible for taking steps to ensure regular coal supplies to the Common Market and examining the effects which investment on the part of multinational companies in coal production outside the Community could have on competition and long-term supplies.

So far, the problem you mentioned in your question has not been put before the Council by the Commission and I cannot tell you on behalf of the Council that I think we are going to discuss this matter in the near future. However, I will say that our idea is not to investigate investment by multinational companies at this stage. We should also like to point out that production within the Community has increased and I am certain — and I will discuss this matter with the responsible persons within the Commission — that the Commission will examine this question and, following your request, consider whether or not a communication to the Council is called for.

Mr Seligman. — Clearly the answer to the danger of an international coal cartel is to make Community coal cheaper by investing in modernization of the Community coalmining industry. Can the President-in-Office use his influence on the Energy Council to see that the

Seligman

coal investment projects are not blocked any longer and that the modernization of our mines is not held up by lack of finance? This is definitely a Council matter and not a Commission matter, because it is in the Council that these matters are being held up.

Mr Thorn. — (*F*) As far as I can see, whether he likes it or not, it is not up to me to give the assurances which Mr Seligman might wish since, as Parliament is surely aware, investment in coal companies in the Community is not a matter for the Council but concerns the private sector and national policies.

However, I think it might well be possible that if the Commission, after examining the question, reached what appears to be Mr Adam's conclusion, i.e. that disproportionate investment outside and within the Community constitutes a threat to our future, to our competitive position and to energy supply in this major sector, a Council, or a European Council, might well look into the problems of energy and draw up guidelines.

Mrs Lizin. — (*F*) Does the President of the Council agree that there is a need for an energy price policy and, as has already been proposed by the American executive, control of investment by the oil companies in other energy sources, particularly coal?

My second question is addressed to you, Madam President: I should like to ask on what authority you have limited the number of supplementary questions which may be put by Members of Parliament during Question time to six?

Mr Thorn. — (*F*) I can only repeat in a personal capacity. As a liberal, I do not think that control of investments would produce the results you appear to require.

President. — To answer in turn, in view of the large number of questions down — whose authors normally wish to receive a reply — I pass on to the following question as soon as — generally speaking after four or five supplementary questions — it strikes me that the various aspects of a particular problem which could be of interest to the various groups have been dealt with.

Since their authors are absent, Questions Nos 75 and 76 will receive written replies*.

I call Question No 77, by Mr Lalor (H-311/80):

Will the Council, as a matter of urgency, agree to convene a special meeting of EEC, OPEC, industrialized

countries, State-trading countries and developing countries with a view to ensuring that there is greater coordination in channelling resources from the developed countries by way of aid for the energy sector to the underdeveloped countries and ensuring that OPEC greatly increases its commitment to developing countries from its meagre £ 31 million?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (*F*) The problem referred to by the honourable Member is being tackled in the more general context of the North-South dialogue. At the 11th special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, an approved text was drawn up regarding the new international development strategy for the 1980s. As regards energy, the aim of the strategy is to facilitate the exploration, exploitation, extension and processing of all the energy resources of the developing countries to an extent commensurate with their development objectives, and, to this end, to provide the appropriate financial and technical resources.

In addition, the new strategy provides for considerable increase in real value of the financial resources made available to the developing countries. The aims and objectives of the strategy adopted, also stipulate that, in connection with this increase, those developing countries able to do so should also continue to provide aid to the developing countries.

Mr Lalor. — I noted that in fact the President-in-Office did not state in his reply to the question whether the Council would, as a matter of urgency, agree to convene the kind of meeting I referred to in the question. I should like to take up that point again in view of the fact that, on behalf of the Council, he did not agree that he should convene such a meeting. I want to ask the President whether he does not agree that it would be comparatively easy at this stage to prevail upon the OPEC countries to give more attention and aid to developing countries, especially when they are amassing large financial reserves at the present time?

Mr Thorn. — (*F*) I concede Mr Lalor's point that I did not in fact give a precise and clear answer to the question to which he has just referred back. However, I must inform him — since he has put the question directly once more — in view of the fact that we have, if not officially enquired, at least sounded out the various groups of countries mentioned. We have not received a clear reply, but the replies we have received have been discouraging and certain groups of countries have made it quite obvious that they prefer to discuss these matters on a bilateral or group basis and are not interested in a more general conference of this kind. For this reason, I am led to share the view of my colleagues to the effect that this solution is unlikely to be something we will see in the near future.

* See Annex.

President. — I call question No 78, by Miss De Valera (H-312/80):

Will the Council elaborate on the 'short-term structural measures' which were reaffirmed as a priority regarding the employment situation for young people at the June European Council meeting in Venice?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (F) During the examination of the economic and social situation in the Community at the last meeting of the European Council in Venice, particular attention was devoted to the employment situation and especially that of young people. On that occasion emphasis was placed on the urgent need in at least some Member States for short-term structural measures as part of an active employment policy by its Resolution of 27 June 1980 on guidelines for a Community labour market policy, the Council sought to lend fresh impetus to this active employment policy which is first and foremost the responsibility of the Member States.

As the President of the Council pointed out to the European Parliament on 8 July, the Community is making its contribution to the solution of employment problems occurring in Member States, in particular through the increasingly close coordination of national policies. It should also be remembered that assistance from the European Social Fund is intended mainly to offset the Community's current employment problems and in particular the problem of youth employment.

Miss De Valera. — May I further ask (a) whether or not the Commission was invited to make certain proposals and specific measures for an EEC policy to fight unemployment, and (b) whether the Council has given consideration to establishing a data bank on the employment opportunities for young people in the Member States?

Mr Thorn. — (F) The Council has just in fact received from the Commission a proposal to the effect that action in favour of young people under the Social Fund should be extended until the end of 1983. The standing Committee on employment has looked into the question and I am convinced that all the Member States are very concerned about the problems mentioned by the honorable Member.

Mr Marshall. — Would the President-in-Office not agree that the chief destroyer of jobs is inflation, and that premature reflation by fuelling inflation could in fact destroy jobs and not create them — the task of all Member Governments being to destroy inflation, because that is the only path to sure prosperity within the Community?

Mr Thorn. — (F) What you are asking for is a statement of economic policy which I can gladly give you since at their last meeting the Nine stressed once more that the fight against inflation remained a priority issue. You can, therefore, set your mind at ease.

President. — Since their authors are absent, Questions Nos 79 and 80 will receive written replies*.

I call Question No 81, by Mr Battersby (H-318/80):

What advantages does the Council see in incorporating reference to the commitments of each Comecon state and the Community in respect of Basket II of the Final Act of the Helsinki Agreement in future agreement between the Community and each Member State of Comecon and Comecon itself?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council. — (F) So far, the Council has not worked out a general approach to the question of any reference to the Final Act of the Helsinki Agreement in agreements to be concluded with East European countries, but has stated its position on each individual case, having regard to the characteristics and conditions pertaining to each agreement. In the negotiations currently underway with Comecon, the Community has suggested that provision be made for a recital stating that both parties were mindful of the provisions of the Final Act of the CSCE. The Community considers such a reference to the whole of the Final Act rather than just Basket II a timely reminder of the importance of the Helsinki document for the process of cooperation between East and West European countries, which serves to underline the fact that negotiations between the Community and Comecon should be seen as one aspect of the implementation of the Final Act. As for the two agreements with Romania signed at the end of July, neither contains a reference to the Final Act.

Mr Battersby. — Could the President-in-Office tell me whether, in addition to the agreements with Romania, the Council intends to conclude any further agreements in the near future and, if so, with who?

Mr Thorn. — (F) Apart from the agreements I have just mentioned and various other sectoral or technical agreements concluded with various other Eastern Bloc countries — particularly in the steel and textile sectors — no other agreements have been concluded or are being negotiated with the Comecon countries at present.

President. — We proceed with the questions addressed to the Foreign Ministers of the nine

* See Annex.

President

Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation.

I call Mr Seligman on a point of order.

Mr Seligman. — (*F*) Madame President, I should like to withdraw Question No 103 (H-271/80), as it has already been answered*.

President. — I call Question No 104, by Mrs Ewing (H-292/80):

Will the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation comment on the failure of the British Government to implement the recommendation of the report on the Employment of Non-Domiciled Seafarers (ENDS) which set out to end the discriminatory wage rate paid to Asian seamen?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (*F*) The honorable Member's question has not been discussed within the context of Political Cooperation and the Presidency therefore regrets that he is unable to reply on behalf of the Nine.

Mrs Ewing. — I am rather disappointed that the President-in-Office could not at least deplore the principle that I have exposed in this question, which is based on facts that have caused considerable concern in the British press and among the British public. Could he not go a little further, even though it has not been discussed, and tell the House that he deplores this kind of principle, which surely is not in keeping with the principles of the EEC?

Mr Thorn. — (*F*) Mrs Ewing, I appeal to you and to all the Members present. You have asked me a question, i.e. whether the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation can state their views on the fact that etc. I tell you that the Ministers of the Nine have not discussed this matter and you complain that I have not stated the position. You ask me about the position of the Nine and I tell you that the Nine have not discussed the matter. I cannot, therefore, make a statement regarding a situation which has not been discussed and which, furthermore, is not a matter for political cooperation, which is one of the reasons why it has not been discussed.

I could of course state my personal views but I do not think this would serve any useful purpose. I had to point out that this was not a field covered by Political Cooperation, that it has never been discussed and that, for this reason I would not wish to set an unfortunate precedent. I hope you will understand that I cannot make a statement, on behalf of the Foreign Ministers

meeting in Political Cooperation on a question — and I have no doubt whatsoever that your question was well-founded — which I have not looked into at all and on which I have no information whatsoever at my disposal. Please excuse me, but I hope you will understand my position.

President. — I call Question No 105, by Mr Christopher Jackson (H-296/80):

In view of the deteriorating situation in Somalia are the Foreign Ministers proposing to take concerted action?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (*F*) The Nine are concerned about the serious deterioration of the situation in Somalia, particularly from the humanitarian point of view.

The situation in that country is being studied within the context of Political Cooperation as an aspect of the overall situation in the Horn of Africa. The Nine will, in due course, decide on the appropriateness of concerted action in this part of the world and on the form it should take, with due respect for the sovereignty of the countries in question and for the principle of non-interference in their internal affairs. The Nine would also remind you that the European Communities have already drawn up a food aid programme involving in particular the supply of skimmed milk powder, butteroil and sugar to the countries in this area.

Mr C. M. Jackson. — The extremely serious suffering of the refugees, caught between a Russian-supported Ethiopia and a formerly aggressive Somalia, has caught the imagination of the peoples of Europe, and I should be grateful if the President-in-Office would convey to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation our strong support for the concerted action which he proposes to take. Would he please do this?

President. — Since they deal with similar subjects, I call Question No 106 by Mr Israël (H-323/80):

Following the declaration made at the Venice Summit, Foreign Ministers gave the clearest possible indication of the precise political terms on which, in the Council's view, the self-styled Palestine Liberation Organization could be involved in the peace initiatives proposed in the Middle East?

and Question No 108, by Mr Newton Dunn (H-361/80):

Will the Foreign Ministers consider pressing for the Palestinian peoples to be represented properly at negotiations by a body which has been democratically selected from among all the Palestinian peoples, either registered and living in Israeli-administered territory or registered and living in surrounding Arab countries?

* See above.

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (F) In their declaration made at the Venice Summit, the Nine outlined their general attitude to the Palestinian problem, the PLO and related questions. And it is on the basis of this document that I can describe our common position today.

As regards the Palestinian question, the Nine have noted that it is time a just solution was found to this problem which is not simply a problem of refugees. In the opinion of the Nine, the Palestinian people, which has a national awareness, should be given the opportunity, by means of an appropriate process to be defined within the framework of the overall peace settlement, to exercise to the full its right of self-determination. The realization of this objective will demand the support and participation of all the parties involved, the principles contained in the Venice declaration forming the basis of the peaceful settlement. These principles apply to all the parties concerned, i.e. including the Palestinians and the PLO. So far, the Nine have not gone into greater detail regarding their views on the involvement of the Palestinian people and the PLO in the negotiations. I have no reason to doubt that this will receive further attention from the Nine.

Mr Israël. — (F) Mr President, I should like to thank you for reminding of the text of the Venice declaration, with which I was perfectly familiar.

If the PLO does not change its attitude and continues to preach the destruction of the state of Israel, do you not think there is a contradiction between this objective and the peace mission which it is your task to carry out?

Mr Thorn. — (F) Mr Israel, you tell me that you know the Venice declaration more or less by heart. I felt it necessary to remind you of the text for the very reason that if what you say about the PLO is true — and the PLO, or at least its leader, denies this this would not in fact be possible as we maintain that the principle must apply to all parties concerned. I am certain that we are in agreement at least on this point.

Mr Newton Dunn. — Mr Thorn answered the questions jointly but he did not answer my question at all. My suggestion, according to the researches I have made, is entirely original. The leaders of the PLO, Yasser Arafat and so on, are not legally or democratically elected by anybody. Would it not be a good idea and help towards a solution in the Middle East if the Palestinians who are registered in their countries of residence in the Middle East were encouraged to hold elections and produce leaders — and it might well be Yasser Arafat — leaders who are actually elected and can therefore speak for the Palestinians with a stronger voice?

Mr Thorn. — (F) I should like to break down this question, or the reply to it into various components. Personally, I share your view, and that of all present here today, that elections always represent the best and the most democratic solution to the formation of a government for solving problems of this nature. Nevertheless, as we all know, there are a good many countries in the world which do not have democratic elections and that of the 150 members of the United Nations, there are perhaps 30 which have parliamentary democracies or operate in this way; thus, if we wish to solve all the problems in all these countries by imposing elections on them, we have a lot on our plate and I do not think a proposal of this kind is likely to have much success. However, I should like to draw the attention of the honourable Member to the fact that in asking for self-determination — note that we do not exactly say 'elections' — we are asking that the possibility should be introduced for the persons involved to express their opinions freely and hence democratically. It is, I think, an important element in the potential solution and one which we thus hope will become a reality. It will be a question of finding out whether it will be a referendum which is involved, what sort of consultation will take place, what is the nature of the question and who will be involved. These are the points which must be clarified in the course of this mission and in the course of future work by the Nine. Thus, you will see that our views coincide to a certain extent on this point even if we cannot exactly speak of parliamentary democracy or elections proper in so many words. The important thing is that there should be democratic consultation and that freedom should be respected, i.e. there should be a guarantee of genuine self-determination worthy of this name.

Mr Seligman. — When I was in Washington this summer, there was considerable disquiet that the visit of the President-in-Office would interfere with the prospects of the Camp David agreement. They called it 'rocking the boat whilst it is still afloat'. Can the President-in-Office comment on this disquiet in Washington, and can he confirm it?

Mr Thorn. — (F) Mr Seligman, I too was in Washington and, without wishing to boast, I hope that I contributed to dispelling a certain amount of apprehension. There have been reasons, in Washington and elsewhere, to fear that action on the part of Europe, even as restrained as this, could adversely affect the results or development of the Camp David negotiations. There can be no denying, however, that if the negotiations between Egypt and Israel have been blocked, it is by no means as a result of us, but as a result of other unilateral steps.

Mrs Lizin. — (F) Could the President of the Council assure us that on the occasion of his meeting with Mr Arafat, it was clearly stated by the gentleman in ques-

Lizin

tion that he no longer had the destruction of the state of Israel in view.

Mr Thorn. — (F) I think we have already spoken on this matter in a more confidential meeting, and we are not going to go over all these points again in a wider and more public meeting! However, since the objectionable statement of the Fatah has arisen, Mr Yasser Arafat has drawn attention to an interview he gave which was subsequently published in the New York Herald Tribune to deny this charge.

President. — I call Question No 107, by Mr Van Miert (H-355/80) for whom Mr Colla is deputizing:

In view of the fact that military matters and in particular the possibility of negotiations on the limitation of strategic nuclear weapons in Europe formed the main subject of discussion at their meeting of 3 July on the Schmidt-Brezhnev talks in Moscow, can the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation confirm that in future military matters are to be discussed in the context of political cooperation?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers — (F) The meeting of 3 July formed part of the reciprocal information procedure currently being conducted within the context of political cooperation. This procedure is in keeping with the objectives of political cooperation, which is designed in particular to guarantee, by means of information and regular consultation, better mutual understanding regarding the major problems of international politics. As stated in the report adopted by the Ministers in Paris on 13 May 1971, which forms the main basis for this procedure, the information can take the form of verbal communication at various levels. This is the case with the meeting of 3 July in Luxembourg, which took place at ministerial level.

As regards the question put by the honourable Member regarding the nature of the meeting of Foreign Ministers of 3 July, my answer must be in the negative. One should not conclude from the fact that the report of this meeting touched on politico-strategic questions that military matters are discussed within political cooperation. The report drawn up by Mr Genscher also dealt with other questions on international politics.

Mr Colla. — (NL) I realize that the exchange of information within the framework of political cooperation is in keeping with the objectives of this cooperation and I find it perfectly in order, and indeed a good thing, that this should take place, for example, on 3 July. This strikes me as perfectly natural. Thus, the first part of your answer poses no problems. As regards the second part, however, we are getting into more specific matters and, if I may quote you, you

said that the meeting of 3 July also discussed politico-strategic problems. This strikes me as a magnificent example of diplomatic vagueness, if I may describe it in this way. All I can say is that I have difficulty in imagining how a discussion between Schmidt and Brezhnev could avoid including a number of military questions. I fully realize that this is a delicate matter, but I nevertheless get the impression that the Foreign Ministers are behaving a little like flies around the jam pot at present. I should personally far prefer it if the Council or the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation, would be a little more explicit as to whether it is necessary or occasionally inevitable that various military aspects should come into their discussions.

Mr Thorn. — (F) You have registered your preference and I respect your opinion. This is all I can say. Nevertheless, I do not think either of us should complain of what has come about, as it simply means that within the context of political cooperation, we were keeping very much up to date with events. It seems to me that we all, regardless of our political views, felt that the meeting between Mr Schmidt and Mr Brezhnev was important, and we know that our American friends were directly informed of it by the leaders of the Federal Republic. Was it not then only to be expected and extremely desirable that our friends in the Federal Republic should inform us too. I am sure this is the way you regard the matter. The report of the meeting therefore may well have contained various elements of a political nature — undoubtedly — and perhaps also economic and military questions. It is, I think, difficult to divorce these various aspects from each other, but this is not tantamount to saying that a Community military policy was discussed.

President. — At its author's request, Question No 109 is postponed until the next part-session.

I call Question No 110, by Mr Lomas (H-372/80):

Given that the Indonesian Government has refused to comply with United Nations General Assembly and Security Council Resolutions calling for the withdrawal of its troops from East Timor, in order that a genuine act of self-determination can take place in the territory, why do the Member States of the EEC collectively abstain in any UN General Assembly vote calling for a cessation of Indonesia's attempted annexation of East Timor, as a result of which at least 150 000 people, approximately one-quarter of the population, have been killed?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (F) The Nine have always recognized the right of self-determination and our willingness to support any solution accepted by both Portugal and Indonesia aimed at putting an end to this conflict, provided this right is respected. The Nine abstained from voting on Resolution 34/40, since this resolution, particularly paragraphs 2 and 5 of the preamble,

Thorn

might interfere with the outcome of the self-determination process.

Mr Lomas. — I must confess that that reply is a little more encouraging than I had expected, but it seems to me that there is really one condition for self-determination, whatever else may happen, namely the removal of foreign troops from a country where they have no right to be. I would press the nine governments of the EEC to make it very, very clear to Indonesia that they have no right in East Timor and must withdraw their troops immediately.

President. — I call Question No 111, by Mrs Lizin (H-386/80):

Will the Foreign Ministers give their general appraisal of the outcome of Mr Thorn's visit to the Middle East and of the conclusions to be drawn from it, having regard in particular to the European attitude of the United Nations and European reaction to the Israeli decision on Jerusalem?

Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers. — (F) According to the Rules of Procedure of this Parliament, the reply given to a question by an institution must not take on the proportions of a statement. Nevertheless, I might outline the situation very briefly as follows.

At the ministerial meeting of Monday and Tuesday, 15 and 16 September, the Ministers of the Nine heard a report by their President-in-Office on the visit decided upon at Venice. The President-in-Office has already discussed this matter this very morning at a meeting with the Political Affairs Committee of this Parliament, at which you yourself, Mrs Lizin, were present.

The European attitude at the United Nations will be defined in due course, particularly on the occasion of the statement which I will make on the 28th of this month as part of the general debate. I can also inform you that in New York itself, the Nine will meet again to formulate their attitude. As regards the question of Jerusalem, the Nine stressed at the European Council in Venice, that they would not accept any unilateral initiative aimed at changing the status of Jerusalem unilaterally. Consequently, the Nine as a whole strongly deplored the recent UNCTAD decision which advocates a *fait accompli*.

Mrs Lizin. — (F) When I tabled this question, I did not know that this meeting with the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers was to be held. Let us say that my question was intended to cover any eventuality.

However, to return to your attitude regarding Jerusalem, I should be grateful if you could tell us whether at

this stage any diplomatic action is envisaged on this point. Furthermore, you are, I think, intending to make a statement on 24 September. My experience of the political cooperation machinery leads me to think that you probably already have some idea of what you are going to say and could perhaps pass some of this information on to us.

Mr Thorn. — (F) Mrs Lizin, you have a remarkable thirst for information! The statement the President-in-Office is to make on behalf of the Nine, will be the result of painstaking consultation between the nine chancelleries. Only ten minutes ago, I received a communication indicating what modifications one government or another would like to make. Tomorrow morning, there will be a meeting of those responsible, i.e. the representatives of the nine Foreign Ministers, to finalize one section of this statement. I cannot, at this stage, say anything at all, and I do not think the final touches will be put to it much before the eve of the 24th. However, I think you have enough information at your disposal to imagine the general approach.

As regards Jerusalem, we have protested against unilateral action not resulting from diplomatic negotiation, and what we are faced with is unilateral action. The Nine jointly and separately state that we cannot accept and deplore this *fait accompli*. This does not directly involve negotiation. The point still at issue is the future of Jerusalem as one of the elements in the conflict and one aspect of an overall solution. However, the two should not be confused and I should be particularly reluctant to give the impression at this stage that the Community is conducting negotiations on the subject of Jerusalem as a result of the unilateral decision by the Knesseth.

President. — Question time is closed*.

12. Agenda for next sitting

President. — The next sitting will take place tomorrow, Thursday, 18 September 1980, at 10 a.m., 3 p.m. and 9 p.m., with the following agenda:

- Decision on urgency
- Ferrero report on world hunger (conclusion of debate — vote at 12 noon)
- Travaglini report on regional development programmes
- Sassano report on alternative energy sources
- Von Wogau report on safety belts and interior fittings of motor vehicles (without debate)

* See Annex.

President

- Turner report on insurance contracts
- Key report on the use of appropriations available in the budget
- Ryan report on the discharge to be granted to the Management Board of the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training

— Hahn report on 1985 as 'European Music Year'

— 3 p.m.: votes

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 7 p.m.)

ANNEX

Questions which could not be answered during Question Time, with written answers

Question No 75, by Mr Fanton (H-308/80)

Subject: Promotion of the wood industry in the Community

Does the Council intend to grant financial support to the industries producing manufactured and processed products from wood, so as to encourage the development of the infrastructure in this sector, which needs a wider market in order to expand?

Answer

The Council has not received any proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to undertake, at Community level, infrastructure action with financial support for the wood-processing and manufacturing industries.

I would furthermore point out that no appropriation was entered for that purpose in the 1980 budget of the European Communities or in the Commission preliminary draft for 1981.

*

* *

Question No 76, by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti (H-310/80)

Subject: Adoption of a regulation on the management of financial and technical aid to non-associated developing countries

In the light of the past opinions of the European Parliament and the importance attached to aid to non-associated developing countries in the major debate on hunger in the world (see the Vergeer report on 'Technical and financial cooperation with the developing countries with a view to the development of agricultural regions and the foodstuffs sector', PE 64.575, 1980), can the Council state what progress has been made as regards the adoption of a regulation on the management of financial and technical aid to non-associated developing countries as a means of increasing the effectiveness of our action in this area and of giving the Commission full responsibility for administering this aid?

Answer

The Council attaches great importance to associated developing countries. It is precisely to increase its effectiveness that the Council — on a proposal from the Commission — has drawn up a draft framework regulation on the administration of such aid.

As you will know, this framework regulation is currently the subject of a conciliation procedure.

A second meeting of the Conciliation Committee was held on Monday 15 September.

Following a wide-ranging exchange of views, the delegations of the European Parliament and the Council decided to allow our two Institutions further time to consider the arguments put forward by either side.

*

* *

Question No 79, by Mr Cronin (H-313/80)

Subject: Amending Regional Fund definition

While welcoming the amendment to the Regional Fund of the definition of eligible infrastructures to include infrastructures 'which contribute to the development of the region or area in which they are located' will the Council include such social infrastructures as 'hospitals, schools and technical colleges'?

Answer

When it approved a wider definition of the infrastructures eligible for aid from the European Regional Development Fund, the Council undertook to define, on a proposal from the Commission and after consulting the Regional Policy Committee, the categories of infrastructure for which aid might be granted from the European Regional Development Fund.

The Council is awaiting the Commission proposal and is therefore unable to comment at this stage on the specific question put by the Honourable Member.

*

* *

Question No 80, by Mr Pranchère (H-317/80)

Subject: Sheepmeat

Sheepmeat prices have fallen in France over the last few weeks. This fall poses a serious threat to the incomes of French sheep farmers. Does the Council not agree that it is essential to take the necessary steps to provide effective protection for sheep farmers by unbinding customs duties and guaranteeing them a price geared to production costs?

Answer

The fall in market prices in a number of Member States, in relation to production costs, was one of the most difficult problems in framing the basis Regulation adopted by the Council on 27 June 1980.

It should be pointed out that the new Community legislation is not yet in operation as the prospective voluntary restraint agreements with the main sheepmeat-exporting third countries have not yet been finally concluded.

The Directive will, particularly as a result of the obligation on manufacturers to notify the responsible authorities of the Member States of the substances and plants in use, allow hazards to be better assessed, and consequently prevent major accidents in the European chemical industry.

*

* *

Question No 86, by Mr Radoux (H-331/80)

Subject: Institutional improvements with a view to the enlargement of the Community

In December 1969 the Heads of State instructed the Ministers of Foreign Affairs to consider how progress could be achieved in the area of political unification with a view to the first enlargement of the Community. Some months ago the Heads of State instructed a three-man team to draw up a report of the same nature with a view to the second enlargement of the Community. Would the Council say what action has been taken to bring about alterations to improve institutional procedures and whether other initiatives may be expected from the Council in addition to the report of the Three Wise Men?

Answer

As instructed by the European Council, the Foreign Ministers, meeting within the appropriate framework, have studied the report of the Three Wise Men in preparation for its examination by the European Council.

Having concluded their study, the Foreign Ministers have drawn up a report to be submitted for consideration by the European Council so that the latter can either discuss the matter itself or give the Ministers for Foreign Affairs the necessary directives on which a further decision can be prepared.

The Foreign Ministers have noted that some suggestions made in the report of the Three Wise Men came within the competence of the European Council itself.

The Foreign Ministers have succeeded in reaching a broad consensus on a number of suggestions contained in the report of the Three Wise Men. The points covered by this consensus have already been put into effect or will be as soon as possible on the initiative of the Institutions and bodies concerned.

The Foreign Ministers propose to continue their examination of the other points when decisions have to be taken in the areas concerned, in the light of any directives the European Council may see fit to give them.

*
* *

Question No 87, by Mr Giummarra (H-332/80)

Subject: Formalities for air travellers

Does the Council not consider that it would be desirable to end a waste of time and money by arranging for the abolition of the 'landing card' which citizens have to fill out and show after every journey by air even if the points of departure and arrival are both within the Community?

Answer

At present the honourable Member's question on formalities for air travellers falls within the responsibility not of the Council but of the Member States.

*
* *

Question No 91, by Sir Brandon Rhys Williams (H-340/80)

Subject: Common capital market

Is the Council satisfied with its progress towards the creation of the common capital market as laid down in the Treaty?

Answer

The resumption of the process of liberalizing capital movements will depend in the future on favorable trends in the situation both within the Community and outside it.

*
* *

Question No 92, by Mr Bocklet (H-342/80)

Subject: Protection of the Franconian 'Bocksbeutel'

Is the Council prepared to protect the right to use the 'Bocksbeutel' bottle of the Franconian wine-growing region at Community level?

Answer

Regulation (EEC) No 355/79 provides for the possibility of making the use of containers subject to certain conditions to be laid down for the purpose of ensuring in particular that 'the quality and origin of the products may be distinguished'.

This provision was inserted by the Council so that specific measures can be taken by the Commission, acting in accordance with the Management Committee procedure. It was understood that this provision was merely a legal basis for taking account of certain instances where the shape of the bottle is associated with specific notions as to the geographical origin of the wine.

The Council has therefore taken into consideration the instance cited by the honourable Member.

Question No 93, by Mr Van Miert (H-345/80)

Subject: EEC-COMECON talks

Does the Council think it appropriate to reappraise the talks with the COMECON countries now that, according to the final communiqué issued after the 34th meeting of the COMECON Executive Committee, Afghanistan has become an observer in COMECON?

Answer

As the Council has already stated in its reply to Written Question No 12/80, which the honourable Member put on the same subject, the talks with COMECON are currently continuing at expert level.

The last high-level meeting was in Moscow in November 1979 between Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission, and Mr Faddeev, Secretary of the CMEA; it was planned at that time to arrange a further high-level meeting in Brussels in April 1980, after an expert-level meeting in March of the same year.

However, at the end of March, following the initial expert-level meeting, the Community did not feel that the circumstances were right for a high-level meeting and proposed to the CMEA that talks continue at expert level. The CMEA agreed to this and a second experts' meeting was held in July, with a third planned for mid-October 1980.

*

* *

Question No 94, by Mr Balfour (H-346/80)

Subject: Financing the Community Budget — The Way Ahead

At which meetings has the Council considered the Commission's Communication to the Council and Parliament entitled 'Financing the Community Budget — The Way Ahead'?

Answer

The Commission communication of 21 November 1978 entitled 'Financing the Community Budget — The Way Ahead' was examined by the Council on 2 April 1979.

*

* *

Question No 95, by Mr Pininfarina (H-347/80)

Subject: Systems of self-discipline in advertising and in the matter of comparative advertising

In the context of the proposal for a Community Directive on unfair and misleading advertising, can the Council indicate its position on the acceptance of the proposed improvements put forward by UPA and other advertising associations with particular reference to the desirability of explicit and formal recognition of the existence and validity of the systems of self-discipline in advertising in force in many European countries and to the deletion of Article 4 relating to comparative advertising?

Answer

1. At this stage in its work on the proposal for a Directive on unfair and misleading advertising the Council cannot comment on the action to be taken on comparative advertising and on systems of self-discipline, whatever the changes suggested in this connection by certain advertising associations.
2. In addition, I would remind the honourable Member that in the Opinion it delivered on 8 May 1979, the European Parliament stated that it was in favour of the principle of comparative publicity as proposed by the Commission in Article 4 of its proposal.

Question No 96, by Mr Collins (H-352/80)

Subject: Nuclear waste

Would the Council provide details of research into the disposal of nuclear waste on or under the seabed being carried out by Member States either nationally or jointly with other countries?

Answer

The information sought by the honourable Member is not at the Council's disposal.

*

* *

Question No 98, by Mr Normanton (H-356/80)

Subject: World textile trade after 1980

To ask the Council when it will reach a decision in principle to instruct the Commission to open negotiations for a framework for world textile trade after 1980, the date when the present international Agreement — MFA — expires, and what will the terms of this remit be?

Answer

The Multifibres Arrangement (MFA) which expires at the end of 1981 provides in Article 10(5) that the members must meet not later than one year before the end of the MFA to consider whether it should be extended, modified or discontinued.

The Textiles Committee, which embraces all signatories to the MFA, is to meet for this purpose at the end of December 1980.

The Commission has stated its intention of submitting in due course its recommendations to the Council, whose subordinate bodies will discuss what approaches should be followed once the matter has been referred.

The discussions at the end of 1980 will to some extent constitute a preparatory phase of the negotiations which will subsequently be conducted in 1981 for a possible renewal of the MFA.

*

* *

Question No 100, by Mr Lomas (H-374/80)

Subject: Parliamentary report on Chile

Can the Council tell me what response there has been by Member Governments and by the Government of Chile to the report on Chile carried overwhelmingly by the European Parliament?

Answer

The question put by the honourable Member essentially falls within the scope of subjects dealt with in political cooperation.

With regard to the Community aspects raised by the Resolution adopted by the European Parliament on the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Chile, and more specifically the request addressed by Parliament to the Council in point 5 of that Resolution, the Council is able to assure the honourable Member that the Community does not grant any economic aid to the Chilean Government as such.

In fact, since the current regime came to power in Chile, the Community has continued — for humanitarian reasons — only one form of aid, to wit food aid intended for populations in distress.

This aid, however, is not granted as it was formerly to the Chilean Government itself, but to a non-governmental international organization, 'Caritas Catholica', which is in a position to ensure distribution without interference by the public authorities.

*

* *

Question No 101, by Mrs Roudy (H-385/80)

Subject: Consumer action programme

In discussing the second consumer action programme, is the Council prepared to confirm its agreement with the broad principles for action set out in its first programme of 15 April 1975?

Answer

The Council is in the process of examining the draft second consumer action programme of the Community forwarded to it by the Commission on 27 June 1979. The Council cannot take a position on the programme until later, in particular in the light of the Opinion shortly to be delivered by the Parliament of which you are a Member.

The Council would also remind the honourable Member that the draft 2nd action programme proposed by the Commission not only embodies the main principles set forth in the 1st programme of 1975 but also contains new guidelines designed to reinforce action on prices, services and consultation between producers and consumers.

*

* *

Question No 102, by Mr Newton Dunn (H-388/80)

Subject: Harmonization of energy costs for horticulture

Who or what is preventing the immediate harmonization of energy costs for horticulture throughout the Community?

Answer

In June 1980, a Commission report on distortions of competition in hothouse horticulture was submitted to the Council which discussed the matter in detail at its meeting on 22 July 1980. The Council does not, at present, have all the necessary data to give a detailed reply to this question. Nevertheless, from the analysis in the report it emerges that the most pronounced distortions are due to the fact that the horticulture sector uses different fuels with different prices per unit of calorific value according to the Member State.

The Commission has undertaken to pursue its work so that a solution to this problem may be reached quickly. The Council plans to return to the matter at its meeting on 30 September, taking into consideration any additional information with which the Commission can provide it.

*

* *

SITTING OF THURSDAY, 18 SEPTEMBER 1980

Contents

1. Approval of minutes	184	<i>Mr Lange, Chairman of the Committee on Budgets</i>	219
2. Documents received	184	<i>Amendments to the proposal for a regulation II:</i>	
3. Decision on urgency:		<i>Mr Lange</i>	219
<i>Mr Lomas; Mr Klepsch (EPP); Mr Bange-</i>		<i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution:</i>	
<i>mann (L); Mr Moreland (ED); Mrs Castle</i>		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	220
<i>(S); Mrs Roudy (S); Mr Donnez (L); Mr</i>		<i>Penders report (Doc. 1-219/80): Human</i>	
<i>Simonnet (EPP); Mr Calvez</i>	185	<i>rights in Poland</i>	220
4. World hunger — Report by Mr Ferrero (Doc.		<i>Amendments seeking to replace the entire</i>	
<i>1-341/80) (continued):</i>		<i>motion for a resolution: Mr Penders, rappor-</i>	
<i>Mr Wawrzik; Mr R. Jackson; Mrs Agnelli;</i>		<i>teur</i>	221
<i>Mr Capanna; Mrs Spaak; Mrs Cassanmag-</i>		<i>Explanations of vote: Mrs Hammerich; Mr</i>	
<i>nago-Cerretti; Mr Pearce; Mrs Boserup; Mr</i>		<i>Pannella; Mr Kirk; Mr Pajetta</i>	222
<i>Haagerup; Mr Capanna; Mr Paisley; Mrs</i>		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	223
<i>Rabbethge; Mr Johnson; Mr De Gucht; Mr</i>		<i>Report by Mr Fanti and others (Doc. 1-392/</i>	
<i>Narducci; Lady Elles; Mr Vergès; Mr Maher;</i>		<i>80): Coup d'état in Turkey</i>	223
<i>Mr Pedini; Mrs Bonino; Mr Cheysson,</i>		<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Frischmann; Mr</i>	
<i>Member of the Commission; Mr Ferrero; Mr</i>		<i>Sarre; Mr Pannella; Mr Van Minnen; Mr</i>	
<i>Klepsch (EPP)</i>	187	<i>Glinne (S)</i>	223
<i>Point of order: Mr Marshall</i>	208	<i>Rejection of the motion for a resolution</i>	223
<i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution:</i>		<i>Glinne, Klepsch and Bangemann report (Doc.</i>	
<i>Points of order: Mr Simmonds; Mr Maher;</i>		<i>1-396/80): Events in Turkey</i>	223
<i>Mr Hord; Mr Simmonds; Mr Forth</i>	208	<i>Amendment seeking to replace the entire</i>	
<i>Explanations of vote: Mr C. Jackson; Mr</i>		<i>motion for a resolution:</i>	223
<i>Vergeer (EPP); Mrs Poirier; Mrs Flesch (L);</i>		<i>Point of order: Mr Spicer</i>	225
<i>Mrs Dienesch (EPD); Mr Vitale; Mr Cohen</i>		<i>Mr Klepsch</i>	225
<i>(S); Mr Pannella; Mr Hord; Mr Vergès; Sir</i>		<i>Amendment after paragraph 4:</i>	
<i>Frederick Warner (ED); Mr Maffre-Baugé</i>	214	<i>Mr Glinne</i>	226
<i>Point of order: Mr Rogers</i>	218	<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Pannella; Mr Almi-</i>	
<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Romualdi (NA);</i>		<i>rante</i>	226
<i>Mrs Bonino (TCDI)</i>	218	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	227
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	218	7. Verification of credentials	227
5. Membership of Parliament	218	8. Regional development programmes — Report	
6. Votes:		<i>by Mr Travaglini on behalf of the Committee</i>	
<i>Dankert report (Doc. 1-373/80): Structural</i>		<i>on Regional Policy and Regional Planning</i>	
<i>problems affecting the United Kingdom and</i>		<i>(Doc. 1-347/80):</i>	
<i>setting up a financial mechanism</i>	219	<i>Mr Travaglini, rapporteur</i>	228
<i>Amendments to the proposal for a</i>			
<i>regulation I:</i>			

<i>Mr Griffiths (S); Mr O'Donnell (EPP); Mr Harris (ED); Mr Damette</i>	229	16. <i>Directives on safety belts and interior fittings of motor vehicles — Report by Mr von Wogau on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (Doc. 1-343/80):</i>	
9. <i>Speaking time</i>	233	<i>Mr von Wogau, rapporteur</i>	253
10. <i>Calendar of part-sessions</i>		<i>Mrs Nielsen (L); Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission</i>	254
<i>Mr Adam</i>	233	17. <i>Directive on insurance contracts — Report by Mr Turner on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee (Doc. 1-237/80):</i>	
11. <i>Regional development programmes (continued):</i>		<i>Mr Turner, rapporteur</i>	255
<i>Mr Maber (L); Mr Lalor (EPD); Mr Skovmand; Mr Petronio; Mrs Boot; Mr Cardia; Mr Clement; Mr Almirante; Mr Costanzo; Mr De Pasquale, Chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning; Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission</i>	233	<i>Mrs Seibel-Emmerling: draftsman of an opinion; Mr Fich (S); Mr Janssen van Raay (EPP); Mr Tyrrell (ED); Mr De Gucht (L); Mr Bonde; Mr Kirk; Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Turner</i>	256
12. <i>Agenda</i>	245	18. <i>Use of appropriations available within Section III of the budget of the Communities — Report by Mr Key on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control (Doc. 1-334/80):</i>	
13. <i>Regulation on support for projects to exploit alternative energy sources — Report by Mr Sassano on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research (Doc. 1-214/80):</i>		<i>Mr Key, rapporteur</i>	264
<i>Mr Sassano, rapporteur</i>	245	<i>Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission</i>	
<i>Mr Adam (S); Mr McCartin (EPP); Mr Seligman (ED); Mr Veronesi; Mr Paisley; Mr Beazley; Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission</i>	246	19. <i>Discharge to be granted to the Management Board of the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training — Report by Mr Ryan on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control: (Doc. 1-344/80);</i>	
14. <i>Urgent procedure</i>	252	<i>Mr Ryan, rapporteur</i>	265
15. <i>Directives on the fuel consumption and engine power of motor vehicles — Report by Mr von Wogau on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (Doc. 1-340/80):</i>		<i>Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission; Mrs Gaiotti De Biase; Mr Kellett-Bowman; Mr Ryan</i>	266
<i>Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr de Ferranti</i>	252	20. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i>	268

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

Vice-President

(The sitting was opened at 10 a.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

1. Approval of minutes

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

Since there are no comments, the minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. Documents received

President. — I have received various documents, details of which will be found in the minutes of proceedings.

3. Decision on urgency

President. — The next item is the decision on the urgency of three motions for resolutions.

We shall begin with the *motion for a resolution by Mrs Castle and others on behalf of the Socialist Group (Doc. 1-378/80/rev.): Violation of human rights in Chile.*

President

I call Mr Lomas.

Mr Lomas. — Mr President, I would just like to say a few words in the hope that I may persuade Members of the Parliament to accept this request for urgency. I hope Members will agree with me that although torture and repression has become a continuous feature of life in Chile, there are two matters which have arisen in the last few weeks which make this a matter of urgency.

One, of course, is the torture of the British citizen, Clare Wilson, and the other is the farcical referendum held a week or so ago.

It is quite astonishing, Mr President, and I hope Parliament will agree with me, that the British Government should react to the torture of a British citizen by saying that we shall still continue to sell arms to Chile.

I intend to be very brief, Mr President, and will just make these two quick points. First of all, I hope Members will agree that we cannot say torture is not an urgent matter, even if this has been a feature of life in Chile. How many citizens have to be tortured before Parliament agrees that it is an urgent matter? I believe that even if the British Government is not concerned about the torture of its citizens, then at least this Parliament will be. I urge Members here to agree that we can debate this tomorrow morning. If we do not, though our motives be the purest — and I attribute no base motives to anyone — the Pinochet regime will believe that we are acquiescing in their murderous policies.

I make this request, Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group.

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

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to speak against urgent procedure and briefly to state my reasons. I twice asked for a differently worded motion, as announced by the Chairman of the Socialist Group, to be tabled on Chile, one which would justify urgent procedure. This has not happened. The text has remained unchanged except for a minor addition dealing with the referendum which has taken place in the meantime. For this reason — at least in the view of my Group — there is no need for urgent procedure. It was a matter of urgency for us to state our views on the referendum before it was held, and my Group did so. On behalf of my Group I protested to Mr Frei and the Chilean Government about the referendum, which we consider undemocratic, before it took place, and Mr Frei

expressed his thanks to us in a telegram. Furthermore, at the congress of the European People's Party on 1—2 September, the Party Chairman, our colleague Mr Tindemans, obtained a decision on this question by the whole congress, and this was made public. Thus we adopted a clear position at a time when might still have been possible to bring some influence to bear on the conduct of the referendum. It goes without saying that we still hold the view that this referendum is undemocratic. But this is not the subject of this motion by Mrs Castle and others, which actually refers, as we see it, to an isolated case and to a statement which is said to have been made in the House of Commons. We do not think that this should be dealt with in this House.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

We feel that this motion can perfectly adequately be referred to the Political Affairs Committee and examined there, to be dealt with at a later stage in plenary sitting. We see no reason for special urgency.

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

Mr Bangemann. — (D) Mr President, with regard to urgency, I second what Mr Klepsch has just said. I am also somewhat disappointed that the Socialist Group was unable to amend the text so that everyone could have accepted it as urgent, since it does refer to violations of human rights. I should like to advise the members of the Socialist Group on no account to turn such highly immediate and acute violations of human rights into a vehicle for internal political wrangling with the government of a Member State. It is this that my Group finds particularly unacceptable. It forces us to the conclusion that the issue should not be regarded as urgent. Urgent procedure would have been appropriate for condemning the violations of human rights, but not for any internal political wrangling to be transferred to the international forum of the European Parliament. We feel that this is an abuse of the instrument of urgent procedure, and so my Group is sorry to say that it sees no alternative but to reject the request.

President. — I call Mr Moreland to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Moreland. — Mr President, I think the argument against urgency has been well put by Mr Bangemann and Mr Klepsch. I do not intend to say anything else.

President. — I call Mrs Castle to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Castle. — Mr President, I am very interested to see from the speeches we have heard from Mr Klepsch

Castle

and Mr Bangemann that they are not contesting in fact the issue of urgency, merely the competence of this Parliament to deal with this particular case. So we are grateful that they do recognize that there is a new situation here and a recent situation which does involve urgent consideration.

Now the sole argument against this motion is that it would bring a national argument onto the floor of this Parliament. But surely that is to ignore the fact that we can all of us only deal with these issues on a European basis if the facts are first established. The reason why this particular British case has been quoted in the resolution is that it is evidence — evidence of political repression and torture in Chile. It is followed by a statement by the Foreign Minister of a Member State that despite this clear evidence, his government is going to continue with the sale of arms to Chile.

Now is this Parliament against the sale of arms to Chile?

(Applause from the left)

If they are, they must support this resolution because it calls on all Member States to ban the sale of arms to Chile and to accept this latest British case as evidence that cannot be refuted of a continuing series of political atrocities by the government of Chile. Anybody who really believes in fighting atrocities, who believes in human and political rights, must support this motion for urgency.

(Applause from the left)

President. — I put the request for urgent procedure to the vote.

Urgent procedure is rejected.

The motion for a resolution will therefore be referred to the committee responsible.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne and others (Doc. 1-395/80): Termination of Mrs Macciocchi's appointment with the French university.*

I call Mrs Roudy to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Mrs Roudy. — *(F)* I wish to stress the need to deal with this affair as a matter of urgency. It is the very type of affair which must be dealt with urgently, since Mrs Macciocchi has already been informed of the termination of her appointment at a time when she

should have been preparing for the start of the new academic year. This whole affair is taking place at this very moment, and so I urge you to deal with this question by urgent procedure.

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

Mr Donnez. — *(F)* Ladies and gentlemen, our Group will vote in favour of this request for urgent procedure. It is not that we wish to prejudge the matter, since we understand that France's court of highest instance, the Council of State, has had the matter referred to it, and it is up to that court to pass judgment. But as far as form is concerned, we want to state tomorrow that we do not at all approve of the way in which Mrs Macciocchi was informed of the measures taken against her. The Members of this House should stand up for one of their colleagues and declare their solidarity. In order to do so, we must adopt urgent procedure this morning, and so that is how my Group will vote.

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

Mr Simonnet. — *(F)* Mr President, our Group feels that urgency is not called for. If we adopted urgent procedure, it would mean that we wanted to pronounce judgment on a very difficult case, so difficult that the lady concerned has herself referred it to a civil court. The best way for us to deal with difficult cases is to refer them to committee. For this reason we shall vote against urgent procedure.

President. — I put the request for urgent procedure to the vote.

Urgent procedure is adopted.

This item will be placed on the agenda of Friday, 19 September.

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mr Calvez and others (Doc. 1-403/80): Common fisheries policy.*

I call Mr Calvez.

Mr Calvez. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we all know how anxious those involved in sea

Calvez

fishing, whether ship owners or fishermen, are to see a rapid solution to the problem of European fisheries. In order to avoid fresh industrial unrest, it is important for us to decide before the end of the year on a common fisheries policy and a review of the organization of the market in fisheries products. I leave it to the House to decide in its wisdom whether to adopt urgent procedure.

President. — I put the request for urgent procedure to the vote.

Urgent procedure is adopted.

This item will be placed on tomorrow's agenda to be debated jointly with the motion for a resolution on the same subject.

4. *World hunger* (continued)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the report by Mr Ferrero on the European Community's contribution to the campaign against hunger in the world (Doc. 1-341/80).

I call Mr Wawrzik.

Mr Wawrzik. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have the honour of opening the second day of this debate on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party. I do not need to remind you how grave and how important this problem is for us. We are discussing this important aspect of development aid at a time when hunger in the world is being identified first and foremost with the suffering of refugees in all parts of the world. The war being waged by Vietnam against Cambodia, the Soviet invasion of a free and independent Afghanistan, the fighting between Ethiopia and Somalia — to give just a few examples — have generated misery and suffering to an extent which has deeply affected all of us and made the people of the Community ready and willing to make sacrifices to alleviate the situation. This sentiment on the part of our people is something for which we in this House should offer our thanks.

(Applause from various quarters)

The people of the Community are making sacrifices to fill the gap left by politicians in many parts of the world who have failed to deal with existing conflicts by peaceful means. Indeed, the politicians are all too often simply unwilling to make any serious attempt to use peaceful means to settle their differences.

In thanking our people, we are of course at the same time committing the European Parliament to make

sacrifices too. It is simply not enough to pass a resolution calling — as the Ferrero Report has it — for major changes in the industrialized countries' production system and way of life. Of course, I am quite prepared to support such a resolution and to give due consideration to the matter. But, ladies and gentlemen, any major change in our way of life and our production system would — with six and a half million unemployed — act as a serious brake on our political will and would result in things proceeding more slowly than we should like.

This report and our ensuing discussions have failed to eliminate other basic contradictions. No one would challenge our attempts to accelerate agricultural development, nor does anyone want to see us interfere in the sovereign affairs of the countries of the Third World. Unfortunately, though, there is as yet no agreement as to how we should implement our proposals without interfering in those countries' sovereignty, and how we should go about tackling the problem of world hunger.

The only concrete thing we can do at the present moment is to vote on the proposal put forward by our Group to cut the Community budget by 1 % overall and to allocate the funds thus made available to the appropriate budgetary items.

We trust that this House will support this proposal as an expression of our willingness to make sacrifices. Surely the survival of between ten and twelve million refugees and the alleviation of chronic malnutrition among hundreds of millions of people is worth such a sacrifice.

I should like at this point to make a personal comment on the Common Agricultural Policy. Even this debate has failed to clear up the contradictions and the general vagueness concerning the Community's agricultural policy — by which I mean over-production. We have been given impressive figures highlighting the world food situation. Even if we were to do everything currently in our power, the need for food in the world would continue to be extremely high for a very long time.

But surely, now that we are aware of this situation, we cannot in all conscience regard over-production as an unfortunate aspect of European policy. Nor can we point to the fact that world foodstocks amount to between 17 and 20 % of world requirements and claim that things are not half as black as they are painted. The fact is that food has been stockpiled throughout the world despite the fact that hundreds of millions of people are starving and we have really only created these stocks primarily to safeguard our own requirements. I am prepared to discuss any aspect of agricultural policy, such as the need to gear production to demand and to try to save all unavoidable costs and change many processes, including storage life and quality. As far as I am concerned, it is unacceptable

Wawrzik

that we should be supplying low-quality food to the Third World. The reason why we are supplying poor-quality food is because the produce concerned has been stored for too long at too high a cost, and then disposed of when it is no longer good enough for our own consumption. Why do we not dispose of the stuff as soon as we have it available? Again, as far as I am concerned that is not a question of agricultural policy. I can only say that the unwillingness on the part of the nine Member States to give the European Community the money it needs to carry out its policy is merely a pretext for using over-production as a European policy scapegoat.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are perfectly well aware that not everyone supports our policy on development aid. Unfortunately there are cases — and we should not seek to deny the fact — which tend to reinforce existing reservations. Dictatorships and war, ideological blindness, ineptitude and waste are perennial sources of doubt. But we must view these phenomena against the background of the repercussions of the mistakes made during the colonial period and our dealings with each other at that time. None of this is reason enough for us Christian Democrats to give up the idea of development aid. As far as we are concerned, the main value of development aid lies in our responsibility for the people of the Third World. We see this as a moral and humanitarian duty, which has priority over all other conceivable aims. Of course, we also attach value to our own interests such as the safeguarding of raw materials and energy supplies in the interests of our own people; we do not regard this as being in any way immoral. But our own interests must come lower down our list of priorities. It is a matter of principle to us that we should support any measures designed to eliminate hunger in the world, regardless of the political structure of the country needing our help. As ever, though, we refuse to use our taxpayers' money to feed armies which are waging war on neighbouring countries.

(Applause from the Group of the European People's Party)

My Group is prepared to vote for Mr Ferrero's motion for a resolution, and we should like to thank him and the draftsmen of the other opinions for their work. We regard this report as a useful instrument in the practical implementation of our policy. We are also prepared to give serious consideration to supporting all the proposals and suggestions under discussion in international organizations, and to investigate their feasibility. We shall, however, refuse to support ideological proposals which we know will harm rather than benefit those regions in which they have been applied.

This House will face a moment of truth when it comes to the vote on the motion for a resolution and our proposal to earmark 1% of the Community budget for development aid. We shall be called upon today and in the future to show how seriously we take this

discussion and this problem. For the Group of the European People's Party, the fight against world hunger is a grave duty, and we are prepared when it comes to the vote and on all future occasions to do whatever is expected of us.

President. — I call Mr Jackson.

Mr Robert Jackson. — Mr President, I should like simply to make two points in this debate: one, a broad point concerning what Mr Debré on Tuesday called the 'grand design' of a European role in combating world hunger; and the other, a narrow point concerning the administration of the existing effort that we are making to provide food aid from the Community.

When talking of grand designs to save the starving millions, we must, I think, beware of the possibility of falling into a certain special pleading.

Let us just recall for a moment the fundamental characteristics of the European agricultural policy — and here I would like to welcome what the EPP spokesman Mr Wawrzik, has just been saying about his openness to re-examine these matters. Our agricultural policy is a policy which works by restricting the import of food into the Community and thereby maintaining European agriculture at an artificially expanded level of production, which is now notoriously in certain sectors producing massive structural surpluses. Nobody, I believe, has yet calculated the resource-cost to the Community of this artificially expanded volume of resources which is being devoted to agriculture. It is possible that such a calculation cannot be made, although it would be very interesting to see what might come of the effort to make it. I myself have little doubt that if such a study were made, we should find that the volume of resources which we devote in this way to sustaining our agriculture in Europe is substantially, very substantially, greater than the volume of resources which we are devoting to the support of the less-developed countries.

In relation to the less-developed countries, there are at least two consequences that flow from the fundamental characteristics of our European agricultural policy. These have been spelled out by the rapporteur of the Committee on External Economic Relations in her report — paragraph 8 of her resolution. Firstly, the Community's agricultural policy damages the capacity of certain less-developed countries to export and, therefore, to win more resources for feeding themselves. And I am thinking particularly of countries which export sugar cane and beef. Secondly, the resources which are devoted by our agricultural policy to protecting European agriculture are as a consequence, not available to us for promoting the development of the less-developed countries.

Jackson

I think it is in this connection, Mr President, that we should look very closely at Amendment No 6, which is proposed by the Group of the European People's Party and to which their spokesman has just referred. This calls for an additional 1 % of the entire Community budget this year to be provided for emergency relief to combat world hunger. I would like to ask the next European People's Party speaker in this debate to answer two questions about this. Firstly, is this 1 % to be achieved by cuts elsewhere in the Community budget, and if so, could he or she please indicate where those cuts are to be made? And if this money is not to be found by cutting from existing or projected expenditure but is to be additional to the expenditure which is already proposed, then I would like the spokesman of the European People's Party please to tell us what other possible projects they would eliminate in order to find the money to provide this extra 1 %.

I would like to insist, on behalf of my Group, that this sort of questioning does not imply that we are in any way hostile to the concept of aid for less-developed countries, or in particular of food aid — our whole attitude through this debate has shown that. But what I think is absolutely fundamental is that we should know what we are really doing when we are making our effort.

Finally, Mr President, a word on what I called earlier my narrow point about the administration of existing food aid. I should like to draw the attention of the House to the strictures of the Court of Auditors last December of the way in which Community food aid is currently being administered by the Commission, and of the constraints which the Council has imposed upon the Commission in its management of food aid. How, I would ask, can we get maximum effect from the effort that we are already making in the Community — quite apart from any future effort that we might make following the amendment proposed by the European People's Party — when the system is such that in one year it takes 201 days to agree the milk programme, while in the next it takes 89 days?

Mr President, after all the generalities in this debate are over, we must come down to these rather detailed technical matters, because it is these things that count. If one thing emerges very clearly from this debate today, let it be this: that this House insists that at the very least the Council should allow the Commission to administer efficiently the effort that the Community is already making to provide food aid.

President. — I call Mrs Agnelli.

Mrs Agnelli. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the world seems to me to be suffering from a strange malady, that of continually announcing the impending arrival of unimaginable disasters without

doing anything to avoid them. Sometimes, admittedly, drastic solutions are proposed, but these are immediately countered by other suggestions entirely at variance with them. So when nothing is done the blame is placed on the difficulty of choice.

At this moment in time the horrific and tragic spectre of starvation looms over a large number of the inhabitants of this planet. Accurate analyses have been made of the situation and it is worth looking at some of these data together.

In all the industrialized countries and in many developing countries the daily individual calorie intake exceeds what is necessary, but in the low-income countries it falls in some cases to 74 % of the required level. The consequences of this for life expectancy and infant mortality are obvious.

This comparison might lead one to ask: why not reduce the excessive calorie intake and increase correspondingly the inadequate intake? But anyone foolish enough to ask such a question would certainly be classed among the dreamers and idealists. The realists know that even the slightest drop in the level of the individuals standard of living is unacceptable in our societies. It is as well to face the facts: we can do very little if we wish to avoid introducing degrees of compulsion which would profoundly alter the structure of our societies.

An examination of the development aid offered by the banks does not lead to very encouraging conclusions. In June 1979 some 47 % of bank credits were concentrated in only five countries, 37 % in fifteen countries and the remaining 14 % in a large number of others, the most needy ones. This is not intended to be a criticism, of course, because the banks are merely doing what they are designed to do, which is to lend to those clients who are most able to repay the loans; if they lent money to clients unable to repay they would be failing in their task.

But does this mean that there is absolutely nothing we can do? No, there is something. The Venice Summit, having paid the ritual tribute to the international institutions, concluded that the recycling of the advances to the oil-producing countries should be left to the private banks. Mr Brandt, however, has put forward specific proposals which I think should have received greater attention. With the annual meetings of the Bretton Woods institutions about to take place, the European Parliament could call for the necessary attention to be given to these proposals. Among the specific measures suggested I draw your attention to the proposal to institute a task force which would help to make development aid utilization more effective. This was the objective of Amendment No 43, which has now been withdrawn, together with the other amendments from my Group.

Agnelli

This Parliament has been criticized for its inability to decide, and to adopt clear positions. Today we have an opportunity to give an example. If we manage to adopt the Ferrero motion with a large majority we shall be helping to resolve the situation which has arisen in the United Nations. This is why my Group has made the gesture of withdrawing all its amendments. This is a genuine sacrifice since all our amendments were carefully prepared and considered.

President. — I call Mr Capanna.

Mr Capanna. — (*I*) Mr President, the poor countries, which are delicately known as the developing countries, are generally areas rich in raw materials and with large available labour forces, but they are nonetheless areas of starvation. The reasons for this are that they have been so organized to export, without being able to create a proper internal market owing to their dependence on manufactured products, that the possibility of developing a handicrafts economy has been closed to them, and they have had to accept the role of colonial exporting economies rigidly subordinated to the development requirements of the imperialist powers.

Unchallengeably authoritative studies by Magdov, Jalée, T. dos Santos and A. G. Frank, without indeed going back to Marx, have shown clearly that the backwardness and the underdevelopment of these countries are the direct consequence of the exploitation which the major industrialized countries have imposed on them. Their backwardness and underdevelopment are not due to lack of resources, but to the consistent plunder of existing resources; they are not generally the result of feudal structures but of the forms of subordination which the large multinational concerns have created in these countries. Trade between the industrialized countries and the poor countries is dominated by the law of 'unequal trade' whereby a lot of work is exchanged for a little work. In concrete terms this means that the products exported from the industrialized countries are sold at a cost above their real value, whereas those exported from the poor countries are sold at a cost below their real value. In the period between 1954 and 1965, for example, this has meant that the Third World has seen its terms of trade deteriorate by around 19 %. In other words, in order to buy in 1965 the same volume of products as in 1954, the Third World had to sell 19 % more of its raw materials.

The hunger in the world, therefore, is not a divine curse, but a curse emanating from one part of mankind against another part of mankind. The situation which results is one of chronic indebtedness which drives the poor countries to continuous borrowing. A devastating chain reaction — debt, loan, more debt — has developed inexorably so that nowadays two-thirds of all the new public aid going to the Third World is needed to pay their accumulated debts.

Theirs is thus a decisive step which this Assembly could and should advocate: the writing off of all the debts accumulated in this manner by the Third World. The activities of the international organizations, like the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, are in fact simply producing an enormous drain of funds from the weaker countries to the stronger ones. The result is that the Third World is financing the rich countries and not the other way round, as some would have us believe. This is true in the fullest sense of the term.

For these reasons the Ferrero motion . . .

President. — Mr Capanna, you are exceeding the speaking time still available to your Group.

Mr Capanna. — (*I*) . . . Mr President, there were five minutes left and I have only spoken for less than three. However, I am on the point of finishing. Thank you for reminding me. As I was saying, for these reasons . . .

President. — Your Group had five minutes in total.

Mr Capanna. — (*I*) . . . No, Mr President, I'm sorry. There is probably some misunderstanding. We spoke to the other Groups and we were granted additional minutes which were not required by the larger Groups so that, if I am not mistaken, we had available a total of around 23, or rather 26 minutes. However, I have just about finished . . .

President. — I am sorry, the result of this agreement was already included in the speaking time to which I referred a moment ago.

Mr Capanna. — (*I*) All right, Mr President, all right. All I wanted to say in conclusion is that the exploiters are here among us. This whole business in fact, confirms it.

(*Laughter*)

President. — I call Mrs Spaak.

Mrs Spaak. — (*F*) Mr President, having read his report I should like to draw Mr Ferrero's attention to two feelings which it raised in a Member of Parliament who, although having a close interest in the problem of hunger, has no pretensions at all to share the honourable Member's knowledge of this subject.

The first feeling I had was that the report which we are examining today attempts to situate this problem

Spaak

against a very wide background, since it raises all the most crucial, most sensitive and most controversial questions. I am referring to the role of the multinationals, of disarmament and also of the profound social and economic remodelling and the great cultural and intellectual transformations which the most developed countries have undergone. I agree with Mr Ferrero: all these questions do arise and must be broached here in this House, but let us beware lest they serve as an excuse for doing nothing, an outcome which would certainly go against the wishes of Mr Ferrero.

The second feeling I had was rather different in nature. If the horrifying and continually worsening figures quoted in this report and confirmed by Mr Cheysson, if the dreadful and revolting pictures we see on our television sets, showing children reduced to skeletons dying before our very eyes, if all this does not move the members of our opulent societies to show the necessary minimum of solidarity with these people, then we must, and quickly, draw the inevitable conclusion that our methods are bad. We must find others, better calculated to pierce our gold-plated armoury of selfishness, we must explain to people, persuade them through our governments, that if this horrifying blight is allowed to persist then it will inevitably lead to violence and world-wide instability. We must explain to people that assuming responsibility for these problems, even if at first it also means accepting sacrifices — slight indeed in truth — will in the medium term help to create trade and industrial outlets which those countries that today are still called — and we may well ask ourselves how long this will last — rich need to balance their economies. Should we not choose some priority projects amongst those which Mr Ferrero's report suggests, and follow them through step by step, using all the means at the European Community's disposal, to a successful conclusion?

It is quite clear from Mr Ferrero's report and from the comments Mr Cheysson made during his speech that maximum aid must be given to local agriculture in the developing countries. In the short- and probably the medium-term, aid from outside will remain necessary. How can the difficulties we are now encountering with the Common Agricultural Policy be affected by the aim of meeting the demands of developing countries? The aid programme and the contract for supplying basic foodstuffs should be long-term ones. This would enable the developing countries at least to count on a minimally predictable factor, which they need in order to draw up their development programmes. An external agricultural policy would facilitate such multiannual commitments, which have already given good results, in India for example. Acting in cooperation with non-governmental organizations, whose efficiency is universally acknowledged, we should undertake integrated rural development schemes.

The Council, with the backing of the Commission and Mr Cheysson himself, supported by Parliament, should concentrate on a few high-priority schemes. We cannot wait for the world revolution in order to act. We have done enough analysing, made enough proposals and reports, held enough meetings and seminars. Two figures must be etched deep into our minds. Soon, one thousand million people will be living in abject poverty; soon, five hundred thousand million people will be reduced below starvation level. This House should provide the impetus for fast, effective, generous and tangible action. This Parliament's credibility and reputation — indeed, the reputation of our whole way of life — are at stake on this issue.

President. — I call Mrs Cassanmagnago-Cerretti.

Mrs Cassanmagnago-Cerretti. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen we have noted, in all their harsh reality, the figures and data relating to the scale and gravity of the problem of world hunger.

Our task as responsible European politicians is not to offer new analyses and interpretations but to come up rapidly with specific solutions and answers to combat this spreading scourge, in order to eliminate the scandal of underdevelopment and death from starvation and malnutrition. These solutions must clearly be provided at world level — the ideal forum is that of the United Nations, which, however, until now has only offered answers which are quite inadequate to deal with the seriousness of the situation.

Proposals are already on the table which would increase the power of the Security Council of the United Nations to impose binding measures aimed at identifying a series of goals which should be given priority in a more effective struggle against hunger in the world.

These goals are:

- an obligation on the industrialized countries, in both the West and East, to devote 0.7 % of their gross national product to public development aid, i.e. the promises already made must be kept, which in this context means that the obligations undertaken previously must be respected. It is no accident that we have spoken in this Chamber of the Brandt Report and of the unreasonable behaviour of the governments in the United Nations,
- the creation of an organization, of the blue beret type, which can give timely aid to the starving and to the victims of disasters, which would guarantee to these suffering people a return to normality as soon as the situation becomes stabilized,
- the putting into effect of the proposal made by the Brandt Commission on an international tax on arms sales which would provide a basis for world

Cassanmagnago-Cerretti

aid to agricultural and rural development in the Third World. These answers must also and in fact primarily be given in the context in which we are directly responsible and in which we can take concrete action, that is the European Community and its policies of development cooperation.

Three areas require our particular attention:

- food aid,
- technical cooperation to non-associated developing countries. Special consideration must be given to those countries which for historical reasons are not signatories to agreements with the EEC, such as the Lomé Convention, and which, let it not be forgotten, make up the majority of Third World countries.

It is clear that the management of operations in these two first sectors must be more exact, and that the direct responsibilities of the Commission must be increased when it comes to the application and implementation of its programmes.

- financial cooperation with non-governmental development aid organizations.

Discussion on these three points will continue when we debate the budget: that will be the moment when we shall be able to demonstrate our unity and to translate into figures the political options to which we give priority. This is why, Mr Jackson, the European Peoples' Party, proposes in its amendment that a 1 % increase should be introduced in the preamble to the 1981 budget, with a view to increasing the available funds for emergencies and food aid.

In future, the latter should be made part of the agricultural and rural programmes, something which has not been possible until now — as we should have wished — owing to lack of staff and management personnel.

I should like here to stress once again the vital work carried out by the non-governmental organizations in the programmes of rural development, something which the Vergeer Report illustrates clearly in its chapter devoted to these voluntary organizations. May I also emphasize the importance of paragraph 23 of the Ferrero motion for a resolution, and thank the rapporteur for having given attention to this aspect of the problem of hunger in the world, since it is one which our Group felt to be particularly important. This paragraph highlights the essential role of women, in the context of the World Conference held in Copenhagen on the theme of 'Women, development and peace.' Many women are not even treated as human beings.

When the rapporteur reminds us that half of the 800 millions of human beings who are starving are made

up of children and that every year 250 thousand of them become blind owing to lack of vitamin A; when we are told that a third of all the children in the underdeveloped countries die before the age of 5 owing to under-nourishment, we must surely recognize the fundamental and decisive role of women in the matter of nutritional training. The main reason for the failure of so many rural development projects is that insufficient attention is given to the training of men, women and young people.

This is why it is vital that youth organizations and women's organizations should have a more decisive role in this sector in order to ensure their full participation in the assessment and implementation of the projects which we put forward, and to encourage educational and information programmes suited to their rural environment and which also fully respect human values.

These training and information programmes can provide the basis for any serious reform of agricultural structures which in many developing countries oblige the majority of the population working in agriculture to live in a state of poverty and dependence which prevents any restructuring of agricultural production. Excellent examples are provided by the African areas, by the Sahel, by the Horn of Africa, etc.

In future the women's organizations must play an increasingly major role in the matter of agricultural reform.

Finally, certain ideas and proposals put forward here in relation to family planning conflict with the conclusions of the World Population Conference held in Bucharest, and represent new forms of colonialism *vis-à-vis* the populations and the families of the Third World. We were present at that Conference. The representatives of the developing peoples asked us for information on matters relating to responsible motherhood and fatherhood, and on the need to return the decision as to whether to have children to the family, and so on.

Our Group has called urgently for this serious debate, and presented a motion for a resolution in 1979. We make no claim to be defenders of priority positions, but we do demand, together with the Commission, that the Council makes some new choices. We shall personally insist to the budget rapporteur that these choices should be translated into priority positions, within the available limits.

President. — I call Mr Pearce.

Mr Pearce. — Mr President, I have four points to make. First of all I wish to say that I think it is important in our appeal to the people of the Community, to aid the Third World in one way or another, be it food

Pearce

aid or anything else, to distinguish whether we are making appeal primarily on the grounds of humanitarian principles or whether we are talking about the need for our society in the West to have a working relationship with the society in the Third World. There are, where I live, not too many votes to be got in an election on the basis of the humanitarian concept. That is unfortunate but realistic. However I think there is a very strong case, which I am doing my best to emphasize, that we need increasingly to get on with people in the Third World and that to help them to solve the problems of starvation and disease is in our interests as well as in theirs. I think that it is that side of it, — the growing interdependence between nations — that should be the centrepiece of our arguments in this debate.

My second point, Mr President, is to warn against the hypocrisy which dogs debates on Third World problems. This is a subject on which all kinds of people can pick up sympathy votes and support. There are those who do this in a callous and cynical way. I would like to point out two examples. The people who produced the report, Mr Ferrero and his colleagues, did an enormous amount of work and rightly deserve the credit they have been given for this. It is unfortunate that one man, one Member of this Chamber, who has produced most of this bookful of amendments, has played such a small part in the work of the Ferrero working party. I think there is a confusion between those that are trying to do some good for the world, including Mr Ferrero — with whom I do not entirely agree, but he has done a very good job — and those who use this as an opportunity for political gimmickry and clowning.

I would also cite, Mr President, another example of jumping on the bandwagon. Earlier this week President Carter of the United States, speaking to the American Press, claimed the credit for solving the independence crisis in Zimbabwe. I do not normally want to use this Chamber, as a forum for boasting about my country's achievements, but the work of bringing about a peaceful solution in that part of Africa does not belong to the United States; and I have to say that I think it is cheap of an American politician to try to take the credit for something that does not belong to him.

My third point, Mr President, is again to the effect that it is actions that speak and not just words. In the United Nations' discussions which Mrs Cassanmagnago-Cerretti has just referred to, where we are all trying to achieve 0.7% of our gross national products, the current figures show our own performance in the Community as being not bad but not good enough. The overall figure for the Community as a whole is 0.49%. The Netherlands has a particularly fine performance inside that figure and it contrasts with the United States' figure of 0.19 and that of the Comecon countries of 0.08. I think that this should be pointed out. The Third World would be well advised

to see who their friends really are, not just who are the people who make noises about solving their problems. The other figure of interest is that the OPEC countries have a figure of 1% in 1979 which is very good and I think it underlines the need for the European Community to work with the OPEC countries collectively or bilaterally to help to use their surplus funds in conjunction with our knowhow in solving some of these problems.

My fourth point is a technical one. I think where we have to use figures to make a point, it is useful if the figures are produced on the same standard statistical basis. I am informed in this connection that the figures for the different Member States of the Community are not produced on exactly the same basis.

I refer particularly to the fact that the percentage quoted for France includes aid given to the French Overseas Territories, which are part of metropolitan France. It seems to me to be inappropriate that they should be included in that figure because it gives a wrong impression of the contribution of that Member State to the Third World. The contribution of France to development aid is a good one and it seems a pity to confuse it with aid to part of that Member State's territory.

Mr President, that is all I have to say. I appeal to people to be honest in their approach, to look at the need for close cooperation between ourselves and the Third World and to make practical progress, not just to produce empty words.

IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

President. — I call Mrs Boserup.

Mrs Boserup. — (DK) Mr President, the Danish Socialistisk Folkeparti has chosen me as its representative in this matter. We are the only party in Denmark which is unambiguously antimilitarist. For us, disarmament is a basic issue and I should therefore like to take this opportunity of amplifying an extremely sensible point contained in motion for a resolution which states that if the situation of the developing countries as regards production and purchasing power are to be improved, an increasing reallocation of current world-level expenditure on arms to development aid will be essential. There are already enough rockets, bombs, missiles and what-have-you to wipe out the entire population of the world a few times over, and yet one million dollars are being spent on armaments

Boserup

every minute. This, I think, should be foremost in our minds when we discuss hunger in the world.

People of my generation have seen what had previously been colonies becoming new independent countries. I am sure there is no one here in this House who thinks that these new countries will put up with living in poverty and being thrown the odd copper in the form of aid for very much longer. They too have a claim to a share of the world's riches and they realize the appalling injustice of the way these riches are distributed. There is no need for us to wait for the Commission and Council to cobble together a few programmes and a policy, particularly when we bear in mind how little previous programmes have achieved. We must all urge our own governments to take action, to take the lead in international bodies and, when drawing up their policies, to take account of the wishes for détente, disarmament and cooperation expressed by a large proportion of their voters and not least, the women amongst them.

The fact that the food problem has deteriorated over the last decade demonstrates clearly how far off-beam our so-called aid to the developing countries has been. It has in fact come in for criticism from many quarters and I should like, if I may, to draw your attention to the prominent Swedish social democrat, Professor Gunnar Myrdal. It should be noted that he has for many years now been involved in international politics and an advocate of traditional aid policy. The idea of transferring resources to underdeveloped countries has often been stressed in the debate and this is, of course, also important. However, it is just as important to see the problem in the light of trade relations, which in the case of the developing countries mean an enormous dependency on the export of raw materials to rich countries. In the developing countries, investments are made on traditional capitalist lines. This can result in increased agricultural production, but this production is not calculated to meet the needs of the local population as regards foodstuffs. It is designed to produce the maximum yield for the landowners and processing industries.

My colleague, Mr Willy Brandt, was so kind as to commend Denmark the day before yesterday for achieving, together with the Netherlands, the modest goal of 0.7 % of the gross domestic product as development aid. This is, of course, excellent, but, as we all know, there are also reactionary forces in our country, which are calling for cutbacks in this region. I am not proud of my country's effort. I could, however, be proud when the day comes that my country, preferably together with other countries represented here in this House, takes the lead on the road towards disarmament, since only then will there be any hope of our establishing equality and fellowship with those who at this present time are starving.

President. — I call Mr Haagerup.

Mr Haagerup. — (DK) Mr President, I should just like to deal with one point in the Ferrero Report — but an important one — from a political point of view. The point I should like to take up is the same as that mentioned by the previous speaker, i.e. the passage referring to the enormous expenditure on arms and the need to transfer resources from armament to development aid.

The explanatory statements speaks of the alleged wastage of thousands of millions on military expenditure, and many people here today, not only the Member who has just spoken, have adopted the same attitude. I should like to say that it is, of course, true that enormous sums are spent for military purposes, but I should nonetheless like to suggest gently but firmly that we should not regard those, on the one hand, who are in favour of a dependable Western defence system and those, on the other hand, who are in favour of extending our development aid as two opposing camps. We realize that there are certain Members in this Parliament who would wish to establish a rift of this kind since they want to oppose the defence policy of our countries as, for example my compatriot, Mrs Boserup. She and like-minded people are perfectly entitled to adopt this attitude. However, I would remind you that it is not shared the vast majority here in Parliament and this is not a question of 'either/or' but of 'both/and', since it is not true to say, in the present serious international situation, that the NATO countries are spending too much on defence, but rather that some NATO countries are spending too little. Some governments are increasing development aid and saying that for this reason they cannot also increase expenditure on defence, regardless of whether this attitude might have serious consequences for other countries from the point of view of defence. We also hear the argument that development aid is an aspect of security policy and that increased development aid compensates for failing to increase or even reducing expenditure on defence. This is a somewhat muddle-headed argument. Naturally, future prospects as regards security are an important aspect of development aid, but simply lumping defence expenditure and development aid together does not take account of the widely differing time scales and the immediate problems. If we are to be able to transfer funds from military expenditure to development aid, this will depend on the international situation and any progress which might be made in détente.

It is not the wish of my group that we should wait until we can transfer resources from military expenditure before we step up development aid. We must avoid establishing an artificial and controversial link between these two important aspects of our countries' policies as this might not only reduce public awareness as regards defence questions, but these constant attacks on the defence expenditure of our own coun-

Haagerup

tries would make it more difficult to gain broad public support for the idea of extending aid to the developing countries and hence the combating of hunger in the world.

(Applause)

President. — I again call Mr Capanna for the remaining time allocated to his Group.

Mr Capanna. — *(I)* Thank you Mr President, but I should have thought that decency would have required the Presidency to acknowledge that it made a major howler a few moments ago. There is nothing to be ashamed of in admitting a mistake; indeed it can only reflect well on the person who remedies the mistake.

I was arguing, Mr President, that hunger in the world is not accidental: it has specific causes deriving from the structural dependence which the poor countries are obliged to accept. I used the metaphor that hunger is not a curse of God but a curse of man and one that has terrestrial origins. It can therefore be banished if we wish and if we recognize its true causes. The truth is that hunger in the world is structurally valuable to those who are not hungry but who have more than enough food. In the same way the 'development of underdevelopment' is vital to the industrialized countries and to the plunderers of raw materials and resources. Hunger in the world is indeed an essential element in the development of underdevelopment.

If this fact is not faced all the other arguments are mere hypocrisy. And the proposal to write off the debts which the Third World has been obliged to contract, — a proposal which probably seems mad to the 'accountants' of the capitalist world — is nonetheless a radical measure which, oddly enough, no radicals are putting forward, but which I am advocating, because it is a measure which this Assembly could back and which be a specific and quite certainly effective step.

But — and I want to make my position very clear on this — some of the Members of this Assembly stand shoulder to shoulder with the exploiters against the starving because they defend the material interests of those large and powerful international concerns which carry a major part of the responsibility for the hunger in the world. This is the real problem and as I was about to say when I had to conclude during my previous speech, I believe that the Ferrero motion is consequently inadequate, because it does not mention these questions and because it is an inadequate response to the seriousness and the nature of the problem of hunger in the world, and offers insufficiently effective remedies to solve it. If, therefore, this vital measure to write off the debts of the countries which are suffering from hunger is not expressly included in the motion, all the rest — from the sending of

powdered milk to that of dried peas — is nothing but idle chat and means that the majority of this Chamber is aligning itself with the exploiters of the hungry people of the world.

President. — I call Mr Paisley.

Mr Paisley. — Mr President, this House should be exceedingly grateful for the able work done by all those responsible for the reports before us today. There are two great problems which immediately face us when we come to consider the plight of the hungry millions of the world. One is the problem of vastness. No matter what views we take of any assessment of the hungry millions of the world, the problem by any standards is vast. 500 million to 1 300 million do not have enough to eat. More than half of these are children in whom malnutrition is causing physical and mental damage. One-third of all children in the developing countries die before they reach the age of five years, from starvation and related diseases.

The second problem is the problem of administering relief. One of the reports called it an administrative jungle, and so it is! Administrative reform must grapple with and conquer: 1. delays in drawing up programmes and implementing aid projects; 2. defects in procurement procedures; 3. transport problems, and 4. defects in supervision over the actual implementation of aid programmes.

Now, how are we to tackle these urgent problems? I believe they can only be tackled by, first of all, economic aid leading to self-help. This must be our long-term strategy, and we should concentrate on the poorest regions and especially on aid to rural development. The economic aid should go to the construction of wells and irrigation and drainage works. Such irrigation schemes mean a change in methods and crops and must therefore be accompanied by technical assistance and agricultural research. Secondly, there must be direct food aid, and in the short-term immediate food aid. I think that the Community itself should have a food bank. We already have surpluses, which should be used up to help the hungry rather than sold off cheaply to Russia. A large bank of food should be built up and used to encourage the underdeveloped and needy countries to build up proper stocks of food. Then when there is an exacerbation of need, supplies will be more readily available.

Of course, all our peoples must be awakened to the plight of the world's hungry and starving millions. At the moment many of our peoples are only alarmed at spotlighted areas, when there is, in fact, a permanent emergency across the whole globe. Our governments have a moral responsibility to give a firm lead in this field.

However, proper supervision is imperative. Free gifts are all too often sold under corrupt regimes, and this

Paisley

deters people from giving liberally to this important and deserving cause. I therefore welcome the recommendation of the Political Affairs Committee on this problem which stressed how important it is that the Community should wherever possible act to help those suffering from hunger. However, in the case of regimes that do not respect human rights, aid should be restricted to food aid, medical aid and possibly rural development aid. This aid should in all cases go directly to those being assisted. Particular steps should be taken to avoid misuse of such aid, for example, by the sale of food to third parties, corruption or diversion to other uses.

Finally, Mr. President, the world's hungry are a challenge to this Community; let us tackle it with all the strength we can muster!

President. — I call Mrs Rabbethge.

Mrs Rabbethge. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the dramatic situation concerning world hunger now and in the near future was described yesterday and this morning in a number of outstanding speeches. I shall not — you will be glad to hear — be repeating the facts.

However, there appear to me to be two points worth mentioning, one of which differs substantially from what other Members have already said, the other of which differs only in nuances. What I am concerned about is the more effective utilization of technical facilities and a change in our methods. I agree with Mr Brandt that we shall have to rethink our attitudes, but that is something we must all do.

The major institutions — such as the World Bank, the UN and the FAO — have proposed and applied models aimed at solving the problem, and these have met with varying degrees of success. A word of constructive criticism should then be in order.

As far as the technical facilities are concerned, let me point out that large-scale projects have often in the past lacked any real spatial and temporal planning. For instance, abattoirs have been erected despite the lack of an efficient cattle industry in the vicinity. Hospitals are built despite the fact that there are not enough doctors to work in them, and spanking new refuse disposal facilities are created without regard to the necessary transport infrastructure.

As a result, those people we want to help are not really benefitting. Expensive hospitals are of little use when so many children are stricken with trachoma, which can be effectively cured by an inexpensive cream applied at the right time.

The problem of the fair allocation of resources is another thing entirely. The unfair or inequitable distri-

bution of land is often regarded as a cause of inadequate food production — as Mr Jaquet said yesterday. Large estates come in for special criticism as being largely inefficient. At closer inspection, however, this argument does not necessarily hold water, because — as we all know — the main areas of world hunger are to be found in South-East Asia and Africa, where the land is owned exclusively by smallholders. In Latin America, for instance, land redistribution programmes have proved to be only partially successful in the fight against hunger. Nonetheless, reform is urgently needed here, precisely because of the negative experience we should be learning from.

A more effective means of tackling the problem of hunger is more effective support for trade and industry, and this point has been made in many forms so far in this debate. For instance, there is the scientifically-based argument that agriculture should develop hand-in-hand with backing for the industrial sector. It has been printed out here that mistakes have been made in managing industrial investment. On this point, I go along with Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, but we must accept that to err is human. In my opinion, we should not now throw out the baby with the bathwater and concentrate exclusively on agricultural development without — as was said this morning — encouraging the development of small and medium-sized firms.

We now have to ask ourselves in what economic-policy conditions a mixed investment programme along these lines would be possible. In my opinion, this House has so far not given any thought to this matter. I have honestly tried to find a centralized economic system with the proven ability to overcome the problem of the lack of commodities, to create incomes and satisfy the wishes of the consumer, or simply to alleviate hunger. I have come to the conclusion that it will only be possible to bring about a rapid improvement in incomes in those countries with the political will to institute a better competitive economy with the essential framework conditions, and with such features as the free movement of capital and labour, free competition and private property safeguards and in particular with a fiscal policy designed to encourage independence and thus a market economy system, which would thus be a democratizing system maximizing resource-efficiency and thus helping to solve the problem.

We have heard references to a new world economic system, which is allright by me so long as someone will explain who is to be responsible for cutting up and distributing the pieces of the cake. In my opinion, we should take concrete steps to improve the efficiency of our development aid volunteer systems. We must give some thought as to how we can improve the quality of this system which is designed to encourage self-help. Young people today are prepared to make sacrifices to bring about social improvement, which is something we all welcome. The essential technical equipment for

Rabbethge

craft trades, farmers, engineers, nursery school teachers, nurses and doctors is usually available, but all too often we get complaints from the developing countries about our young development aid volunteers. In their sense of social commitment, these people all too often interfere in the political life of their host countries and get so involved in internal conflicts that they finish up in prison and have to be fetched out by their national Embassy staff.

That is just a point I wanted to make in conclusion. We should bear this aspect in mind and try to improve our training schemes to make the young volunteers more aware and more respectful of other religious ways of life, other cultures and other mentalities they are likely to come across in their host countries. Let me remind you of what the great French poet and writer Romain Rolland said: 'The idea is important, the thought is essential, but the deed is decisive'.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us proceed to action today. Let us express our solidarity with the people of the Community who expect more than just more words and resolutions; they expect us to set an example. Let us try in this first legislative period, at work and at home in our families to motivate young people to become development aid volunteers — with the essential technical qualifications and mindful of what I said just now. That would perhaps be a way of showing that the European Community is not only good at talking, but is also prepared to set an example.

President. — I call Mr Johnson.

Mr Johnson. — Mr President, the amendment standing in my name calls on the Community and on the Member States to increase their aid to countries which request assistance in the field of population and family planning. I stress the words 'countries which request assistance'. I am speaking of a situation where a country has a population policy or a family planning programme and where it wishes to seek external help in the implementation of that programme.

What kind of help? In most cases we are dealing with a wide range of projects. Countries may need assistance in establishing the basic demographic characteristics. What is the size of the population? What is its distribution? How fast is it growing? What are the rates of fertility, mortality, internal migration and so on? They may need assistance in setting up the infrastructure necessary for the spread of family planning both in urban and rural areas.

Now in many cases there is an acute shortage of doctors and nurses and para-medical workers of all kinds. They may need contraceptive supplies of one kind or another or the money to buy such supplies.

My amendment, and others which are before the House, would simply call upon the Community to recognize in its own development and cooperation efforts that this is a perfectly legitimate area of assistance and we call upon Member States to do likewise. I am convinced, Mr President, that this amendment is entirely relevant to the debate which the Parliament is holding on world hunger.

You do not have to be a Malthusian to believe that high rates of population growth in many developing countries exacerbate the pressures on food supplies and on resources of all kinds. The evidence is unmistakable that in many parts of the world the stork is out-running the plough. And, in any case, even where *per capita* food supply is managing to keep ahead of population growth, we are often talking about such a low starting base in terms of calorie and protein intake that statistical gains are virtually meaningless.

Of course, population and family planning policy are delicate areas. National sensitivity is involved. Personal convictions are involved. But we must try to leave polemics behind. What we must focus on is the need for assistance where this is clearly felt and clearly expressed by developing countries. It may be that the Community will, at the request of governments, include a population and family planning component in its overall package of aid. It may be that Member States will do likewise in their own assistance programmes. Some are already doing it. All could do more.

What we should also do, I think, is encourage the efforts of international organizations in the area such as the United Nations Fund for Population Activities and the World Health Organization, and non-governmental organizations like the International Planned Parenthood Federation.

Mr President, I conclude by saying that I attended in 1974 the World Population Conference in Bucharest. That conference adopted a world population plan of action. All the Community Member States subscribed to that plan of action. I think the time has come for the Community to honour the commitments made in Bucharest. I therefore commend the amendment to the House.

President. — I call our new — and probably youngest — colleague, Mr De Gucht.

Mr De Gucht. — (NL) Mr President, there are two problems — closely related to each other — which are of special importance for the subject we are dealing with today, and they are the stabilization of agricultural prices and the influence of multinational companies in the food sector.

I should like in this context to emphasize the need for improving national agricultural prices in the develop-

De Gucht

ing countries and their importance as a stimulus for farmers. Agricultural prices are in fact very low in the developing countries, usually as a result of a policy of favouring consumers in towns and because of high taxes levied on products for own consumption. To encourage farmers to increase production, it is absolutely essential for the prices of basic agricultural products to be stabilized. This should be seen as a first tentative step towards an increase in agricultural prices in the long run. The Stabex system introduced for the benefit of the ACP countries makes it possible to increase prices as well as reducing taxation on agricultural incomes. This does not mean to say, though, that a Stabex system is not open to improvement, for instance, by extending its scope to a wider range of products. I am thinking here in particular of fisheries products, which should incidentally feature on the developing countries' menu. The Stabex system covers only a limited number of countries — the ACP countries — and here the range could well be extended.

Mr President, talk of agricultural prices brings us automatically onto the multinational companies and their destabilizing role. We have witnessed a worrying development over the last few years, namely the ever-growing vertical organization to complement the old horizontal organization. Multinational companies in the agricultural sector have always monopolized the entire production process, from the production of basic products in the developing countries up to distribution in the industrialized countries. By means of monopolies and cartels, they are in a position to manipulate the level of production and prices. The control exerted by the multinational companies extends to the means of production, fertilizers, seeds and agricultural machinery, in which sector these major companies often have a monopoly as well. Only the large-scale, rich farmers are interested in such machinery — or, to be more precise, can afford to be interested — because farmers' incomes are so low that the majority cannot hope to invest in such machinery. As a result, the multinationals buy up the agricultural products — need we say? — at a low price from the producers or national sales agencies, and sell the goods at enormous profit at relatively low prices in the developed countries, which already have an abundance of the stuff. As a result, the dependent position of farmers increases, as they make a loss on production for export and at the same time neglect production for their own consumption, whereby the whole process often jeopardizes the delicate ecological balance. The processing of basic products is likewise in the hands of the multinationals, which are organized on a capital-intensive basis with the aim of maximizing profits.

Let me sum up by saying that the multinationals control not only the whole production process, but also all those aspects which have a decisive effect on prices. We have only to think of transport of the produce by sea and their control over stocks. In order to maximize their profits, the multinationals force down prices paid to farmers and thus encourage the destabi-

lization of agricultural prices to enable enormous profits to be made by speculative dealing. Speculation may consist of restricting production so as to send selling prices shooting up. The distasteful thing here, Mr President, is not the fact that profits are being made so much as that the price paid is all too often hunger throughout the entire population. Specialization in certain products for export on the part of developing countries also increases their dependence on prices on the international market and the multinationals operating in this field.

The power of the multinationals over the developing countries is best illustrated by the fact that some of the multinationals have a turnover which is higher than the gross national product of some of the developing countries. There can be no doubt that private investment is absolutely essential for the development of the Third World, but an appropriate response must be found to the activities of the multinationals and the danger they represent in terms of world hunger. The European Community must formulate a code of behaviour for the multinationals as a matter of urgency — those companies with registered offices in the Community, of course — encouraging investment in sectors which are of decisive importance to the developing countries. This code of behaviour should make the companies' management somewhat easier to keep track of, the aim being to prevent — and if necessary authorize — the manipulation of transfer prices and restrictive measures. The code of behaviour should also incorporate a social element, guaranteeing an elementary level of protection as regards working conditions, as recommended by the International Labour Office. The Community should make its contribution to a policy of national agricultural prices, incorporating an element of stimulus for producers — a policy which incidentally is closely connected to the question of the stability of international food prices.

President. — Thank you, Mr De Gucht. I should like to congratulate you on your maiden speech.

I call Mr Narducci.

Mr Narducci. — (*I*) Speaking at the end of a debate, Mr President, has the obvious disadvantage that many things that one might wish to say have already been amply stated. But for the same reason it is possible to keep to the allotted time, since brevity in such cases becomes an obligation. I shall therefore limit myself to a few remarks.

The first is that the vote which this Parliament is about to give on the Ferrero motion for a resolution on hunger in the world is an important one because it shows that there is in this Chamber, going beyond all the legitimate and due ideological and political differences, a majority of persons of goodwill — we also saw this during the vote on the budget — who are able

Narducci

to respond to serious and specific objectives, not by demagogy and unrealistic exaggeration, but by real and effective construction. The fact that such a majority exists in this Chamber augurs well for the future and permits us to say that the work done to alleviate the hunger in the world will not be mere bombast, mere propaganda fodder, but genuine and constructive assistance on a day-by-day basis to the starving populations. As I said there is a majority of persons of goodwill, from whom only those are excluded who have used this subject as a platform for demagogy . . .

(Interruption from Mr Capanna)

Mr Capanna, hunger in the world will not be eliminated by 80 amendments, it will not be eliminated by abstaining from the work of the working group on hunger in the world and by refusing to carry out the tasks which have been laid upon us. We are there to work and to build, that is why we have a committee, to accept tasks and to do our duty, and if you are looking for exploiters in this Chamber you should look also amongst those who do nothing but use up paper and avoid work . . .

(Interruption from Mr Castellina)

no, I said that they should be sought among those who do not work, and I can scarcely avoid noting that the amendments have been signed exclusively by Mr Pannella. So if the shoe fits . . . But this is not really what we should be talking about. A realistic way forward has been chosen, a policy of reform has been chosen and I think it is worthwhile pausing to consider this with respect to the future policies which we may perhaps be able to develop together, quite apart from the differences between us which, as I said, are perfectly proper and will continue to exist.

I have three rather marginal comments on matters which I find of importance. I fully agree with the remarks in the Ferrero report on demographic education. Mrs Cassanmagnago also highlighted this point, but some voices have been raised in this Assembly which appear to see the problem rather in terms of massive demographic planning, with which we clearly cannot agree, not only because the World Population Conference in Bucharest rejected this approach, but because it has been shown to be valueless by the scientific studies carried out following the horrifying arguments of the Club of Rome and the MIT. Education in responsible family planning is one thing, but planning on a massive scale which would impinge on the most delicate aspects of human life is another.

My second remark is that many speakers have underlined the value of the non-governmental associations, and I too would like to stress this point. Without voluntary workers, without the capability which these have of penetrating all areas of the Third World successfully, generously, and effectively, areas where the international and government organizations are

unable to enter, without the cooperation of these organizations virtually anything done for the Third and Fourth World is likely to run aground. We must take full account of this when we are discussing the budget, because we shall be continuing this debate on that occasion, and we must then find some fundamental outlets. The same applies to food aid. I agree also with those who say that direct food aid can act as a disincentive to local populations. It is fair to be concerned about this, but we must not forget that the food aid is useful. When I see that the preliminary draft budget reduces the relevant appropriation, instead of increasing it, I feel extremely concerned and consider that we must return to dealing with these questions when we come to discuss the budget.

In conclusion, my final comment would be that this debate seems to have had the common thread that none of us wishes to accept or is able to accept that hunger is an ineradicable evil. We are all convinced that if we continue to work day by day, a little every day, hunger is a scourge which can be eliminated. We have often seen the links between armaments and hunger and, since we are unable to believe that war is necessary, we must likewise refuse to accept that hunger is necessary. Unless we engage in moral disarmament something good can be done every day. The fact that international organizations like the United Nations are in difficulties, while this Parliament on the other hand is able to put together a majority, with its own strength and style, indicates to me that our contact with our voters, with the real views of the citizens who are behind us, perhaps provides some hope which cannot be disregarded.

President. — I call Lady Elles.

Lady Elles. — Mr President, I shall speak in telegraphic style in order to save time.

First, we are debating the role of the Community and its responsibilities towards the rest of the world. We already live in an interdependent world, and what we are discussing is not whether we should have responsibilities but what responsibilities we have and how we should implement them. The very first request I would make to Member States, in the overwhelming contribution that the Community can make to further development of less-developed countries, is to welcome warmly and immediately Zimbabwe as a signatory to the Lomé Convention; to stop haggling over the quantities of bags of sugar and packets of tobacco and to recognize that there are 7 million people in the heart of Africa who want to be associated with the European Community. I very much hope that the Commission will maintain a strong position *vis-à-vis* the Council and do all they can to see that this measure is implemented at the very earliest possible moment.

Lady Elles

Secondly, we are all agreed, I think, that there will always be a need for emergency food aid to deal with situations resulting from war and from drought and other climatic events. It is a political inescapability and we have to make up our minds. If ever the CAP has achieved only this, to bring food aid to millions of people throughout the world, it has justified its existence from the beginning: there is no question whether the CAP must be continued, it is again a question of how. Many proposals have been made today and I know that the Commissioner will be listening with interest. Here is a question which must be discussed more deeply, to see how the CAP and different regions of the Community can be used to the greatest effect to bring food aid to those parts of the world which will undoubtedly need it for some years to come.

Thirdly, the long-term contribution of the Community: it is impossible to have an agricultural programme if it is not multiannual, and this, I think, must be recognized straight away in the budget.

Fourthly, we have had many cases of the total failure of projects, and I think there must be much a better study of pilot projects, for instance in afforestation of in the provision of water. We have heard ridiculous examples of stupid and inefficient results, and further studies should be made to see how this can be improved. Above all, there is an overwhelming need for the exchange of technical information, such as the magnificent work that has been done by a small village in Tuscany, at Borgo a Mozzano, in training indigenous agricultural teachers to teach their own farmers how to farm. There should be far more of these individual projects set up within the Community for the benefit of agriculturalists in less-developed countries. In this connection, the proposals of Sir Fred Catherwood and Mr Debré can be seen to be interdependent: teaching people to produce for themselves and at the same time to improve their purchasing capacity and so encouraging trade and commerce.

So it is not a question now of merely transferring resources; we have to consider to whom. We have not mentioned the newly-industrialized countries. They now export ten times the amount of manufactured products they did in 1965, if you take Hong Kong or South Korea, and 30 times, if you take Brazil; but if we in the Community are to apply protectionist measures, all the efforts that these countries, with their ingenuity and their skills, have made within their free-market economies will give way to retrogression, so that a measure of protectionism is a measure against the development of many parts of the world.

Fifthly, how much should we give? I do not believe these arbitrary figures of 0.7 % or 1 % are helpful. The Development Assistance Committee countries' contribution amounted to US \$ 19.8 billion in 1978, and according to the Thirteenth General Report of the Community, 2.4 billion EUAs went over the last 2

years to the Lomé countries, which comprise 282 million people. But what are the effects of this? We heard earlier from Mr Poniatowski that food imported to the less-developed countries amounted to 20 million tonnes in 1950; now the figure is 80 million tonnes. It is clear that there is correlation between the amount of aid going into these countries and the amount of food they are being able to produce, and it is, therefore, a question of what we do to see that this money is used effectively.

The Netherlands yesterday issued a report which says that of their 1.4 billion dollars' worth of aid, many projects must be halted; many projects are useless; many projects even have counterproductive effects. It is not the willingness to give that matters, it is how this money can be applied effectively. In this connection, I should like to tell Mr Pajetta that the British record is an extremely good one. In the EOC Development Cooperation Review of 1979, of the total net flow of resources in 1978 the United Kingdom accounted for US \$ 10 billion, of 3.35 % of its GNP. Italy, I regret to say — and I am not attacking the Italian Government but merely saying this for the benefit of Mr Pajetta — had a figure of 1.21 %; Germany 1.19 %. I do not think that the United Kingdom has anything to be ashamed of.

With regard to the effectiveness of aid, the World Bank Report said that power-stations in India are working at 50 % efficiency. A saving of 7 % by power-stations throughout the less-development countries would mean a saving of US \$ 2 billion a year. So here is something practical which I think the Community should consider and see how they can cooperate with less-developed countries' governments.

With regard to the multinationals, many less-developed countries in fact welcome the multinationals. They have seen from their own bitter experience after independence that Marxism just does not work as an economic system, and it is no good holding out political dogmas as a cure for the suffering of the people who have been living under Marxist régimes. We are now seeing many less-developed countries turning to what is, perhaps, a failing capitalist system but nevertheless one which does produce wealth, which does create opportunities and does provide encouragement for the native populations of those countries. We only have to see the increase in the number of governments which are passing national legislation to protect foreign investments and encourage the multinationals to go in. Of course they need to be guided, they need to be guarded — there are guidelines, and that is, of course, to be welcomed and approved — but the multinationals as such do make a contribution to development, and I think it is political dogma to deny that this is so.

What do we give to the less-developed countries? A transfer of technology, as such, is again useless. The less-developed countries will be littered with the trans-

Lady Elles

fer of broken-down and irreparable remnants of technology unless these are maintained and unless there is the training to use them. I believe firmly that there should be a better use of the European University which, after all, we have in our Community, to facilitate the exchange of ideas and to encourage bright students from less-developed countries to learn what Europe has to offer. After all, we have not suffered blood, sweat and tears for 2 500 years and come where we have just at the drop of a hat. I think others can learn from the way we go about things, from our respect for the individual, which will help them to respect individuals in their own country.

I strongly support what Mrs Cassanmagnago Ceretti said on population problems. You cannot have population control in a country like Botswana, with a population of 800 000 inhabiting an area the size of France. The French with a population of 52 million, would be indignant if somebody told them that they must control their population: why should you, therefore, go and tell it to a population of 800 000? So I think these are matters which need looking at.

In conclusion, Mr President, I should like to thank most warmly Mr Ferrero and all those who have contributed to making this debate so worthwhile. We hope that, unlike the UN Assembly, we shall be able to adopt this report unanimously. We hope you will look kindly on our amendments, but that what goes out from this Parliament will show that we know that we have responsibilities and we are prepared to take them.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Vergès.

Mr Vergès. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, since I have only a very short speaking time, I should like to place the emphasis of my speech on the following points.

Firstly, however great our shock may have been at seeing the pictures shown in the press and on television in Europe of the victims of the famine which is now raging in Uganda, it is nonetheless true that we have generally approached this problem from the point of view of pity for the victims and by showing finer feelings which could ease our consciences. Anyway, this tragedy did not stay front page news for long, and it is not even back page news any longer. However, undernourishment and malnutrition which place the lives of whole unborn generations in jeopardy — and which ever more frequently lead to genocidal famines — are permanent fixtures in what is called the Third World. The figure of tens of millions of victims per year has been quoted. This is like having a Hiroshima disaster every two days. This many-faceted problem has been with us for years, and will remain with us for years and years to come. What can we do to ensure that this

lasting, widespread tragedy is ever-present in the minds of the European public and in public opinion in the developed countries? This is a top priority. We should give thought to the reproach levelled at us recently by the minister from Senegal who during the United Nations' session in New York stated that it was because the leaders of the affluent countries considered themselves culturally superior to the Third World that they were unable to see the true size of poverty in the Third World.

Secondly — and the report and most of the speakers have stressed this point — the situation in the developing countries will become even worse. I shall not repeat all the figures which were quoted. But I should like to stress how disastrously deep in debt the countries of the Third World are. Their total debt was some \$ 400 thousand million at the end of 1979 and for the same year world military expenditure alone exceeded this figure. We should point out that development aid received by the Third World countries for the same year totalled less than 6 % of their external deficit. It is not surprising that many of these countries are already on the verge of bankruptcy.

Thirdly, the scale and seriousness of the problems they have to solve are magnified by the consequences of a population explosion which can be objectively explained. We should not forget that in twenty years from now, there will be one billion five hundred thousand more people on earth, and 90 % of those will be from the Third World, the Third World which will then account for 80 % of world population. Mexico City will have 30 million inhabitants, Calcutta 20 million, Cairo, Jakarta and Seoul between 15 and 20 million. Twenty years is not far away. What can we do to ensure that public opinion in those countries which are wealthy and powerful, and above all that the media in Europe become aware of the threat to all mankind which this truly meteoric metamorphosis will pose, a metamorphosis which is certainly the greatest in the history of mankind.

But we should not let these figures paint a picture of doom. There is no such thing as historical inevitability. Various speakers have stressed that there are ways and means, in terms of resources, manpower and technology, to solve the problems of hunger and the problems of development in the future. This does not mean that we should underestimate the scope and complexity of the problems, but that there are ways of solving them. If we are faced with this tragic situation today it is because there are certain forces whose aim is to maintain the status quo, because that is what the international division of labour is based on, a division which was the cornerstone of the material and financial power of the Western countries during the Empire building phase in the development of the capitalist system. This is why we can see that these problems can only be solved by closing our ranks for the struggle, and not by sanctimonious utterings or technical directives which are often tinged with paternalism. In fact,

Vergès

the simple choice — and I am forced to simplify things here — the 'grand design' which confronts the industrialized countries and the Third World and in particular Europe and Africa, is that of a broad alliance between the peaceful and democratic movements in Europe and the democratic and revolutionary movements in Africa, so that a new economic order may be established, a new economic order which will be a departure from the old and will mean progress in the social field. This is the noble objective, the grand design which links our fate with that of other nations. For we cannot hope to save ourselves without joining together and showing solidarity, building a new international system which will be the key to the future of the peoples of Europe and of Africa.

President. — I call Mr Maher.

Mr Maher. — I have very limited time and I will try to make the best use of it to make a few practical points. First of all, I think it is important that this Parliament should abandon the Jekyll and Hyde attitude of some people who say on the one hand we have got to reduce agricultural production within the Community and at the same time we have got to give more food to the people in other parts of the world who are hungry. Those two views are self-contradictory. For God's sake let us abandon them!

Secondly, this problem clearly cannot be solved by any one single measure. It must be solved by a combination of measures. In the short-term food aid, and in some cases in the long-term, food aid too. But the most important thing is to help these people to help themselves. In that context, Mr President, it is utterly illogical that some of these countries are exporting food while at the same time there is serious malnutrition and hunger in that same country. One of the reasons is, of course, that they are producing the wrong kind of food. The classic example is sugar. They are exporting sugar to a very difficult market. Could we not give them technical aid to convert to producing soya beans, which is a protein food, which they need badly? We know that where you can grow sugar cane you can also grow soya beans. In that way they will be helping to make up their own protein needs and at the same time have a product to sell to the western world that is always in short supply. There is a good market for soya beans and protein at all times. We would in this way be helping these countries to help themselves and at the same time putting their economies on a better footing.

My third point, Mr President, is this: could we help these people to help themselves to produce more food by supplying them with simple implements for production? Not sophisticated tractors or sophisticated farm machinery which rely on oil for their operation, which makes them dependent on the whim of the Arabs in increasing the price of or stopping oil supplies. Simple

implements that are operated by animal power rather than by oil. After all, did we not feed the peoples of Europe for thousands of years with implements operated by animal power: buffaloes, donkeys, horses, cattle, etc. In any event, Mr President, many of these countries lack the technical expertise needed to operate, maintain or to repair many of these machines. Maybe we could even set up industries in some of the regions in our own countries to produce very simple ploughs, cultivators and so on. Moreover, Mr President, let us bolt them together, not weld them together. I have seen cases in some parts of Africa where welded machines got broken. There were no welders present. They did not even have electricity to repair them. Let us think about these details.

My final point, Mr President, is directed to Mr Cheysson. Mr Cheysson, I know that shortly you are having a meeting with the representatives of the agricultural and fishing cooperatives of the European Community. I remind you that a tremendous fund of expertise and knowledge and competence exists inside these organizations, in galvanizing people to help themselves. We have done it in Europe. Could you use this expertise in order to help people in the African countries to establish cooperatives, in order to help themselves? It is there for you to use, Mr Cheysson. Indeed, I say that first of all you need to recognize the value of these cooperatives. They are self-help organizations. They have performed tremendous services for the agricultural and fishing communities of the European Community. Let us see if we can use them to help the people of the Third World.

President. — I call Mr Pedini.

Mr Pedini. — (I) Mr President, when this debate was being prepared last year I had an opportunity to express my opinions, and having now read this bulky report, which has certainly clarified the terms of reference of this debate, I remain convinced that the problem of aid to the hungry and emerging nations of the world demands first of all, on the part of the European nations, a willingness to pursue their sectoral policies, be they economic, agricultural or industrial, in full awareness of their responsibility to those who are hungry, in other words to the developing countries. We shall not be able to change the world, Mr President, if we are unable to change ourselves.

My hope in this debate, Mr President, is that the honourable Members who have spoken here will be able to influence their governments so that they will be able to provide a common answer to this challenge. This debate has highlighted once again the problem of how we should link this Assembly, and its political will, to the national parliaments which, in turn, bear responsibility for the participation of the various nations, the authentic wielders of power and the

Pedini

economic instruments, in the establishment of this policy. And since this policy must be 'polyphonic' and requires coordination of all our political activities, I should like to make a single critical observation.

I regret the fact that in the consultations which led to agreements between our excellent rapporteur and the Committee on Agriculture, the Economic Committee and many other committees, no account was taken of the responsibility of this Parliament for the promotion of a policy relating to schools, youth, and the training of *cadres* which would reflect this responsibility to the new developing world.

I know that the vast experience of Commissioner Cheysson, who has already spoken on this subject, will make up this deficiency, for I believe that if we ignore schools and, the training of young people, and fail to show the young that we are willing to take part in this important task of promoting technical and human assistance in the hungry parts of the world, all the rest of our work will be in vain.

For this reason, Mr President, I intend in my capacity as Chairman of the Committee on Youth, Culture and Education, to present the document on which we are voting today to the European Youth Forum as a text for study and as a concrete foundation aimed at promoting a policy of voluntary help, technical cooperation and understanding of the new cultural dimensions of the problem, without which, alas, our proposals will remain a dead letter.

President. — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — (*I*) Mr President, honourable Members, Mr rapporteur, clearly I am not one of the majority of men and women of goodwill who will vote in favour of this motion. I do not know whether Mr Narducci will conclude from this that I am a person of bad will, but I must tell you that I shall not vote in favour of this report, not because I am in any way predisposed to the idea of voting with a large majority, but for a number of very specific reasons relating to the text of the motion for a resolution.

In my view the fundamental weakness of this motion is clear from paragraph 7, which is the crucial one. This motion is out of date with respect to the 0.7 % of the gross national product which the developed countries decided, in 1970, to give for public development aid. It is out of date indeed with respect to the motion which we approved in October, when following a debate which was to some extent rather rushed, and which had not been prepared by months of contacts, we voted in favour of 0.7 % of the gross national product immediately, even though the immediacy may be regarded as somewhat relative given the delay of ten years which has already accumulated.

In this new motion, however, any commitment, any indication of dates, has completely disappeared. All we have is a wish that the countries might be willing to give 0.7 %, a wish that is already ten years old and which could well become twenty years old. The various governments are invited to honour us with a timetable within which they might finally be prepared to allocate this 0.7 %.

Now it is true that this Parliament has no binding powers, but it did have and still has a power and a duty to direct and to stimulate. Here the only directive and stimulus which we are in fact putting forward is to ask the governments if they would, please, let us have a timetable. I do feel, Mr rapporteur, that this is really far too little, and we have therefore submitted an amendment which we offer as a form of compromise, in which we ask for the 0.7 % by 1983. When we come to vote on this amendment we shall ask for an electronic vote by name because we consider it of political importance to know which countries, which colleagues and which political groupings favour this specific commitment, and because the attitudes of the different political groups will provide us with a means of judging the behaviour of these same groups in their respective national parliaments.

The second point which I wish to emphasize relates to paragraph 41 on the Food Aid Convention, which the rapporteur has corrected with an amendment which, I am sorry to say, does not satisfy me either. Admittedly a new food aid agreement has to be concluded by June 1981, but here too no figure has been fixed. What on earth does 'the quantities to be provided are to be adequately increased' mean? Adequate with respect to what? The only acceptable increase would be to provide ten million tonnes for the new food aid agreement. This is a figure which has been on the table for at least ten years and it has never yet been reached and it would have been advisable to fix, in the context of our work, a specific non-demagogic and certainly not unrealistic objective — one indeed that is relatively modest, but specific.

Thirdly, it is my view that the entire part B of this highly disjointed motion, which deals in one place with cooperatives and in another with women's education, education of young people, aid to agriculture and the industrial sector, does not seem to me to have much relevance to an organic food strategy leading to self-sufficiency in food or agricultural development.

Finally, Mr President, with respect to the emergencies, which, as many Members have pointed out, are occurring and will continue to occur for a long time, in particular the present crises in Uganda, Djibouti, the Sahel, Ogaden, and elsewhere, we have long been in favour of the creation of a European task force which would be able to intervene immediately wherever necessary, and to use the existing military transport which is generally supposed to be carrying out exercises. Instead of inventing exercises, we should be

Bonino

using these vehicles to perform the necessary carriage of products. It is intolerable that in Uganda today there are only two helicopters available to transport food while we have in all the countries of the European Community, I believe, plentiful supplies of unused military means of transport.

I shall finish these few words, Mr President, with the wish that today's sitting will not mark the end of our interest in preventing starvation, and that the topic will not be shoved back on the shelf for another entire year. We shall continue with this struggle and I can inform you that during the next part-session an extra-parliamentary campaign will be organized here to underpin our interest and particularly to call the attention of all honourable Members to what will be our next extremely important rendezvous with Mr Cheysson, that is on the budget.

I hope that we shall not see a repetition of what happened last year, the voting of a motion in October, with the subsequent approval of a budget which with respect to cooperation and development offered less in percentage terms than the budget which was rejected.

President. — I call Mr Cheysson.

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) Mr President, I should first like to express my thanks for this very comprehensive debate, and I should like to reply to many of the points raised, but unfortunately time does not permit. Mr President, several speakers, and then the Chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation asked the Commission to explain what had happened in New York, at the opening of the North-South dialogue. I might perhaps just recall that the aim of the special session which has just ended, unsatisfactorily, was two-fold. The first aim was to adopt what is known as the 'development strategy for the third decade', that meant laying down the broad lines of North-South relations for the next ten years. The talks had already reached a very advanced stage on this subject at the start of the special session. Only one point was in dispute and the delegation from this Parliament, presided over by Mr Bersani, had occasion during its stay in New York to express its concern at the fact that two of our Member States showed a marked reticence in stating their position.

On this point, I am pleased to be able to report that progress has been made, since general agreement was finally reached and because in the strategy document which the General Assembly can now adopt, the target figure of 0.7% for all industrialized countries is repeated and the document then goes on to state that every effort will be made to reach this target before 1985, and that come what may this target will be reached at the latest during the second half of this decade. A subsequent target of 1%, then 2%, is also mentioned. So progress has been made on this point.

The second aim of the special session was to facilitate the launching of negotiations between all the countries in the world on all the problems affecting North-South relations. The Community had adopted a decision in principle before the delegation left for New York, and this decision, although its contents were simple and strictly limited, was at least comprehensive. It accepted that all the topics should be examined because if this were not the case the talks would have no outcome. It also stressed how urgent some aspects of the problem were, the same aspects which were noted in the Brandt report — and Mr Brandt reminded us of this the day before yesterday during the debate — but it also accepted the principle of discussion on the structures to be used. It was drawn up with two things in mind, first that all the questions should be considered by all the countries which play a real part in negotiation, the countries of Eastern Europe, the oil producing countries, together with the industrialized countries and developing countries. Further, it envisaged a balance between the General Assembly and the specialized agencies so that empty procedural arguments and unacceptable delays could be avoided.

The importance of this session was also highlighted by the noteworthy presence of all the Ministers of Foreign Affairs — or almost all — of our Member States, whose introductory speeches were extremely constructive and greatly appreciated.

And yet, the procedural discussion went on for ages. Towards the end of it the Community, albeit with reservations from two Member States, was able to propose a text which was taken up by the Yugoslav delegation and which appeared also to be quite satisfactory from our point of view. This text provided for three-phase negotiations, the first phase being a centralized one aimed at deciding on the objectives and laying down guidelines, the second taking place within the specialized agencies and ad-hoc committees, and the third aimed at reaching overall agreement, a 'package' as United Nations' jargon puts it. All the decisions at all levels should be taken unanimously by consensus. We really thought that we had achieved a breakthrough.

Unfortunately things then started to go wrong. On Monday, the failure of the session had to be conceded although it was noted — and I should like to stress the interesting and very specific wording to this text — that, except for the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States, all the states were prepared to accept the outline plan which I have just told you about, an outline which I should like to remind you came indirectly from the Community. This is a very serious setback.

It is serious because it means further delay in launching the comprehensive negotiations on which the Third World pins so much hope, but it is also serious for the boosting of the world economy. This setback,

Cheysson

and the way it was presented, are also — if you don't mind me saying so — strange. The wording of the text is strange. I think it is one of the first occasions ever in the history of the United Nations that one of the 'super powers' has been so isolated in this way.

It is also peculiar, Mr President, as far as the Community is concerned. Is there any great divergence between the Nine on the broad lines and basic principles? No, there is not. The Nine showed in many different ways at the United Nations, during the speeches at the closing ceremony, that they had the same basic principles and took the same stand on the comprehensive negotiations. The same cannot be said of the United States and I should like to quote the ambassador Mr McHenry, who was speaking on behalf of his country and who stated that there was a fundamental difference of opinion. Amongst the three countries which are explicitly referred to by name in the final resolution, I thus observe that one clearly states that there is a fundamental difference of opinion, whereas the other two, within the Community, recognize individually that they are in complete agreement on the basic principle and the stand which should be taken, but they are simply not in agreement on the tactics to be used. The outcome of this disagreement on tactics is that the Community split apart in New York, and did so while stating categorically that it was unanimous on the basic principles, on the stand to be taken, and on the way in which the text should be interpreted but two of its Members rejected.

Mr President, I shall harp on this no longer, since it does not concern the North-South dialogue, which I shall now return to. Is everything then lost? Certainly not. When the General Assembly meets we can take up this text again, the text on which all the countries in the world except the United States have expressed their agreement as regards its basic principles, the stand to be taken, the way it is worded, and the way it is translated. And then we must take some specific steps: because the North-South dialogue is not simply this debate at the United Nations, a debate which is often conducted in terms which are quite incomprehensible to the man in the street, but it is also the examination of specific problems. And we shall have very specific opportunities to ensure that progress is made on this matter.

At the end of this month, in Washington, the meeting will take place of the bodies set up under the Bretton Woods agreement. Everyone accepts that these bodies could be of great use in solving the problems of recycling petrodollars and of the progress to be made in the Third World. Here I refer to the Brandt report, and to the declarations made by all our governments without exception. So, I am expecting progress to be made in a few days in Washington, on ways of making better use of the potential of the International Monetary Fund, on the follow-up which will be given to the very interesting proposals Mr McNamara made on this subject in connection with the Brandt report.

We ourselves in the Community will have the chance to show how interested we are in the North-South dialogue. Negotiations on the cocoa agreement will restart at the end of October. I hope that the Community will iron out the amazing contradiction which exists between the aid it gives to cocoa producers, the guarantees it gives to those producers where export revenue is concerned and its desire to take advantage of the lowest possible prices in a speculators' market.

There are also, as Lady Elles has said, our discussions with Zimbabwe, our talks with the oil producing countries, and some advance is being made in these talks. Mr Cohen referred to a quite remarkable step taken by Venezuela and Mexico. These countries have accorded the right to some Third World countries to a 30 % refund on the price of their oil, provided that the funds so generated are spent on development. I am pleased to be able to tell this House that both Mexico and Venezuela are fully prepared to work in close collaboration with us. Also, political pressure must be maintained in the summit meetings, Parliaments and within trade unions. Mr Brandt said this in his report and I am simply referring to what he said.

Mr President, I shall now very quickly return to the subject of our debate. Certain specific questions were put, by Mr Michel for example. No, we naturally do not intend to reduce development aid in the 1981 budget. Compare it with the 1980 budget and you will observe that there has been a large increase in aid. I should also like to say to Mr Michel that it is being a little ungenerous to quote the figure of 4.9 % as the proportion of our development aid expenditure in relation to the overall Community budget, because this does not take any account of the contributions under the Lomé convention which are large. The fact is that in 1980 1.9 thousand million units of account were spent, and I am not talking about commitments, compared with a total Community revenue of 17 thousand million. The proportion is even greater in 1981 and the real shares amount to 11 and 13 %.

In this debate, Mr President, I was struck by the fact that, with the very few exceptions of people who have a specific bias or are somewhat behind in their ideas, there is a general consensus in this House on the fact that we should give top priority to stimulating progress in the Third World countries themselves, that is to say that we should encourage progress within their societies by stimulating trade between them and boosting their production. I shall not go back over all that. I should just like to mention one more point before I conclude and that is the question of the overall balance of this analysis.

Everyone agrees that it is desirable that the countries of the Third World be encouraged to define their development strategies and to define their food strategy as part of that overall development strategy. I also think that this should be true for Europe. We also should define our food strategy, our strategy on agri-

Cheysson

cultural production and trade in agricultural produce in relation to overall world strategy. We are seeking to become self-sufficient, or at least to balance our external agricultural trade, and in doing so we must tailor our production, our agricultural strategy to the overall world food strategy, and the Common Agricultural Policy should enable us to do this.

The world outlook is that of a dearth. Figures have already been given and unfortunately they cannot be denied. All the countries of the temperate zones (Eastern Europe, North America and the Community) should act accordingly. Mr Brandt states that the Common Agricultural Policy should not be a means of obtaining surpluses. We all agree with him. Mr Debré states that surpluses are necessary in order to make outside action possible, and his reasoning is sound too. The only reproach I could make — and it is perhaps somewhat bold of a mere Commissioner to do so — would be that both of them start their analysis of the problem with surpluses. This is not the right place to start, neither if we wish to condemn these surpluses nor if we wish to encourage them. We should pitch our analysis in relation to our potential, and to our world responsibilities, and within the framework of a development strategy and a food strategy, and as long as we can see that there are needs we should ensure that our own strategy in agricultural matters can contribute towards meeting them, and that it can do so first and foremost in ways consonant with Third World countries' own development strategies of course. Our task is to place ourselves in this context, that is to render these developments possible, and this is why we need the means to make long and medium term commitments, by ensuring that our Common Agricultural Policy is adapted to their needs. I shall not repeat the numerous and well-founded criticisms of the Common Agricultural Policy which have been made in this House and we must of course keep all these considerations in mind when we revise that policy.

World food strategy is one of the basic factors to be considered when examining the Common Agricultural Policy, but I must state categorically here and now that the Common Agricultural Policy is also one of the basic factors in our contribution to world food strategy.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

President. — I call Mr Ferrero.

Mr Ferrero, rapporteur. — (I) Madam President, my dear colleagues, I see no reason, nor indeed any possibility given the lack of time, to close the debate

following Mr Cheysson's speech, and anyway I have no ambitions to do so. Moreover, the idea of winding up a debate such as that which we have been holding here during these last couple of days seems to me to be wrong, and to run contrary to the spirit which I feel has animated most of the speeches and which, at any rate, animated the work of the Committee on Development in preparing the motion for a resolution which will be voted on in a few moments.

I will tell you what I think the value of this debate has been. I believe it has lain in the fact that we have been able to examine the proposals contained in the motion, which the Committee on Development has placed before you, as a stepping stone, a point of departure as some Members put it, or as others described it, a working instrument. Yes, an instrument to perform work which does not finish today, but which in some ways merely begins today, and which takes these proposals, this document, as its starting point.

With the President's permission, I should like to make a few brief observations, and at the same time assure you, that I do not intend to speak during the voting procedure, in order to ensure that the debate which we have held can be rounded off by a debate worthy not only of this Parliament but also of the seriousness of the problems which we have been debating.

I wish therefore to stress first of all that no-one — no-one at all — will find everything he or she wants in the motion for a resolution which has been tabled. As others have pointed out, no-one will find his or her views reflected for a 100 % in this motion, I least of all. This, I believe, to be the merit of this motion: the fact that political groupings with various philosophies are able to agree on a common basis for action going beyond their differences, which remain unaffected. I understand the reactions of honourable Members; I understand the criticisms which have been made, and the doubts in people's minds; doubts and criticisms which I too have with respect to the text which we succeeded in drawing up within the Committee on Development. Someone said this was merely a catalogue; someone else saw in this motion an indifferent instrument in the struggle against hunger in the world and against underdevelopment.

But I believe I can say, in all honesty, that for my own part — and I believe that the same is true of all those who approved this motion in the Committee on Development and the various political groups — I endorse the spirit of this motion and its internal logic.

As you well know, ladies and gentlemen, and it is well worth stressing, this motion is the fruit of long and patient labour, requiring dozens of meetings, public hearings with political figures and top level experts. Too long a labour perhaps, but a labour carried out together with politicians from the various political parties which inevitably had to embrace, if it was

Ferrero

to be successful, various elements of conflict and compromise.

I shall not spend time dealing with the happenings at the Special Assembly of the United Nations in New York. Having heard the courageous and unambiguous statements of Mr Cheysson I do not believe that any of us will fail to see the link between the failure in New York, the difficulties and problems arising in New York, and what we are in a position to do today by adopting this motion in this Parliament, which is a meeting point for the responsible political groupings of various countries in Europe.

It seems to me that this motion is likely in the present circumstances to be the only working instrument of an international character available at the present time.

The real problem which faces us, therefore, is not that of improving the text of the motion further. Certainly it can be improved, given that it makes no claim to embrace all the problems relating to hunger and underdevelopment in the world. The problem is to possess this working instrument, which offers to Parliament — if you wish — a working and a fighting means which begins today, but which does not end today. It is a means of action: it may not be complete, it is certainly inadequate, but it is an instrument for action!

This brings me up immediately against the problem of the amendments which have been submitted. As you have all seen many amendments have been submitted, and this is in my view to be welcomed. I should like to touch on these briefly. I have read these amendments with attention, as many of you will certainly have done also. My impression is that there are three groups or categories of these amendments. The first is those which aim to improve the wording of the text; I believe that many of these could be accepted in that they yield a clearer and more explicit text. However, as I said, the question is not of adding words to words but of acting. And that is why I feel, now that we have got to this stage, that improvements in the wording are not indispensable. There are only two amendments of what I might call a technical nature which I can tell you now that I am prepared to support as rapporteur, which aim to bring the text up to date with respect to events which took place following the approval of the document: these are Amendments No 51 and No 25.

A second group of amendments, however, contains supplementary suggestions, more detailed proposals aimed at fleshing out proposals considered too meagre or merely referred to in the present text. In this category belong the amendments, to cite only these, of the Committee on Health. Clearly, ladies and gentlemen, we could write an entire book for the purposes of developing the suggestions and proposals for the various sectors contained in the present motion.

Finally, as you would expect, there are amendments which propose real changes, i.e. new proposals or at least proposals which differ from those contained in the present text. Here I think that we have to be responsible and recognize that there is a problem. I understand the motivations of those colleagues or political groups who felt at a certain stage in our work that they were unable to contribute fully to that work and who did not approve the motion which is put forward here, and who now put forward variant texts, indeed in a certain sense a different resolution. And I also understand those colleagues or those groups who did in fact take an active part in the work, and who voted, but who wish now to propose alterations to improve or give greater cohesion to the text. Both of these proceedings are legitimate and proper, but I feel I must point out to all these colleagues and to all these political groups that we shall have further occasions to put forward new proposals, improved proposals, more advanced proposals, and that we shall have further opportunities to express our views on these problems. After all, even in this sense the motion for a resolution is an instrument for action, because it lays down precise deadlines, and calls for precise commitments from the other Community institutions and the Member States.

I therefore believe that, if we all agree that actions must follow words, it is essential that we approve this motion for a resolution and have, as I said, a vote which is worthy of the debate which we have had and of the problem which we have been discussing.

Clearly, there can be no doubt at all of the legitimacy and in many cases also the usefulness of many of the amendments which have been submitted by various political groupings. There are good, positive and often useful suggestions, but if we wish to have the kind of vote which I have advocated, if we wish to give the European Parliament this working instrument which we have all stated that we wish to possess, I consider that I must urge you to approve this motion as it stands. I call on you to do this, honourable Members, not as the Italian Communist Ferrero, but in the name of the Committee on Development so that the resolution will be adopted in a form reflecting the consistency and logic which the Committee on Development wished it to have. We may regret the fact, but the present text and no other represents the document on which the various political groupings were able to agree.

For these reasons I call on all honourable Members, on all groups and on all committees to withdraw their own amendments, though not of course to abandon their positions here or elsewhere or to drop any reservations and doubts which they may have, and to express these reservations and doubts by means of their vote. I ask you all to create the conditions which will allow this debate to end with dignity even if, as my colleague Mr Agnelli has pointed out, it will in some cases be a sacrifice to withdraw the amendments. I am

Ferrero

afraid that unless we do this, unless we follow this route, we risk not only reopening the debate but also adopting a resolution which is less coherent than the present one and which will lower the dignity of this Parliament. I shall therefore give you immediately my views on various of these amendments. Clearly, in endeavouring to express the spirit which guided our labours, I am opposed to all the amendments, since I must defend our common efforts. Nonetheless I recommend that the two technical amendments to which I referred earlier should be approved, namely Nos 25 and 51. Moreover, following a number of speeches by Members of the Christian-Democratic Group, that is by Mr Bersani and other Members of the European Peoples' Party, I would ask if possible for the withdrawal of Amendment No 6 because it is, in my view, an amendment which will be acceptable in the budget context, and we shall have an opportunity to discuss it in the very near future.

Madam President, before you open the voting, I believe it to be my duty to thank on behalf of the Members of the Committee on Development and the other Parliamentary committees, with whom we have worked closely for many months, all those who have spoken not only to support our work but also to criticize it and, in particular, to thank the Chairman of the Committee on Development, Mr Poniatowski, and Mr Cheysson, not only for his presence here today, but for all the assistance which we have received from the Commission departments during these months of work.

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Madam President, I shall comply with the rapporteur's request and, on behalf of my group, withdraw Amendments 1 to 5. We do, however, wish to maintain Amendment No 6.

President. — The debate is closed.

I call Mr Marshall on a point of order.

Mr Marshall. — Madam President, it has come to my notice, reading the Report of Proceedings for yesterday's debate and Question Time, that these are not accurate in that they omit certain observations from my colleague, Mr Howell, and I was wondering why.

President. — This is not the moment to propose corrections to the minutes of proceedings.

We shall proceed immediately to the vote on the motion for a resolution.

Since the rapporteur made his remarks all together and has given us his overall view on all the amend-

ments, I shall refrain from asking for the rapporteur's opinion on each amendment. I thank Mr Ferrero for saving us time in this way.

(Parliament adopted the first three indents of the preamble)

On the fourth indent I have Amendment No 55 by Mr Pannella*.

I call Mr Simmonds on a point of order.

Mr Simmonds. — Madam President, I wish to raise a point of order on all the amendments proposed by Mr Pannella. Is it in order for a person who has been appointed a rapporteur by this Parliament, who has failed to produce a report, has failed to vote against a report in committee, is it then in order for him to bring a vast number of amendments to this House?

(Applause)

President. — Mr Simmonds, Members are entitled to table amendments.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted the fourth indent)

On the fifth indent of the preamble I have Amendment No 56 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted the fifth indent)

On the sixth indent I have the following two amendments:

- Amendment No 57 by Mr Pannella
- Amendment No 7 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

(In successive votes Parliament rejected the amendments and adopted the sixth indent)

After the sixth indent I have the following six amendments:

- Amendment No 6 by Mr Bersani and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party
- Amendment No 51 by Mr Fantì
- Amendments Nos 58, 59, 60 and 61 by Mr Pannella.

(In successive votes Parliament rejected Amendment No 6, adopted Amendment No 51 and rejected Amendments Nos 58, 59, 60 and 61)

On paragraph 1 I have the following two amendments:

* The complete texts of the amendments are given in the annex.

President

- Amendment No 62 by Mr Pannella
- Amendment No 8 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

(In successive votes Parliament rejected the two amendments and adopted paragraph 1)

On paragraph 2 I have Amendment No 63 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 2)

After paragraph 2 I have Amendment No 64 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

On paragraph 3 I have the following three amendments:¹

- Amendment No 65 by Mr Pannella
- Amendment No 26/rev. by Mr Christopher Jackson
- Amendment No 9 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

(In successive votes Parliament rejected the three amendments and adopted paragraph 3 and the title of section (a))

On paragraph 4 I have the following two amendments:²

- Amendment No 66 by Mr Pannella
- Amendment No 10 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

(In successive votes Parliament rejected the two amendments and adopted paragraph 4)

After paragraph 4 I have Amendment No 28 by Mr Christopher Jackson.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

On paragraph 5 I have the following two amendments:³

- Amendment No 67 by Mr Pannella
- Amendment No 11 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

(Parliament rejected the two amendments and adopted paragraph 5)

After paragraph 5 I have Amendment No 12 by Mr Fergusson on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

On paragraph 6 I have Amendment No 69 by Mr Pannella.⁴

Parliament rejected the Amendment and adopted paragraph 6)

After Paragraph 6 I have Amendment No 69 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

On paragraph 7 I have Amendment No 70 by Mr Pannella. From the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members I have a request for a roll-call vote pursuant to Rule 35 (4) of the Rules of Procedure.

The electronic voting system will be used for this vote and for all other roll-call votes which may be requested.

*(Parliament rejected the amendment)**

(Parliament adopted paragraph 7)

After paragraph 7 I have the following five amendments:

- Amendments Nos 29 and 30 by Mr Christopher Jackson.
- Amendments Nos 71, 72 and 73 by Mr Pannella.

(In successive votes Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 29, 30, 71 and 72 and by roll-call vote rejected Amendment No 73)

I call Mr Maher on a point of order.

Mr Maher. — Madam President, I wonder if this machine is working. There was no print-out on the board.

President. — I call Mr Hord on a point of order.

Mr Hord. — Madam President, I note from the agenda that the morning sitting is to last from 10 a.m. to 1 p.m. I see that the clock now says 1.05 p.m. Should this Parliament not now adjourn until 3 p.m.?

(Laughter)

¹ Amendment No 52 by Mr Fanti was withdrawn.

² Amendment No 27 by Mr C. Jackson was withdrawn.

³ Amendment No 47 by the Liberal and Democratic Group was withdrawn.

⁴ Amendment No 1 by Mr Bersani and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) was withdrawn.

* See the minutes of proceedings for the detailed voting figures.

President. — The group chairmen have all expressed the view that, if we are to get through the agenda, we must finish voting before adjourning for lunch.

I put this proposal to the vote.

That is agreed.

On paragraph 8 I have the following two amendments:

- Amendment No 136 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group
- Amendment No 31 by Mr Jackson.

(Parliament rejected the two amendments and adopted paragraph 8)

On paragraph 9 I have Amendment No 74 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 9)

After paragraph 9 I have Amendment No 75 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

On paragraph 10 I have Amendment No 76 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 10)

After paragraph 10 I have the following four amendments:

- Amendment No 14 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group
- Amendments Nos 77, 78 and 79 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the four amendments)

On paragraph 11 I have Amendment No 80 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 11)

On paragraph 12 I have Amendment No 133 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

I call Sir Frederick Warner.

Sir Frederick Warner. — The amendment is withdrawn, Madam President.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 12)

President. — After paragraph 12 I have Amendment No 81 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

On paragraph 13 I have Amendment No 82 by Mr Pannella.*

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 13)

After paragraph 13 I have the following six amendments:

- Amendments Nos 32, 33, 34 and 35 by Mr Christopher Jackson
- Amendments Nos 83 and 84 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the six amendments)

On paragraph 14 I have Amendment No 15 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 14)

After paragraph 14 I have the following three amendments:

- Amendments Nos 36 and 37 by Mr Christopher Jackson.
- Amendment No 85 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the three amendments)

On Title (b) I have Amendment No 86 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted Title (b))

On paragraph 15 I have Amendment No 87 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 15)

On paragraph 16 I had Amendment No 16 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group, but its author has informed me that it is withdrawn.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 16)

* Amendment No 2 by Mr Bersani and others was withdrawn.

President

On paragraph 17 I have Amendment No 88 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 17)

After paragraph 17 I have Amendment No 89 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

On paragraph 18 I have the following two amendments:*

- No 17 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group
- No 90 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the two amendments and adopted paragraph 18)

On paragraph 19 I have Amendment No 91 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 19)

On paragraph 20 I have Amendment No 92 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 20)

On paragraph 21 I have Amendment No 93 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 21)

On paragraph 22 I have Amendment No 94 by Mr Pannella.**

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraphs 22 and 23)

On paragraph 24 I have Amendment No 95 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 24)

After paragraph 24 I have the following two amendments:

- No 39 by Mr Johnson

* Amendment No 45 by the Liberal and Democratic Group was withdrawn.

** Amendment No 3 by Mr Bersani and others was withdrawn.

— No 54 by Mrs Squarcialupi on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (I) Madam President, since I feel that by withdrawing this amendment I would be complying with the wishes of the majority of the Public Health Committee, I very reluctantly do so.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraphs 25, 26 and 27)

After paragraph 27 I have Amendment No 96 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 28)

After paragraph 28 I have Amendment No 18 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group.¹

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

On paragraph 29 I have Amendment No 97 by Mr Pannella.²

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraphs 29 and 30 and Title (c))

On paragraph 31 I have Amendment No 98 by Mr Pannella.³

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 31)

After paragraph 31 I have the following three amendments:

- No 13 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group
- Nos 99 and 100 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the three amendments)

On paragraph 32 I have Amendment No 101 by Mr Pannella.⁴

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 32)

¹ Amendment No 4 by Mr Bersani and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) was withdrawn.

² Amendment No 53 by Mr Ippolito was withdrawn.

³ Amendment No 19 by Sir Frederick Warner was withdrawn.

⁴ Amendment No 5 by Mr Bersani and others was withdrawn.

President

After paragraph 32 I have Amendment No 102 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

On paragraph 33 I have the following two amendments:

- No 103 by Mr Pannella
- No 20 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

(Parliament rejected the two amendments and adopted paragraph 33)

On paragraph 34 I have Amendment No 104 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 34)

On paragraph 35 I have Amendment No 105 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 35)

After paragraph 35 I have two amendments, Nos 106 and 107, by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the two amendments and adopted paragraph 36)

On paragraph 37 I have Amendment No 108 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 37)

On paragraph 38 I have Amendment No 109 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 38)

After paragraph 38 I have Amendment No 110 by Mr Pannella*.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraphs 39 and 40)

On paragraph 41 I have the following two amendments:

- No 111 by Mr Pannella
- No 25 by Mr Ferrero.

First of all I put Amendment No 111 to the vote, for which I have received a request for a roll-call vote.

* Amendment No 50 by Mr Nielsen was withdrawn.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

I put Amendment No 25 to the vote.

(Parliament adopted the amendment)

On paragraph 42 I have two amendments, Nos 112 and 113, by Mr Pannella.

For Amendment No 112 I have a request for a roll-call vote.

I call Mr Simmonds on a point of order.

Mr Simmonds. — Madam President, in view of the fact that, as I understand it, a roll-call vote must be requested by a minimum of 10 persons, could you just check whether that number of people have requested it.

President. — Mr Simmonds, this vote was requested by the requisite number of people.

I should like to take advantage of this short break to inform the House that the Secretary-General is at present investigating the possibility of arranging the equipment so that there is no time lost between two votes.

(Parliament rejected the two amendments and adopted paragraph 42)

After paragraph 42 the Liberal and Democratic Group tabled Amendment No 43, which they have now withdrawn. However, Mr Berkhouwer has taken it over in his own name.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

On Title (d) I have Amendment No 114 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted Title (d))

On paragraph 43 I have Amendment No 115 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 43)

After paragraph 43 I have Amendment No 116 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

On paragraph 44 I have the following two amendments*:

* Amendment No 49 by the Liberal and Democratic Group was withdrawn.

President

- No 117 by Mr Pannella
- No 21 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

(Parliament rejected the two amendments and adopted paragraph 44)

On paragraph 45 I have Amendment No 118 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 45)

On paragraph 46 I have Amendment No 22 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraphs 46 and 47)

After paragraph 47 I have two amendments, Nos 119 and 120, by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the two amendments and adopted paragraphs 48 and 49)

On paragraph 50 I have Amendment No 121 by Mr Pannella.¹

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 50)

On paragraph 51 I had Amendment No 46, which has been withdrawn.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 51)

On paragraph 52 I have Amendment No 23 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 52)

After paragraph 52 I have two amendments, Nos 122 and 123 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the two amendments)

On paragraph 53 I have the following two amendments:²

- No 124 by Mr Pannella
- No 24 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

(Parliament rejected the two amendments and adopted paragraph 53)

After paragraph 53 I have the following four amendments:

- No 38 by Sir Frederick Warner on behalf of the European Democratic Group
- Nos 125, 126 and 127 by Mr Pannella.

(In successive votes Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 38, 125, 126 and 127 and adopted paragraph 54)

After paragraph 54 I have the following three amendments:

- No 128 by Mr Pannella
- Nos 134 and 135 by Mrs Dekker.

I put Amendment No 128 to the vote.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

I call Mrs Dekker.

Mrs Dekker. — *(NL)* Madam President, under the existing agreements on voting and as long as this is not construed as a renunciation on my part of their content, I am willing to withdraw my Amendments Nos 134 and 135.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 55)

President. — After paragraph 55 I have Amendment No 129 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

On paragraph 56 I have Amendment No 130 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 56)

After paragraph 56 I have Amendment No 131 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

On paragraph 57 I have Amendment No 132 by Mr Pannella.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 57)

I call Mr Forth on a point of order.

Mr Forth. — Madam President, I would like under Rule 35 to call for a roll-call vote on the whole report.

¹ Amendments Nos 40 and 42 by the Liberal and Democratic Group were withdrawn.

² Amendments Nos 48 and 41 by the Liberal and Democratic Group were withdrawn.

Forth

I believe it is important that we know how many people regarded this as sufficiently important to be here for the vote at the end.

President. — Explanations of vote may now be given.

I call Mr Jackson.

Mr C. Jackson. — The rapporteur felt it would aid the dignity of this resolution if no amendments were passed. His argument was obviously accepted by many groups because amendments have been rejected wholesale regardless of merit.

I must confess that I am less concerned with dignity than with helping those in need, and I regret his move which, I believe, has achieved a result positively unhelpful to those in need. Parliament has missed an opportunity to improve a resolution which, despite being seven months late, was prepared in a rush. As draftsman of the opinion of the Political Affairs Committee I have to say that, in my view, its considered opinions on political matters relating to world hunger were not properly reflected in the resolution. While assenting, with difficulty, to the resolution I shall be asking my committee to consider a further resolution to pick up the important points that have now been left on one side.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Vergeer.

Mr Vergeer. — *(NL)* Madam President, first of all, I should like to point out that we shall of course be supporting the motion for a resolution when it comes to the main vote. We should also like to give voice to our satisfaction at the fact that this motion for a resolution looks like receiving the support of a large majority of this House, despite the major political differences which are bound to emerge in an important debate like this. It certainly looks as though this House will overcome these political differences and reach its decision with a maximum degree of unanimity. However, this sense of satisfaction is overshadowed by the disappointment felt in my group at the fact that this House has not had the courage to make a genuine gesture at the conclusion of this debate by adopting Amendment No 6, tabled by my group. We are extremely disappointed at this failure, and we shall be coming back to this point in the course of the forthcoming discussion on the budget.

President. — I call Mrs Poirier.

Mrs Poirier. — *(F)* Madam President, I am responsible for making a short explanation of vote on behalf of the French Communists. Firstly, we are all the more

deeply attached to defending the interests of those peoples who suffer from hunger because we are firmly convinced that the peoples of our own countries share the same interests, and in our own case we refer of course to the French people. The profit-making greed of the multinationals is the same on both sides of the oceans and their victims are naturally on the same side of the fence.

The prosperity and purchasing power of the people, agricultural production together with industrialization need to be increased in all countries, be they industrialized or developing countries. This is the *sine qua non* for fulfilling the natural and legitimate demands of people. And in this day and age, it is quite within our abilities to do it.

I should also like to remind you all that, with the exception of the Communist Parties, all the political groups in this House took part in the setting-up of the colonial system and helped to sustain it for as long as possible.

(Loud protests from the centre and the right)

I note that my last remark struck a chord in some of you. We should not, therefore, be surprised at seeing those same parties, and the governments of which they are a part now systematically resisting all the major demands of the developing countries at all international talks. We do not approve the noble and generous pretext which this Parliament would like to see itself as and which it would seem you sorely need in order to disguise some far less palatable truths, Madam President. As for us, we have only one way of speaking. We make no claim to a monopoly of good will, we simply feel that it is our duty to always be plain spoken. We approve some of the main lines of this resolution, and we disapprove others. But what counts for us is to know what the peoples who are struggling to set up a new international order will gain by it.

As a result, the French Communists did not participate in the votes on the amendments, and, just as they did in committee, the French Communists will abstain from voting on the whole motion for a resolution.

President. — I call Mrs Flesch.

Mrs Flesch. — *(F)* Madam President, I should like, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group to express our satisfaction at seeing that there is a very large majority in this Parliament which has formed and is forming around these very important reports and this very important motion for a resolution.

This debate was carefully prepared, which was something which we had been requesting from the outset. It is a very important debate in my opinion, both for this

Flesch

Parliament and because of the subject to which it is devoted. The Liberal Group had drawn up amendments, which it presented sometime during the debate. However, having noted the efforts made by all the rapporteurs, the efforts made by the competent Committee, and the quality of the report itself, we decided to withdraw our amendments in order to simplify the progress of the debate, and that is why, Madam President, we were led to vote against all the other amendments. There were some amongst them which we might have been able to support, but we had taken as our ground rule that we should withdraw our amendments and that as a result we should vote against the other amendments which had been tabled. I just wished to make this explanation of vote, on behalf of our group, and to express once more our satisfaction at seeing that there is a very large majority in this Parliament to support these motions for a resolution.

President. — I call Mrs Dienesch.

Mrs Dienesch. — (F) Madam President, I must, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, stress that we fully support the passing of this motion. 'The highest human duty and the most rewarding policy is to aid the development of peoples and mankind', as General de Gaulle once put it.

I too, like you all, deplore the fact that these international conferences have failed, and this can only give us concern about what our suggestions, appeals and decisions will really lead to. We should like to stress three points which we feel need to be fully examined in order to give more weight to the great effort we have just made and which we in my group are pleased to have seen, as indeed we are pleased to see this semi-consensus of opinion in the House.

We request that the developing countries be more closely linked to the drawing up of development schemes, and that more real respect should be paid to their own scale of values. Secondly, given that a world lack of resources is inevitable, and given the present state of development in all our countries, we should appeal to the men and women of the European Community to accept a drastic change in their way of life. We must put a stop to over-consumption and wasting of resources and decide to really share our wealth with the poor peoples of the world.

For all the votes taken, we supported with the aim of arriving at a mutual understanding, the views which had generally been decided upon. There was only one exception to this rule, when we abstained on paragraph 46 which does not contain the increase in loans which we demand and which we in our group agree upon. This paragraph, because it is so unclearly worded, might well only penalize one category of society. This is not our aim.

President. — I call Mr Vitale.

Mr Vitale. — (I) Madam President, as my colleague Mr Pajetta has already stated, we Italian Communists shall vote in favour of the motion for a resolution put forward by the Committee. We shall vote in favour even though, of course, the motion does not contain everything we should have liked to see, especially in connection with certain important problems, for example the reform of the common agricultural policy. But in our Group the overriding consideration was felt to be the establishment of a unified position, embodied in the Ferrero Report which has already received so much support.

It is our belief that in a matter like this one a single Parliamentary position, even though we do not endorse it in every single aspect, represents a step forward in the dialogue between Europe and the developing countries, and also means — and this is what counts — that the resolution we adopt will be more binding on the Commission, the Council and the governments of the Community countries. In the final analysis, too, it will reassure the public that this Parliament is not merely a talking shop but a source of stimulus, action and commitment, both at national and at international level.

Moreover, and this is the second reason for our voting in favour, we feel that congratulations are due not only to Mr Ferrero, who has received them in profusion, but to the various committees and the *ad hoc* working group for the extremely careful way in which this debate was prepared and conducted, and also for the seriousness of the present discussion.

We believe that the Committee has provided suggestions which can impose real obligations on the Commission as well as mobilizing public opinion and aiding the struggle against vested interests. This does not mean that we intend to avoid the necessary conflicts or to ignore the problems to which I referred earlier: I can tell you now that we are in the process of preparing a scheme for the reform of the common agricultural policy; we shall fight our corner on this, as on other points, both at national and Community level, in order to ensure that the words we have spoken today lead to concrete action by the governments and positive policies by the political parties, which are an essential component of our political and cultural heritage and of the struggle of the people and the great working masses. These are the reasons, Madam President, for our support for the motion for a resolution.

(Applause from the left)

President. — I call Mr Cohen.

Mr Cohen. — (NL) Madam President, I should like to say on behalf of the Socialist Group that we shall be voting *en bloc* for Mr Ferrero's motion for a resolution. I already said in the course of the debate that we are not 100 % satisfied with the resolution; there is plenty we can go along with, but by no means 100 %. We too could have tabled amendments to improve the text somewhat, but we thought that the text we have before us now and which we shall shortly be voting for gave us the chance at least to approach the subject of development, our relations with the Third World and world hunger from a new standpoint. That was the important thing as far as we were concerned in this debate, and that will remain our central concern in the future. We have put forward specific proposals which are reflected in this resolution. The important thing now is to put these proposals into practice, and the Socialist Group will make every effort to ensure that this is in fact done.

Let me comment briefly on the amendment tabled by the Christian-Democratic Group concerning the 1 % of the budget — an amendment which was rejected by this House. Of course, we are not against this proposal. On the contrary, I might even go so far as to say that we too could have tabled an amendment along these lines. The important thing, though, is that we should have the wherewithal to implement such a proposal. We Socialists will be coming back to this point at the appropriate moment, that is to say, when we come to discuss the 1981 budget. We shall be able to see next month where everyone stands on this issue. The Socialist Group's attitude will be unambiguous, as you will see next month in the course of the budget debate.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (I) Madam President, I wish to state, calmly and without impropriety, that as far as I am concerned the sneers and insinuations of the members of a certain Group, like Mr Simmonds, are water off a duck's back.

Faced with the reality of starvation in the world and all the economic instability, each of us knows where the responsibilities lie among the various groups and their ideas. The important thing as far as I am concerned, Madam President, is that in their hearts Mr Scott-Hopkins and Mr Simmonds well know what the truth is. And this truth, which they know and which their consciences cannot deny, must surely give them troubled dreams.

Madam President, unanimity was always desirable and is possible, but it is a unanimity of intent and not a unanimity of vote.

To Mr Ferrero and his Italian Communist comrades I would say that we have never been in the habit of

doubting the good faith of anyone before the event. Therefore, until the contrary is proved, we must believe that everyone in this Chamber wants genuinely to see this problem solved. But once you take the next step and claim that in this House unanimity on a political matter is anything but a lie you are denying your political nature and the reality of the facts. Someone must after all be responsible for this lack of political will or appropriate policies, concerning which we all talk of the necessity not of reformist thinking but of reforming actions. And any vote which demonstrates the unity between persons for whom I have the same regard — Mr Scott-Hopkins and Mr Ferrero — demonstrates a unity of falsehood and not a unity of wish or intent; it demonstrates a unity in a political manoeuvring which, for once justifiably — the exception proves the rule — your French communist comrades were right to point out.

I have no need, therefore, Madam President, to take up any more speaking time. All that we were unable to say in the committee is written down here in our amendments and it will consequently be perfectly obvious, I believe, why in all calmness and conscience I cannot vote for this text, which is being presented as a success and a step forward.

President. — I call Mr Hord.

Mr Hord. — Madam President, I am conscious that I am keeping members of this House for a further few minutes from their lunch, but I did, of course, try to give everybody the opportunity to break at the appropriate time.

What I wanted to say, Madam President, is that I do not think I have ever witnessed a bigger abuse of a democratic institution by its own members than what we saw this morning when certain political groups were clearly being whipped into an absurd stance on so many sensible amendments. I think there can perhaps be no better example of this House being brought into disrepute. We have devoted one and a half days to this major debate. We had a long speech from Willy Brandt, and what do we find? When we get down to the real issue of where this House stands, we see some very hypocritical decisions being made. And I may say, Madam President, that Members must ask themselves if they can justify to their electors the decisions that so many of them have taken to reject so many realistic and relevant amendments. It is in a mood of incredulity and protest at the way so many votes were taken that I shall abstain.

President. — I call Mr Vergès.

Mr Vergès. — (F) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like, at this stage in explaining my

Vergès

vote, to stress how important both the research and documentation work and the deep study carried out by fellow Members were both for the main report and for the supplementary reports which required the opinions of the Committees.

But, in my opinion, all the hard work and even our debate has been sidetracked by choosing at the start the theme of hunger, which is certainly an urgent and serious problem, but which is only one of the many aspects of the basic problem which is the consequences of the under-development of the countries of the Third World, where an enormous majority of the world population live.

Although the motion for a resolution in its 57 paragraphs covers most of the aspects of the problem of hunger and under-development, sheds light on some interesting points, puts forward some technical solutions, and expresses some desires, its main weakness, in my opinion, lies precisely in the fact that it is a whole catalogue of measures many of which will never be any more than mere wishful thinking. Of course, the solutions worked out by the experts and the knowledge we have gleaned from our experience can at some point form the basis for a global and gradual solution. But we feel, we believe that we have not yet reached this stage, because if we approach the present problems of the Third World from this angle then we run the risk of giving the impression that it is just a technical problem, a problem of educating people, a problem of having the desire to do something. At its worst, this could mean leaving the way open to a mixture of good intentions and complacent unanimity.

In fact, we are faced with what is perhaps the most important problem of our time. A problem which is inextricably linked with the questions of peace, disarmament, progress in the social field and world democracy. It is a political problem. Both in the industrialized and the Third World countries there are pressure groups which would like to see the present disgraceful situation maintained. There are other groups in the same countries which would like to see the status quo altered. And we must refer to this option when groups form to foster progress, democracy and peace in Europe and in the Third World, and in Africa in particular, in order to establish a new economic order, a new political order, a new social order and a new cultural order. This is the grand design which can unite the peoples of these two continents. Only a solidarity of this kind, and a struggle of this nature will enable us to shake off the present climate of barbarity and lead us to a true renaissance of both continents. I sincerely do not think that the resolution and the way in which the vote will be passed can really open the path to the type of solidarity and above-the-board politics I have just mentioned. This is why I regretfully shall not be able to take part in this muddled vote.

President. — I call Sir Frederick Warner.

Sir Frederick Warner. — Madam President, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, I wish to say that we shall be voting in favour of this resolution. We are of course disappointed and indeed astonished that all of our amendments were rejected, particularly when we saw voting against them people who had clearly expressed support again and again for the views which they contained.

However, you cannot make problems disappear simply by rejecting a piece of paper and I am confident that in the months and years to come we shall find that much of what was recommended in our resolutions will be put into effect. It will be our task in the Committee on Development and Cooperation, and in our work with the Commission, to see that that is done.

We had hoped very much that this resolution would be passed unanimously. Everyone has been disappointed and indeed somewhat disgusted by the performance in the United Nations. Our group had felt that here at least we would get unanimity on a resolution to deal with this great scourge. After listening to Mrs Poirier and others I now understand that for many people it is more important to score party or ideological points than to do something for the starving people in the world. We, however, shall vote for this resolution.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Maffre-Baugé.

Mr Maffre-Baugé. — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the facts in this debate are quite unambiguous. We farmers — and I have not heard many farmers speaking here — are involved and I must insist on this. We will carry out our share of the common task, but before trying to eradicate this type of problem, the root of the evil must be closely defined. The root of this evil is embedded in the aftermath of colonialism which has been supplanted by neo-colonialism. The riches of the land and minerals of the developing countries have been exploited with all the profit going to pressure groups and multinational companies, and with no consideration being given, unfortunately, to the independence and self-sufficiency in food of these countries. The food weapon is also being brandished once more as a political lever, even in this House. There are some obvious contradictions in terms, highlighted by the Commission's policy, which plans to abolish agricultural surpluses. How can this be compatible with a policy of effectively combatting hunger in the world? There are no surpluses, either at national, or European or world level. There is simply a lack of consumption as a result of unemployment, there are 7 million unemployed in the European Community for example, and there is also a lack of consumption because the developing countries do not have the financial resources to properly face up to the problems of endemic starvation and famine.

Maffre-Baugé

Bruno Ferrero's report — I should point out that he is both a colleague and a friend — forces us to ask ourselves some questions. What should we understand by a trading policy which is compatible with Community development policy, what do we mean when we say that priority should be given to the entry into the Common Market of agricultural products from developing countries? Would not such guidelines mean overturning the Common Agricultural Policy and abolishing once and for all the rules set by the Treaty of Rome? And what would happen if they were overturned? Would this successfully solve the problems we have? In fact, all this would lead to is giving more wealth to the multinational companies which today control international trade in foodstuffs, against the best interests of the developing countries, consumers and producers. This is why, Madam President, I shall abstain on the text submitted, because it is obviously ambiguous as regards the Common Agricultural Policy.

President. — I call Mr Rogers on a point of order.

Mr Rogers. — Madam President, can you use your powers as President to limit the explanations of vote, which I think you are entitled to do. All we are hearing now from all sides of the House, from the right and the left, are regurgitations of the debate. Members are simply scoring political points off each other.

(Applause)

I really think, Madam President, that you ought to use your powers at least to close the list for explanations of vote at this moment.

President. — Mr Rogers, I have only two further requests to give an explanation of vote, and these seem to me to fit normally into this debate.

I call Mr Romualdi.

Mr Romualdi. — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, although we do not withdraw our criticisms of the unsystematic and inadequate way in which the motion for a resolution has been formulated and illustrated, but unfortunately not amended, I wish to state nonetheless that the Italian non-attached Members will vote in favour. Our aim in so doing, in common with the large majority of this Parliament, is to accept the responsibility which the European Parliament has at this time to the poor peoples of the world, to those who are suffering and who need our support and help, wherever they are.

President. — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — *(I)* Madam President, honourable Members, I rise merely to confirm that the Italian Radicals will vote against this 'Holy Alliance' built round this motion, which, as we have just heard, is also supported by the MSI.

I believe that our isolation here is in reality representative of a position which has widespread support in my country and in the other countries of the Community among Communists, democrats and Christians. Our opposition arises primarily from the attitude of the rapporteur and the majority in this Assembly to the amendments proposed, some of which, I believe would have seriously embarrassed certain colleagues, for I do not understand the positions of the Socialist Group — particularly on the 0.7 % question — or of the Communist Group. But obviously they preferred a facile unanimity: it is extremely easy to agree when you are not committing yourself to anything at all. And I fear we shall see the whole thing repeated in the budget vote.

In truth, this chameleon-like and opportunistic approach represents one of the major disasters currently affecting our countries and our political parties, which do not seem to realize that it is one thing to seek unanimity and 'Holy Alliances' but another thing altogether to take decisions and to see what has actually to be done, what specific proposals we want to make to the Commission and the Council of Ministers.

I wish therefore to emphasize once again the words of my colleague Mr Pannella, that we oppose this agreement which has been cobbled together, and I believe that our isolation which now appears to be complete following the adherence of the MSI to this motion, is nonetheless a position widely supported by true democrats, true Christians, true Communists and true Socialists.

President. — I put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote, while reminding the House that this is a roll-call vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

5. Membership of Parliament

President. — Mrs Groes had informed me in writing of her resignation as a Member of the European Parliament.

Pursuant to Article 12 (2), second subparagraph, of the Act concerning the election of the representatives

¹ OJ C 265 of 13. 10. 1980

President

of the Assembly by direct universal suffrage, Parliament notes this vacancy and will inform forthwith the Member State concerned.

Furthermore, out of consideration for the staff, I am sure you will all agree to suspend the sitting until 3.30 p.m.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 2.30 p.m. and resumed at 3.35 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR JAQUET

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

6. *Votes*

President. — The next item is the votes on the motions for resolutions on which the debates are closed.

We shall begin with the Dankert report (Doc. 1-373/80): Structural problems affecting the United Kingdom and setting up a financial mechanism.

We must first vote on the amendments tabled to the proposals for regulations.

On the proposal for a regulation I, I have Amendment No 14 by Mr Taylor on behalf of the European Democratic Group, which seeks to reinstate the original text.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Lange, Chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, please allow me, on behalf of the rapporteur, to put his views on these amendments. Perhaps, Mr President, you would also allow me to deal with the amendments to the proposal for a regulation all at once so as to save time. The rapporteur holds the view that, after the discussions in the Committee on Budgets, all the amendments tabled to the proposal for a regulation should be rejected. I would therefore ask the House to vote accordingly.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

President. — On the fifth recital I have Amendment No 10 by Mr de la Malène and others on behalf of the

Group of European Progressive Democrats, seeking to delete this recital.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

On Article 1 I have Amendment No 11 by Mr de la Malène and others on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, seeking to delete the second indent of paragraph 1.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

On Article 2 (c) I have Amendment No 12 by Mr de la Malène and others on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, seeking to delete this subparagraph.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

On Article 4 I have Amendment No 13 by Mr de la Malène and others on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, seeking to delete the following words in paragraphs 1 and 2:

covering the exploitation of coal resources.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

We shall now consider the proposal for a regulation II.

On Article 1 (4) I have Amendment No 15 by Mr J. Taylor on behalf of the European Democratic Group, seeking to reinstate the original text.

(Voting by sitting and standing, Parliament rejected the amendment)

We now come to the motion for a resolution proper.

On recital (c) of the preamble I have Amendment No 3 by Mr de la Malène and others on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, seeking to add the following phrase to the end of this paragraph:

and whereas it should not infringe the principles of financial solidarity and Community preference nor introduce indirectly the concept of a 'fair return';

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Lange, Chairman of the Committee on Budgets. — (D) The rapporteur advises the House — and I would ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to look at the amendments concerned — to adopt Amendments Nos 5/rev. and 1. As for Amendment No 2, the rapporteur told me that he leaves the decision to the House, since this point was not dealt with in committee. He also advises Parliament to reject all the other amendments, including Nos 3 and 4.

I therefore ask the House to vote accordingly.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted the third recital)

President. — On recital (d) I have Amendment No 4 by Mr de la Malène and others on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, seeking to delete this recital.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted the fourth recital)

After the preamble I have Amendment No 5/rev. by Mr de la Malène and others on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, seeking to insert the following paragraph:

Recalls that the agreement of 30 May should be seen as an overall compromise in which account was taken not only of financial problems but also of other Community problems, in particular fishing, which is a particularly urgent matter.

(Parliament adopted the amendment)

On paragraph 1 I have Amendment No 1 by Mr Notenboom, seeking to amend the paragraph as follows:*

1. Maintains the view that a fair and balanced budget can only be achieved by fundamental reform of the Community budget through the control of expenditure on agricultural structural surplus sectors and through the strengthening of Community structural policies.

(Parliament adopted the amendment and paragraphs 2 to 7)

On paragraph 8 I have Amendment No 16 by Mr Taylor on behalf of the European Democratic Group, seeking to delete this paragraph.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted in turn paragraphs 8 and 9)

On paragraph 10 I have Amendment No 17 by Mr Taylor on behalf of the European Democratic Group, seeking to delete this paragraph.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 10)

On paragraph 11 I have Amendment No 18 by Mr Taylor on behalf of the European Democratic Group, seeking to delete this paragraph.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 11)

On paragraph 12 I have Amendment No 9 by Mr de la Malène and others on behalf of the Group of Euro-

pean Progressive Democrats, seeking to add the following words after '... the Commission's proposal':

which must only be of a provisional and entirely specific nature.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 12)

On Paragraph 13 I have Amendment No 19 by Mr Taylor on behalf of the European Democratic Group, seeking to delete this paragraph.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 13)

After paragraph 13 I have Amendment No 2 by Mrs Castle and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

- 13a. Notes the dramatic increase in unemployment in the UK to over two million with further increases to come as a result of the UK Government's deliberate deflation of demand in obedience to its monetarist policies; and insists that the resources being made available to the UK under the supplementary measures be used to reduce the intolerable levels of unemployment in the UK by expanding public expenditure.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 14)

On paragraph 15 I have Amendment No 20 by Mr J. M. Taylor on behalf of the European Democratic Group, seeking to delete this paragraph.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted in turn paragraphs 15 and 16)

On paragraph 17 I have Amendment No 21 by Mr J. M. Taylor on behalf of the European Democratic Group, seeking to delete this paragraph.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 17)

I put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in the *Penders report (Doc. 1-219/80): Human rights in Poland.*

* Amendments Nos 6, 7 and 8 were withdrawn.

¹ OJ C 265 of 13. 10. 1980

President

I have the following two amendments, both of which seek to replace the entire motion for a resolution by a new text:

— No 5 by Mr Pannella and others:

The European Parliament,

- welcoming the birth of free trade unions in Poland in fulfilment, however belatedly, of the commitments to that effect entered into by the Polish Government with the ratification of Conventions 87 and 98 of the International Labour Organization,
 - stressing furthermore that point 3 of the 'Gdansk Protocol' lays down in particular that 'the activities of radio and television and the press must serve the free expression of the various currents of opinion and thought' and is thus fully concordant with Article 2 of the declaration on the contribution of information to the strengthening of peace adopted by all the Member States of the international community in UNESCO on 22 November 1978,
 - aware that the first European Assembly elected by universal suffrage cannot remain indifferent to the aspirations of freedom and pluralist democracy which are stirring the hearts of the peoples of Eastern Europe and cannot justify hiding behind the principles of 'non-interference' and 'détente', which are the eternal concomitants of 'legitimism' in every era,
 - with a view to undertaking a full re-examination of the relations between the EEC and the countries of so-called 'real socialism' to adapt them to the new political situation and to the spirit of the Helsinki Agreements, taken as a whole, and of the other instruments of international cooperation,
1. Expresses the hope that the European countries of Comecon will respect the undertakings entered into with the ratification of the conventions of the ILO and the adoption of the UNESCO Declaration and embark upon the liberalization of the press and of trade union organizations, the first conquests in the struggle for freedom, pluralism and true democracy;
 2. Calls upon the Council and Commission to let this principle guide relations between the Community and the European countries of Comecon and to ensure that in practice their political and economic relations are made strictly dependent on the respect by those countries of fundamental rights including the inalienable right of freedom of information;
 3. Calls upon the Commission, furthermore, to study a draft framework association agreement which will in future govern relations with all the individual European countries who show interest in such a relationship.

— No 4 by Mr Estier on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group), Mr Fergusson on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, Mr Haagerup on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and Mr Israël on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats:

The European Parliament,

- having regard to recent developments in the People's Republic of Poland,
 - referring to the Final Act of Helsinki on security and cooperation in Europe, which is to be followed up at the forthcoming Conference in Madrid, particularly with regard to human rights,
 - mindful of the efforts of the Polish people throughout their history and in recent times to shape their independence, often in difficult situations,
 - recognizing that Poland has over the last twenty years played an important part in establishing and encouraging *détente* in Europe and that this must be pursued,
1. Welcomes the manner in which the Polish workers, supported by forces giving expression to social pluralism, have asserted their rights and congratulates them on the results they have obtained over the full range of their demands;
 2. Emphasizes in this regard that the right to strike, the right to establish free trade unions and non-discrimination at work are a part of fundamental rights;
 3. Considers that freedom of communication and of information is also essential;
 4. Welcomes the fact that a solution has been sought without recourse to any violence;
 5. Notes that only the Polish people has the right to decide the future of Poland;
 6. Requests the Commission and the Governments of the Nine to improve economic and financial cooperation with Poland;
 7. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Governments of the nine Member States, to the Ministers of Foreign Affairs meeting in political cooperation, to the President of the Economic and Social Committee of the EEC and the Polish Ambassadors in the capitals of the nine Member States.

Amendments Nos 1, 2 and 3 by Mr Tyrrell and Mr Hutton have been withdrawn.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Penders, rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I am against Amendment No 5. Mr Pannella was involved in the discussions on a joint text, but he left the meeting early. I cannot therefore recommend adoption of his amendment.

As for Amendment No 4 by Mr Estier, Mr Klepsch and others, I must say that I find it a very balanced text which amply covers the events in July and August. It is perfectly in keeping with the debate we had on the subject, and so I wholeheartedly recommend its adoption.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 5 and adopted Amendment No 4)

President. — Explanations of vote may now be given.

I call Mrs Hammerich.

Mrs Hammerich. — *(DK)* Mr President, the reason for our abstaining from voting on the motions for resolutions on Poland and Turkey is by no means that we are indifferent to the two countries or have no personal opinions regarding the two problems. I personally, for example, am opposed to the motion tabled by the Italian Radicals regarding Poland. In my view, it is totally out of place if what we want is a peaceful development. Fortunately, however, nobody attaches any importance to motions of this kind — indeed, generally speaking, all such statements are in fact meaningless when it comes down to it.

Our reason for abstaining is that we represent a majority in Denmark which does not wish the European Community to develop into a supranational body and does not think that foreign policy is a matter which should be discussed in this House.

Denmark's foreign policy should be adopted and controlled by our Parliament, the Folketing, in our own country where the general public is in a position to be involved in the debates. Thus, we can have no part, either directly or indirectly, in enabling the European Parliament to arrogate to itself influence or authority in the field of foreign policy.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* Mr President I believe that many Members of this Parliament support our position in fact, but that it is their chairmen and their parties which take a different attitude.

I shall tell you what our concern is, Mr President. We believe that when a State has outlawed itself with respect to human rights — and with respect to international agreements — that State represents a danger not only to peace and liberty but also to the lives of our peoples and the present state of the world.

It therefore seems to me clear, Mr President, that in all those countries where there is 'real' communism the States are outlaws in terms of the Helsinki agreements, trade union rights and the Charter of the United Nations. We must decide once and for all whether all we want to do is deplore this situation, and thus make ourselves accomplices of these governments, or whether instead we wish to help open the road to peace and liberty, the right to the rule of law, without, however, asking the workers, the men and women of the countries where 'real' communism reigns, to risk their lives or liberties to win what is not a privilege but a right belonging to all of us and to them.

Consequently, Mr President, we have proposed that an end should be put once and for all to this attitude of effective complicity with the countries of 'real' communism when they violate international treaties and the overriding laws of humanity and right. This means that we must have the courage and the frankness to refuse to collaborate with men of violence. Men of peace do not collaborate with men of violence, otherwise they become pacifists, may I remind you, like Daladier, Laval or Chamberlain, pacifists, who pave the way to war by their collaboration with men of violence.

For these reasons, Mr President, and because we are convinced that the policy presented to us is one of complicity of NATO with the Warsaw Pact and vice versa, which strikes at law and human rights, we shall abstain from voting on this motion now that our amendment has been rejected.

President. — I call Mr Kirk.

Mr Kirk. — *(DK)* Mr President, my reason for asking to speak is that I should like to draw your attention to the views of the vast majority of the people of Denmark regarding the situation which has arisen in Poland and the way in which the Community has succeeded in reacting to the matter in a responsible manner and demonstrating its solidarity with the Polish people. There can be no doubt that the people of Denmark recognize the fact that, in situations of this kind, the Communities have resisted the temptation to go at it like a bull at a gate, but nevertheless have tried to a great extent to support the people and the movements who feel that freedom and human rights should be given pride of place. Both in a personal capacity and on behalf of the millions of Danes who support these ideas, therefore, I intend to vote in favour of the Penders Report which clearly demonstrates that, in matters of foreign policy, the Community has a great and increasing sense of responsibility and, by means of our votes here in Parliament, we hope to play a part in increasing this sense of responsibility still further with a view to improving the situation as regards *détente* and the rights of the individual both within and outside Europe.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Pajetta.

Mr Pajetta. — *(I)* Mr President, I have asked to speak, firstly because I wish to point out that the name of my colleague Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli on this motion is not accompanied by any political indication, and I would not like Parliament to have the impression

Pajetta

that the Italian Communists are unwilling to endorse the spirit of this motion, and to accept the responsibility which Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli accepted when she signed it.

We shall vote for this resolution because we believe it to testify to a sense of responsibility and because we believe and indeed hope that it will encourage a reluctance to use serious foreign policy problems as problems in internal party struggles. I view the statements of Mr Pannella, as I believe the majority of honourable Members have done, as not only going beyond the normal canons of Parliamentary behaviour, but also as going beyond reason. Fortunately he represents tendencies whose provocative activity is limited to mere mouthings, which we are rightly patient enough to tolerate within our Rules of Procedure.

I should like to stress that the motion recognizes that in the last 20 years Poland has played an important role in the implementation and furthering of the policy of *détente* in Europe. I would remind you in this context, for example, of the Rapacki plan, now somewhat long in the tooth but perhaps not totally out of date. Noteworthy too is the fact that a solution has been reached without recourse to violence, and this is something really worth stressing, because in Poland on previous occasions both those who expressed their discontent and called for changes, and those who opposed them, ended up using violence. I think we ought to recognize the sense of responsibility shown by the Polish government, by the workers' party and by the workers themselves, who demonstrated by their strike their desire to be heard and, having achieved this goal, the legitimacy of their demands.

Finally I think it would be right to invite the governments and the Commission to improve their economic and financial cooperation with Poland because none of us can benefit from an economic crisis which would aggravate the social tensions and introduce into Europe elements which would disrupt the policy of *détente*, a policy which we Italian Communists at least think must be fought for and worked for.

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

The resolution is adopted.¹

*

* *

President. — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mr Fanti and others (Doc. 1-392/80): Coup d'état in Turkey.*

I call Mr Frischmann on a point of order.

Mr Frischmann. — (F) Mr President, we shall not be supporting the resolution put forward by the Socialists and the other two right-wing groups.

(Cries from certain quarters on the left)

The only text we shall be supporting is our own, because it is the only one which is unequivocal in its condemnation of the military *coup* in Turkey. We French Communists really did learn something from the outrageous statements we heard in yesterday's debate. In fact, we were taught that a military *coup* is a good *coup* when it is underwritten or masterminded by NATO. That is quite appalling! And we heard at the same time approval for what some members euphemistically called the re-establishment of order in Turkey, in other words the replacement of an authoritarian régime by a fascist-type military one, and the consequent disappearance of all liberty, all rights and all democracy. That is appalling too. That is the sort of order we wish to condemn, unambiguously, plainly, and vehemently, and we shall vote for the only resolution which does that: the resolution of the Communist and Allies Group.

President. — I call Mr Sarre.

Mr Sarre. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to add my support, and that of a number of my friends and colleagues from France and elsewhere, to that for the resolution tabled by Mr Fanti.

There undoubtedly was a *coup d'état* in Ankara on 7 September, and a *coup d'état* — the violent overthrow of a lawful government — requires unequivocal condemnation from us, no matter what views may have been expressed in this house on the nature of the political situation which prevailed in Turkey before the *coup*.

The restrictions on liberty and civil rights, the arrest or house arrest of the country's political leaders and of most of its trade union leaders, are a very clear indication of the nature of the military régime and of the repression which it has begun.

Our condemnation must be expressed in a tangible way. Relations between the Community and Turkey under the Association Agreement must be suspended as long as the military junta is in power in Ankara. In addition, the three loans granted by the European Investment Bank on 17 July must be frozen for the same duration.

Finally, it would be appropriate to call on those Member States participating in the current NATO exercises in Turkey to withdraw their troops. That would be an excellent method of emphasizing that the necessary independence of judgement is alive in the countries of Europe, and, as I am sure is the case, that

¹ OJ C 265 of 13. 10. 1980

Sarre

their peoples have not the slightest intention of sanctioning the new military régime in Turkey. We must make it abundantly clear that the existence of a military regime instituted by force of arms, the overthrow of the lawful government and the suppression of democratic institutions are incompatible with association with this Community.

Some may think that we are only talking about a transitional period, but to do so is to forget that no *coup d'état* was ever the right course of action or good for its country. The best way we can help in the return to democracy is to repeat, without hesitation, without sitting on the fence, that no-one can ignore his commitments without suffering the consequences. It is in the adversity which they are facing today that the forces for democracy in Turkey will learn who can be relied upon. And that, ladies and gentlemen, will not be without significance in the future for which we should now be preparing: the future of a liberated Turkey once again associated with the Community.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (I) Mr President, we shall be supporting this motion, not, as Mr Frischmann suggests (if he will allow me to say so) because it is the only one which supports particular principles, but because it supports exactly the same principles as we support, in specific terms which will be put to the vote.

With Mr Frischmann's permission, I should like to say that we support this motion because we realize that when the law is ignored, when liberty is crushed, it makes no difference who is responsible, although Mr Frischmann frequently makes such distinctions, I regret to say. We are consequently bound to vote for this motion to ensure that the European Parliament is not restricted to mere condemnations, to ensure that it is free of all complicity in this *coup d'état* of these murderous generals, who are destroying liberty and peace, and also as an explicit token of our solidarity, not only with the Turkish working men and women, but with our own imprisoned colleagues, with the judges, the magistrates, and the trade unionists who are the victims of this 'clean' military *coup* which is, in reality, as sordid and murderous as all the others.

Mr President, I think it is appropriate at this time to remind the Assembly that in some cases the defence of freedom is a dangerous game. We have been told that this *coup d'état* was inevitable, on account of the economic crisis and the terrorism. Reasoning like that could lead one to justify a *coup d'état* in Italy, and in other places, and I find such reasoning aberrant.

These, Mr President, are the reasons for our vote. I trust that Mr Pajetta will not be displeased: for once we shall be voting on the same side — which was not the case this morning, in the debate on hunger in the

world, or again later, on Poland, when he voted on the same side as Mr Almirante. He is perfectly entitled to do so, of course, but it is worth pointing out. That is provocation if ever there was: for an old revolutionary to be voting systematically with someone from the other side like Mr Almirante when we are dealing with subjects like freedom, and peace.

President. — I call Mr Van Minnen.

Mr Van Minnen. — (NL) Mr President, I shall of course be voting for our common 'umbrella resolution', as well as for a number of wider-ranging amendments, because the European Parliament should not, at this particular moment in time, deliberately avoid making any criticism of the new rulers in Turkey. I think that this House should, as a matter of principle, condemn any military action directed against a democratically elected government. The army has no right to overrule a democracy; on the contrary, a democratically elected government must be the supreme commander over the army.

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (F) Mr President, Mrs Gredal and I were able to explain in detail the Socialist Group's point of view during the debate itself, and I do not wish to return to that now.

I should simply like to say that if we approve the text which a number of political groups agreed on, we shall be doing so in the knowledge that today's resolution constitutes a first public warning. Today's resolution seems particularly significant to us, especially the first paragraph, which, I would remind you, emphasizes that the process which will ensure political and trade-union liberties for the Turkish people in a democratic context must begin immediately.

It is obvious that the struggle for democracy in Turkey, for political and trade-union rights, will continue. It will continue in a number of forums within the Community.

A Communist speaker referred to the Socialists just now as a right-wing group. I should like to remind that speaker that the political party I belong to, which is part of the Belgian coalition government, worked very hard to bring about the withdrawal in a matter of days of the Belgian troops who were on exercises in Turkey.

(Laughter)

I would like to see others following our example.

In the meantime, Mr President, I believe it is proper that this Parliament should set the strict time-limits

Glinne

proposed for monitoring developments in Turkey, and demonstrating the uncompromising attitude of the democracy we represent.

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

The motion for a resolution is rejected.

We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne, Mr Klepsch and Mr Bangemann (Doc. 1-396/80): Events in Turkey.*

On the whole of the motion for a resolution I have Amendment No 12 by Mr Lemmer and Mr Spicer, seeking to replace the resolution by the following new text:

The European Parliament

1. Calls on the Foreign Ministers of the European Communities meeting in political cooperation to report to the competent committees of the European Parliament at the earliest possible opportunity on the situation in Turkey, its implication for the association agreement and the steps being taken to re-establish democracy;
2. Calls for a full debate on the matter to take place not later than November 1980;
3. Instructs its President to transmit this resolution to the Council, the Foreign Ministers of the Nine Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation, the Commission and the Ambassador of Turkey to the European Communities.

I call Mr Spicer on a point of order.

Mr Spicer. — Mr President, I think everyone would agree that the short debate we had in this House yesterday was a very concerned debate. Initially Mr Lemmer who, as you know, is a senior Vice-President and the rapporteur of the Turkish Committee, and myself as Vice-Chairman — but speaking in a purely personal capacity — felt that the time was not right for us to express opinions because we had not sufficient information.

However, Sir, we want to show a great degree of unanimity in the views of this House and therefore, with your approval, what I would like to propose is that the amendment we have put forward should be considered not as replacing the text but as additional. As I said, if we want to show concern, let it be a continuing concern.

All the authors of the original motion can surely accept that. I hope they will because it expresses the view, I think, of the whole House. It does not change their document at all, it just adds to it, so that two new paragraphs, Nos 4 and 5, would be inserted into their original text. I hope the House will agree with the spirit in which that is moved.

President. — Do the authors have any objections?

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Mr President, the authors of the motion wish to submit a text for which the great majority of Parliament can vote. Originally we had intended to leave this to the EEC-Turkey Association Committee, but for personal reasons it was unable to meet in time, and so Mr Glinne, Mr Bangemann and I tabled a motion. As far as I can see, the motion is not changed and nothing is deleted if these two passages are added. I therefore agree to the adoption of these two additions to the text.

President. — Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

(Parliament adopted the single indent of the preamble)

After the first indent I have the following three amendments:

— No 2 by Mr Pannella and others, seeking to add the following new indent:

- whereas a military *coup d'état* has abolished constitutional and personal liberties in Turkey, disbanded the political parties and the leading trade unions, dissolved the Grand National Assembly and had many of its members arrested and has imposed martial law throughout the country,

— No 3 by Mr Pannella and others, seeking to add the following new indent:

- noting the gravity of the political, economic and social situation in Turkey and considering, therefore, as all the more intolerable all forms of military insurrection and all moves to eliminate popular and democratic participation in solving the crisis,

— No 4 by Mr Pannella and others, seeking to add the following new indent:

- noting with considerable disquiet that the *coup d'état* in Turkey took place at the very moment when NATO military exercises were under way in Thrace (the European part of Turkey),

(Parliament rejected the three amendments)

On paragraph 1 I have Amendment No 13 by Mr Romualdi and others, seeking to amend the paragraph as follows:

1. Hopes that the new Turkish Government will implement as soon as possible the proposals it has announced to guarantee the Turkish people the enjoyment of political and trade union freedoms, within a democratic constitutional framework.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 1)

President

After paragraph 1 I have Amendment No 5 by Mr Pannella and others, seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

- 1a. Strongly condemns the military intervention in Turkey, since recourse to institutional violence is always and in all circumstances an unacceptable instrument of oppression and the abuse of power.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 2)

After paragraph 2 I have Amendment No 6 by Mr Pannella and others, seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

- 2a. Condemns all countries which, in the name of the 'sacred' principles sanctioned at Yalta of dividing up Europe and the world, endorse any forms of violation of human rights, of fundamental liberties and of the law, provided that they do not disturb the international status quo and the military alliances to which they belong.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 3)

After paragraph 3 I have Amendment No 7 by Mr Pannella and others, seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

- 3a. Calls upon the Member States of the EEC to break off all military, economic and commercial ties with the regime brought to power by the *coup* in Turkey, until such time as democracy and respect for human rights are restored.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)

On paragraph 4 I have Amendment No 1 by the Liberal and Democratic Group, seeking to add the following text to this paragraph:

.... and stresses in this context the declaration by the Foreign Ministers of the Nine meeting in Brussels on 16 September 1980.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 4)

After paragraph 4 I have Amendments Nos 8, 9 and 10 by Mr Pannella and others, each seeking to insert a new paragraph:

No 8:

- 4a. Requests the Council and the Commission to 'freeze' the EEC-Turkey Association Agreement until such time as democratic freedoms are restored and to suspend all forms of cooperation with Turkey;

No 9:

- 4b. Calls for a 'freeze' on the appropriations earmarked for Turkey in the budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1981;

No 10:

- 4c. Supports and approves the Belgian Government's decision immediately to recall the troops it had committed to the NATO military exercises in Turkey and consequently calls upon the governments of the other Community countries involved in these exercises to do likewise.

(Parliament rejected in turn the three amendments)

In accordance with the decision taken a moment ago, we shall now vote on Amendment No 12 by Mr Spicer.

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Forgive me, ladies and gentlemen, but I should just like to make one point in order to avoid confusion. The amendment, which was conceived as a substitute text, has been changed by its authors into an addition, and so I feel I can sum up the opinion of the Socialist Group as follows: the idea is to make sure that the competent committees of Parliament are able to examine without delay a report on the situation as seen by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation, that is by the end of November 1980 at the latest. In view of this, we can accept the replacement text in its new guise of an amendment to be added.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 12)

President. — On paragraph 5 I have Amendment No 11 by Mr Pannella and others, seeking to replace this paragraph by the following new text:

5. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and the Commission, the governments of the Member States and the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 5)

Explanations of vote may now be given.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — *(I)* One of the arguments which Mr Glinne has considered at length is the reason for which I feel I must vote against this resolution.

Mr Glinne quite rightly recalled that his own country, Belgium, wishing to indicate its displeasure at this *coup d'état*, took a positive step and withdrew its troops. We consider that to be a very significant gesture, and we applaud it. But it is my belief that there is something slightly illogical in restricting ourselves in this House to condemnations and statements, without demanding the withdrawal, not of 500

Pannella

Belgian soldiers, but of the millions upon millions we are giving, and continuing to give away to these military usurpers. Every unit of account we hand over to such people means another day's survival for these torturers, these murderers of democracy.

And since the condemnations merely serve to mask tacit support for the line which NATO has already unofficially expressed, we shall naturally be voting against the resolution, which condemns the tyrants in its words, but which supports them in its deeds.

President. — I call Mr Almirante.

Mr Almirante. — (I) Mr President, I am making a short explanation of vote on behalf of the Italian non-attached Members, and on my own behalf I should like to begin by addressing Mr Pannella because of what he just said concerning the real meaning behind the votes which I and we have all cast.

This time we shall not be 'married' to anyone, not to Mr Pajetta, not to Mr Pannella — heaven forbid —, nor to anyone else, because we are forced to state . . .

(Interruption by Mr Pajetta)

. . . My dear Pajetta, a lot of things can happen when political situations are met with the necessary sense of responsibility! . . . I was saying that we are sorry not to be able to follow anyone else's lead since we are forced to abstain because an amendment we tabled was not approved, even if some Members — and I thank them — were good enough to approve it, obviously because they had read it, and the rest of Parliament did not approve it and I think this was more than anything else because they had not read it.

What is the subject-matter of our amendment? We asked that paragraph 1 be amended, and that what, in our opinion, is excessive in its wording be removed. Paragraph 1 states: '(the European Parliament) urgently requests that steps be taken immediately towards . . .'. Please tell me if this is not interference in the internal affairs of another Member State and of a State, what is more, which has an association agreement with the European Community? We propose that the following statement full of common sense and integrity be put in its place: '(the European Parliament) hopes that the new Turkish Government will implement as soon as possible the proposals it has announced to guarantee the Turkish people the enjoyment of freedoms . . .'.

We have heard lessons being given, yesterday and today, by all the groups in this House on the subject of non-interference where Poland was concerned, we have heard all the groups — without exception — in this House repeating that this Parliament has no specific powers to intervene in foreign policy within

the meaning of the Treaty of Rome and that it should not exercise such powers until its Regulations had been changed, and now we see the majority of Parliament on the point of — excuse me for saying so — somewhat rashly, approving a document which in its first paragraph shows that it is a text which supports interference openly, heavy handedly and above all for no good reason and in a slightly ridiculous way. It is slightly ridiculous firstly because we all know that the Council of Ministers of the European Community, yesterday or the day before yesterday, adopted an attitude which was very carefully worded and showed a sense of responsibility. I also think that Parliament's attitude is a little ridiculous because the Belgian Foreign Minister was present at that meeting despite the fact that Belgium had decided to suspend its decision to deploy its armed forces during the NATO manoeuvres in Turkey.

We are faced with a military take-over. And there are all sorts of military take-overs just as there are all sorts of democracies. In this case we are faced with a clamp-down on violence, which was not the case prior to the *coup d'état*; we are in the presence of measures aimed at immediate commitments in the social field, measures which the whole of the world press has noted. Therefore, we think that by abstaining from voting on a text of this nature, which in other circumstances we would have been willing to approve, we will be making an appeal to the sense of responsibility and the caution which the majority of the Members of this House possess.

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

The resolution is adopted.¹

7. Verification of credentials

President. — At its meeting this morning, the Bureau verified the credentials of Mr Beyer de Ryke and Mr Clément, whose appointments were announced on 11 July last.

Pursuant to Rule 3 (1) of the Rules of Procedure, the Bureau has made sure that these appointments comply with the provisions of the Treaties.

It therefore asks the House to ratify these appointments.

Since there are no objections, these appointments are ratified.

¹ OJ C 265 of 13. 10. 1980

8. Regional development programmes

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-347/80) drawn up by Mr Travaglini on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning on the regional development programmes.

I call Mr Travaglini.

Mr Travaglini, rapporteur. — (1) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning felt that Parliament should be consulted on the regional development of programmes submitted to the Commission by the Member States, as these are matters of great relevance to the economic and political integration of Europe.

The Committee on behalf of which I have the honour of presenting this report, is convinced that regional development and convergence policy necessitates an overall examination of the problems of regional planning and the development of productive structures in the less-favoured regions, which in turn will necessitate effective coordination of the programmes and measures which the individual Member States and the regions in question regard as necessary in the various sectors of the European Community with an eye to regional development and convergence.

Regional development programmes must not in future be regarded merely as the instrument necessary for obtaining benefits from the ERDF but should soon take on the significance and content of reference instruments for all the work aimed at promoting the socio-economic development of the less-favoured regions.

This Parliament has repeatedly stressed the inadequacy of Community action in the field of regional convergence and the fact that regional policy is one of the most important elements, if not the most important, which may permit meaningful and coherent European integration.

As stated in the declaration made on that occasion, the Heads of State and Government as long ago as the summit meeting of 1972 gave high priority to the objective of correcting structural and regional imbalances within the Community which could be prejudicial to the realization of economic and monetary union.

For the rest, the Treaty of Rome is quite clear on this matter. One of the main driving forces and indeed the very *raison d'être* of the Community is to 'ensure harmonious development' of the economies of the Member States 'by reducing the differences existing between the various regions and the backwardness of the less-favoured regions'. Thus, the Treaty does not merely state that the harmonious development of the economies of the Member States is one of the basic

objectives of the Community, but also makes it quite clear that this will primarily be brought about by reducing regional imbalances.

It follows, therefore, that all common policies, whether structural or not, relating to all the sectors, should play their part in eliminating regional imbalances. The regional policy thus assumes the role of an overall Community policy forming the foundation of European integration.

The aid programmes therefore take on a fundamental significance as instruments whereby the coordination of the various Community, national and local regional development policies may be formalized.

The Committee for Regional Development and Regional Planning has carried out a thorough examination of the programmes submitted by the Member States and has concluded that they could, on a provisional basis, be used by the Regional Development Fund for financing the projects that apply to the financial year up to 1981 — I have tabled an amendment changing this date which is given as 1980 in the report. The programmes must, therefore, — and this is also the view of Commission — be revised and extended so that they will be able to perform this coordinating function with regard to all the regional development measures which go far beyond the aid to which the Community contributes via the ERDF.

Whilst reaffirming the fact that there is no substitute for the ERDF, which should be constantly increased — and I urge Parliament to do all it can to see that this can be done in time for the 1981 budget — we must nevertheless realize that the Fund cannot continue to be the only Community instrument for the elimination of regional imbalances, as is the case in practice today.

The Regulation governing the Fund should be revised with a view to giving more weight to Community action. The Community cannot restrict itself to supporting national measures. It should also stimulate and encourage them. The Community should get closer, in practical terms, to the realities of those regions which, for reasons of the local geography, etc. for a whole range of socio-economic problems do not manage, in spite of the efforts made by the Member States in question, to achieve a satisfactory development.

With the enlargement of the Community to include the three other Mediterranean countries, regional problems will assume such dimensions that the methods used for Community action, and to a certain extent the objectives, should be re-examined in good time. It would be a good idea for Parliament to study the political and practical implications of the Commission's work in this field — which, for the rest, is quite excellent — and make its contribution to devising more suitable approaches.

Travaglini

Mr President, in spite of the major political difficulties which are such a common feature of this Parliament, the Community today has the possibility — and I think all the necessary elements are present — to carry out, in a unified and organized manner, the grand design of economic integration, thus making a fragmented Europe a thing of the past.

Parliament could not avoid coming in for criticism from the people of Europe, particularly those in the peripheral and less-favoured areas, if this grand design, despite the political resolve, the constant stimulus and strategical proposals which it implies, failed to arouse and mobilize, above all in this House, this drive and political resolve since, whilst recognizing the positive value of this first year of Parliament's work, it is nevertheless felt that Parliament has not as yet worked sufficiently hard to hasten the construction of Europe.

(Applause)

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

Mr Griffiths. — Mr President, the Socialist Group supports the sentiments expressed in Mr Travaglini's resolution on the regional development programmes. We feel that his emphasis on the need for greater cooperation between the Commission, the Member States and the regions qualifying for assistance from the Regional Development Fund is vital for the development of effective action to improve the prosperity and economic activity of the regions. A call to action is the keynote of the resolution rather than a fine declaration of grand hopes which are forgotten when the debating is over.

As the world lurches deeper into recession and the regions of the Community take the brunt of the damage inflicted by this recession, a recession made worse by some governments chasing the shadows of policies that failed disastrously 50 and more years ago, it is imperative that we respond even in the small way that the acceptance of this report offers us to the challenge of the continuing and growing imbalance between the rich centre of the Community and the poor, often peripheral regions; between those areas where unemployment is more often than not under 4 % and those areas where it is rushing towards 14 %. The Socialist Group accepts the value of the regional development programmes as a framework for Community action, even though Mr Travaglini's report is critical of them.

This criticism, however, should not be seen as an indictment of those programmes but as a constructive attempt to improve them so that they can provide an effective framework for regional development. We wish to highlight briefly three areas where we think

the most effective action can be taken and which are highlighted in the resolution itself.

We believe it is very important for the Commission to receive the full cooperation of Member States and for the regions which receive this aid to be involved both in the planning of programmes and in their operation. We also feel the need to repeat once again, although it has often been repeated in debates concerning regional policy, that the measures which the Community has available at the moment should be coordinated so that help is more effectively given.

Finally — and this, we believe, is the most important point — where the Community is proposing measures or developing policies, whether they be in a particular industry or whether they are going to affect the whole of the Community, the specific effect of those policies on the regions needs a response from the Regional Committee to see if, in fact, they are going to benefit those regions.

So, on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr President, I conclude by saying that we hope that within the next year, effective action will be taken to improve the presentation of these programmes so that the poorer members and the unemployed members of this Community can feel that it offers them a brighter future.

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

Mr O'Donnell. — Mr President and colleagues, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party I wish to very sincerely congratulate my esteemed friend and colleague, Mr Travaglini, on his excellent report on a very vital and fundamental aspect of the regional development policy of this Community.

The Travaglini report represents very accurately the response of this Parliament's Regional Policy Committee to the report issued by the Commission in May 1979 on the regional development programmes of the Member States. Even though the Commission's report was issued well over a year ago and might therefore seem somewhat out-of-date, it is nevertheless very appropriate to the present stage and, indeed, to future stages in the evolution of a Community regional policy.

The real significance of the Commission's report now under discussion is that it emphasizes once again one basic and irrefutable fact, namely, that this Community, a quarter century after its establishment, still has no real coherent or credible Community regional policy. This fact becomes crystal clear after a close study and a comparative analysis of the regional development programmes of the Member States.

One need only point to the wide variations attending the policies and the methodology employed by the various member governments in their respective regional development programmes. One need only point to the ludicrous situation in which the regional development programmes of the Member States now cover a total of 75 regions and zones, representing 55 % of the entire area of the Community and 38 % of the total population.

We in this group, and indeed this Parliament have been consistently and continuously demanding over the years the implementation of a real and efficacious Community regional policy, a policy designed to eliminate serious regional imbalances within the Community.

Let us be realistic and face the fact that such a policy has not yet been implemented, indeed that it cannot be implemented whilst we have a situation where a grossly inadequate Fund is indiscriminately dispersed over such a wide geographical area of the Community. The watering-can effect, more than any other factor, has contributed to the continuing disgraceful and indefensible situation which unfortunately has become the most remarkable characteristic of this Community, the trend of the rich regions getting richer and the poor getting poorer.

Faced as we are with this alarming situation in the present Community of the Nine, one shudders to think what the situation will be if we continue with the same policy following the forthcoming enlargement of the Community.

There are important, inescapable and irrefutable conclusions to be drawn from the report before us.

First of all, there can be no real progress in tackling the problem of regional disparities in the present Community, and much less in the enlarged Community, unless the Council of Ministers and national governments are prepared to cooperate with Parliament and the Commission as well as with the regional and local authorities in formulating and implementing a genuine Community regional policy based on Community criteria of need and backed by adequate finance.

Secondly, there must be a far greater concentration of aid in the neediest regions, and less of the watering-can approach. Such regions must be selected on the basis of new and more realistic Community criteria. Regional planning, of course, must form an essential and integral part of the Community regional policy in the future. Plans and programmes appropriate to the needs of each region must be formulated in accordance with Community criteria. These programmes should be comprehensive and integrated, so as to embrace all aspects of development, economic, social, cultural and educational. They should include agriculture and we in this group have repeatedly emphasized

the vital role of agriculture in the under-developed regions of this Community.

In addition to agriculture, regional programmes should include industry, fisheries, forestry, tourism, crafts, the services sector, transport, communications, education and culture. In other words, all the resources of the region, human as well as physical, must be utilized to optimum advantage.

Further, all the instruments of this Community having a regional impact must be coordinated and, together with national and regional instruments, be incorporated into a coherent Community regional policy.

Of course, regional development policies and programmes affect the lives and the fortunes of the people of the regions. The people of the regions should therefore be consulted and involved in the formulation and implementation of policies and programmes designed for their betterment.

This can best be done by devising appropriate procedures that will ensure the active participation of local and regional authorities in the development of their regions. We in this Group also, I might say, are very much in favour of encouraging practical direct inter-regional cooperation in Europe and of forging direct links, in particular, between the highly-developed regions and the under-developed regions.

Finally, we must provide the finance necessary to implement a new dynamic Community regional policy. This will require a massive increase in the present financial resources of the Community and a greatly enlarged Community budget. Studies recently carried out by this Group on the implications of enlargement for the ERDF indicate the possible need for a new Community financial instrument to tackle the enormous disparities which not only exist in the present Community, but will exist to an even more marked degree in the new Community — the enlarged Community.

The report before us, Mr President and colleagues, reminds us that the greatest challenge facing this Community now and in the future is a challenge of creating regional equilibrium in Europe. We must create economic and social conditions in the regions which make it possible for everybody who wishes to do so to find in their own areas satisfactory employment and a decent standard of living. Compulsory emigration and migration, which for so long have been characteristic of my country and of many countries in this Community, have no place in the Europe of the 80s and the Europe of the future.

I believe, therefore, we must face the challenge with courage and with determination and I respectfully submit that the Travaglini Report provides the frame-

O'Donnell

work within which this Parliament can spearhead a new drive to create a just society in Europe.

(Applause from the centre)

President. — I call Mr Harris to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Harris. — Mr President, first of all I wish to move the amendment which stands in my name on behalf of the European Democratic Group. Although it is being moved by my group, I think it does reflect the views of the Committee as a whole. I believe it is probably acceptable to the rapporteur and I think it will strengthen the report.

One of the distinctive things perhaps about the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, under the chairmanship of Mr De Pasquale, is the fact that we really do not have great differences of views. I think we are a united committee. All of us on it do, of course, look at the whole business of regional policy with enthusiasm, and that enthusiasm was shown today by Mr Travaglini in the way in which he moved his excellent report. Mr Travaglini brings a true zest to the proceedings of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, and I join with the other speakers in congratulating him on the report.

I too, like the last speaker, would like to pick on a couple of aspects of the report, and it so happens that basically they are the same aspects. This again illustrates what we have said a number of times, and that is that it is an illusion to think that there is such a thing as a European regional policy — there is not. What we see is our national governments interpreting regional policy according to their own lights and according to their own preferences. If we are going to have a regional policy we really should have better criteria. On the point which Mr O'Donnell mentioned, the fact that 55 % of the Community is regarded as being eligible for regional aid is quite frankly a nonsense, and indeed I think it equally wrong that Ireland — the whole of Ireland — should be listed as an assisted area. I am not just picking on Ireland, because Germany also has a big percentage — 61 % of Germany, the richest country in the Community, is scheduled as an assisted area. Of course, people can equally point to the United Kingdom and to the defects in the policy pursued over the years by both governments in the United Kingdom on regional policy. What we need to do is to have a completely fresh look at the criteria of the Regional Fund, and certainly I believe it is the intention of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning to serve notice, in a friendly way, on the Commission that that is what we intend to do in that committee.

Speaking quite personally, I would like to see a reduction in the number of assisted areas in the Community,

but also a much larger non-quota section where we can have the flexibility which is also needed, because we must recognize that in some of the prosperous areas there are very real problems. The regional policy must tackle those black spots, as I like to call them — horrid word though it is. We must have the flexibility to tackle the problems that exist, say, in London, undoubtedly in Dublin and undoubtedly in parts of Germany. On the one hand we must reduce the number of assisted areas which benefit from the main part of the Fund, but on the other hand we must increase the non-quota section so that we can have that additional flexibility.

Could I also underline another point already made? That is the vital importance of having these close dealings between the regions themselves and the Commission. I believe this is happening inevitably, indeed partly as a result of our own election to this Parliament. The regions are looking through us, the elected Members, to Brussels. They are looking for help and finding in Brussels sympathy with and understanding of their problems. This, I believe, will develop and must develop. Somehow, without necessarily duplicating the machinery that already exists in national governments, we have got to find some means of harnessing this enthusiasm and interest which undoubtedly does exist in the regions for the Community's Regional Fund. They are interested because, of course, they see money there to be got, but I think we have got to develop our procedures in this respect. I feel that only good can come of a building up of direct contact between the regions and the Commission and Brussels.

In conclusion, Mr President, I would say that before long — and this is inevitable because of the consequences of enlargement of the Community — we must have a fundamental and radical review of the Regional Fund. In the meantime I am very happy indeed to support the words of our rapporteur and his report.

(Applause from the centre and from the right)

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

Mr Damette. — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, before I give the French Communist and Allies view of Mr Travaglini's report I would first like to set it properly against the background of what the Community calls its Regional Policy. There are in fact two sides to this policy: the financial side, based on the fund, and the political side based on the programmes. Theoretically the two sides hang together since the programmes should depend on and justify resources from the funds.

Even at first sight it is in fact clear that the reality is completely different and that we are dealing with two

Damette

different policies and conducted by means of the fund, to other by means of the programmes. The fund known as Regional Development is a system of using regional questions as a means of transferring funds to the two Member States which take up most of the credits. I observe that in fact the United Kingdom's share of the funds granted by the ERDF remained at 26 % from 1975 to 1979, and rose miraculously to almost 38 % in 1980. It seems to me that as far as Europe is concerned the regional question is a convenient umbrella which will shelter anything and everything. In fact the Regional Fund is a convenient supranational means of financing something completely different. And in effect it is part of the British Government's attack on the Common Agricultural Policy.

Under these circumstances what meaning can one attach to the regional development programmes and the Travaglini Report which is devoted to them? Basically the report by the Regional Policy Committee, on which I have the honour of serving, can be reduced to a single line, in point 7 of the motion for a resolution which states that the Parliament 'agrees with the Commission's opinion on the development programmes drawn up by the Member States'. The report is in fact an almost word-for-word copy of the executive Commission's opinions and recommendations. And without wishing to take anything away from the excellent work of the rapporteur, I am bound to observe that as far as policy is concerned, as will be plainly seen from the Commission documents annexed to it, the report might just as well be called the 'Giolitti report'.

What then does this report offer us by way of regional policy? The answer is given in point 4 of the motion for a resolution which commonly states that 'all the common structural policies must be more effectively developed and properly coordinated so as to ensure that they make a decisive contribution to the process of developing the less-favoured regions'. Put in simple terms what you want is more, and more vigorous, Davignon plans, higher co-responsibility levies on milk, and more European regulations on sheepmeat and other products. But these are precisely the policies which bring about regional crises in a country like France. This is of course not the time for a guided tour of France's regional crises, but I think I should point out that their principal characteristic is that they are closely connected to such European structural policies. The North and Lorraine are first in the queue for the knacker's yard as far as the ECSC and the Davignon plans are concerned. The Mediterranean coast is breaking all unemployment records with the wine policy and the damage done to the shipyards. And even that is nothing compared with the Lozère department which is a tragic illustration of the situation. The Lozère has been given a special European development programme at the very moment when regulation of the sheep trade is dismantling its last real economic base. Even worse, all the evidence indicates that

enlargement of the Common Market would adversely affect a number of regions in France, not just in the South-West, possibly ruining their economies.

So, we dismantle the French mining industry and its sheep-farming, we dismantle machine tools and fishing, and at the same time we are bold enough to talk about developing and balancing the regions. We are doing exactly the opposite. The regional policy which is being proposed to us goes hand in hand with the policy for redeployment of capital which has been decided on by the European multinationals. This so-called regional policy is nothing more than a means of implementing a class-based policy. If I may use the expression, I should call it the casualty hospital for the victims of the Davignon plans and enlargement of the Community, which is the way it was quite clearly put in the definition of the supplementary ERDF. I could also mention that this policy will only serve to extend the one already imposed in France by the Giscardien authorities, compounding all its negative characteristics.

Having said that I would like to raise another question, one which is more strictly political. How has this Assembly given itself the right to pass judgment on Member States' regional programmes? We all know that Article 3 of the Treaty makes no reference to regional policy and that it is by constantly going beyond the terms of the Treaty that this policy which they call regional has been established. This overstepping of authority is the result of a double act by the Council and the Commission, and the Assembly is now getting in on the act with reports like the one we have before us today. The Council established in its resolution of 6 February 1979 what it called coordination between the regional policies of Member States and of the Community. This idea of coordinating regional policies is no more than an appearance. Coordinating regional policies for the Mezzogiorno and for Wales has neither sense nor value from the point of view of the region. It does on the other hand serve as a blind for the introduction, via the regions, of a process of political integration, that is of supranationality. And on that Mr Travaglini's report is quite explicit, since he uses an expression which we have heard before, saying that he is convinced of the great importance of regional policy in the economic and political integration of Europe. What he is calling the coordination of regional policies is nothing more than a fig leaf for integration. Regions are being used as a tool in a supranational movement whose ultimate purpose is an internal attack on national sovereignty.

All in all the main interest of this report is that it shows the close connection between the structural policies dictated by the multinationals and the pursuit of political supranationality. Visible through the regional action is the class content of supranationality. It is of course quite logical that the multinationals should wish to draw up and impose their policies on a European scale since there they are sheltered from

Damette

national class struggles. No-one, though, has the power to end those struggles. In France they are becoming more determined and more broadly based and the French Communists have the honour of playing a decisive role in this struggle. Our own position is that we shall campaign for genuine development in every one of our regions, knowing full well it can only be achieved by developing all their resources against a background of national sovereignty and new international cooperation. The French Communist and Allies will therefore be voting against this report since it forms part of the grand design of supranational politics which is masterminded by the multinational corporations.

9. Speaking time

President. — The enlarged Bureau proposes that speaking time for tomorrow's sitting be allocated as follows:

- five minutes for one of the authors of each motion for a resolution or report
- 90 minutes for the Members, allocated as follows:

— Socialist Group	20 minutes
— Group of the European People's Party	19 minutes
— European Democratic Group	13 minutes
— Communist and Allies Group	10 minutes
— Liberal and Democratic Group	9 minutes
— Group of European Progressive Democrats	6 minutes
— Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members	5 minutes
— Non-attached Members	8 minutes

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

10. Calendar of part-sessions

President. — At the request of the Committee on Budgets and after consultation with Parliament's other committees, the enlarged Bureau has decided that the part-session initially scheduled for 27 to 30 October 1980 will be deferred to the period from 3 to 7 November 1980.

I call Mr Adam.

Mr Adam. — Mr President, with regard to the announcements that you have just made relating to the part-session in Luxembourg, when can we expect to have a further announcement of the effect that this

will have on the already scheduled meetings of the committees? It is very important that we know this as soon as possible.

President. — Since the decision was only taken this morning, the committees have obviously not yet been able to come to any decisions of their own, but the group chairmen are already meeting to fix other dates for committee meetings. You will therefore be informed of these shortly.

11. Regional development programmes (continued)

President. — We shall now continue the debate on the report by Mr Travaglini on regional development programmes.

I call Mr Maher to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mr Maher. — Mr President, I think Mr Travaglini must be complimented on adding another building-block to the now very solid case that exists for a more comprehensive and more dynamic approach to the problems of the regions in the European Community. Of course more blocks are needed: the building is not entirely complete, but he must be complimented nevertheless.

When Mr Jenkins, the President of the Commission, assumed that position nearly four years ago, he said that the divergence between the rich and poor areas of the Community was the greatest danger to its cohesion. I wonder if Mr Jenkins could honestly say today that the position has improved greatly under his presidency. This is not meant as an accusation, because I think it would be quite wrong to blame Mr Jenkins for the fact that we have not made very much progress. Perhaps he should take some of the blame, but I think the main share must lie with the member governments, who do not seem to have the political will to bring about a really cohesive and dynamic approach to the difficulties confronting people living in these regions which have been losing population — for many decades and, indeed, in some cases for many generations.

There is one point that I should like to underline at this moment, and it is that some people seem to entertain the illusion that if you carry out development programmes in regions where depopulation is taking place, you are helping those regions and those regions only. I should like to introduce a correction here. Of course you are helping to attract more people to live in these regions and to stabilize the population, but you are also in fact helping the more developed regions;

Maher

because what has been happening is that people have been moving out of these remote areas and areas where there is unemployment towards the areas that are already overcrowded. And if they do, then of course financial resources have to be found to take account of their arrival in these already overpopulated areas. We have seen this happen in many countries. My own, perhaps, is a classic example, for now almost one-third of the total population of the Republic of Ireland lives in Dublin; and as we have only a little over 3 million people altogether, that means that there is a very sparse population spread over a large area. But Dublin is grossly overcrowded. We cannot take account of the people there: there are not services enough. Everything is bursting at the seams: there are not enough houses, hospitals or public services; whereas in other regions of our country these same services are being closed down. So there are two sides to this problem. By carrying out regional development programmes, we are helping those regions, but we are also relieving the pressure on the more populated areas. I think that should not be forgotten, because too often we consider the problem of the regions alone without looking at the picture as a whole.

Mr President, you will forgive me if, because I am a farmer, I emphasize more the difficulties of the more rural regions than I do those of the industrial regions that also have problems. I accept fully the fact that there are industrial regions in our Community which particularly today in the midst of this economic depression, are facing serious problems, and I do not for a moment wish to be charged with ignoring them. Of course they are there, and in some cases the need, I would concede, is even more urgent today than in some of the rural areas. But in the rural areas this problem of depopulation is endemic and has been going on for generations, and I believe strongly that unless we can achieve a real convergence between the various instruments that we have — the farm policy, the regional policy and the social policy — and use them together to home in on the problems of these rural areas, we are not really going to be as effective as we ought to be.

In fact, what I personally would like to see developed is a rural policy, perhaps overshooting the farm policy, because we want a total approach to the problem in these regions, not a piecemeal one, not using the farm policy here, the regional policy somewhere else and the social policy in yet another area, without any idea of what the totality of the effect is going to be. We need to establish objectives and head towards those objectives, using the various instruments that we have to achieve those ends. Consequently, we ought to be thinking about a comprehensive policy, a policy that will take account not only of the farming problems in the regions, but also tourism, the question of small industries, or the one mentioned by my friend Mr O'Donnell — forestry.

It is a great drawback that we have no forestry policy in the European Community today. That is a matter of

great urgency, particularly living, as we do, at a time when energy has become one of our major problems. I am not suggesting that we can all burn wood in our fires or use it to drive our motor-cars with, but there are many activities where in fact highly energy-absorbant materials are being used. For instance, to mention one example alone, cement: it takes more than a tonne of oil to drive five tonnes of cement, when in fact we could be using more wood to build our houses. We know today how to pestproof, fireproof, and weatherproof timber; we could have very good houses out of wood, yet we all continue to build them of concrete and brick, and these are making very serious demands on the energy we have. Apart altogether from that, we have the paper industries that could be developed into industries using cellulose. Above all, we know that in the world today the consumption of wood is rising at double the rate of production in terms of cost, it is the highest import into this Community after oil, and yet we are doing very little about expanding our forests. Here is an ideal way of utilizing underproductive land. In many remote regions, that is the most plentiful material we have, and by using underproductive land to produce more timber, we could create new possibilities of employment in the planting, processing and care of the forests. I am sorry if I emphasize this unduly, but it is one area where I think there are a lot of possibilities; and so wrap that in to this whole idea of a total approach to the problems in these areas under the heading of rural policy.

I would also like to emphasize — or re-emphasize, because I know it has been said before, but we cannot ignore it — the importance of a dynamic regional policy in helping people to recognize the value of being part of a community of nations. Too few citizens in our streets and in our countryside recognize the value of being together in a community: on the contrary, because of the way the media have treated this subject, many of them are regretful that they ever joined. They do not see the benefits, and I must say that some of our governments, particularly in connection with the use of the Regional Fund, have contributed towards that ignorance of what the Community can do. Governments are using these monies without indicating that they have come from the European Community; they are, in fact, giving the impression that they come from state funds. In some countries, the authorities at least mark the work that is going on by putting up a notice saying that the project is being aided by the European Development Fund. That is very useful and I hope that more countries will follow this practice, then the man passing by on the road at least can see the fact and perhaps reflect that the project would probably not be carried out were it not for funds from the European Community.

I want to underline also something which has been said before and repeated today by a number of people, and that is the danger of what Tom O'Donnell called the watering-can effect. I agree completely. I think that if we are going to get real results, we have to have

Maher

more concentration and let the concept of the greatest need apply. I am appalled at what is being done in my own country, and I know it is happening in others too. Dublin is overpopulated, yet we are using some of this money very close to an area like Dublin, when we know that in the western part of our country there is still serious depopulation. The money is not being used in the areas with the greatest need. We are, in fact, tending to attract more people toward the areas where there is overpopulation. I know the same thing can be said of other countries.

With regard to the cross-border effect, I think that here again the Regional Fund can be a very important political instrument in promoting cooperation between our various countries, and my own is an example. Both in the North and South of Ireland we can cooperate across our border to perform useful work that will help people regardless of what side of the border they live on. We can cooperate in carrying out development, providing more jobs and stabilizing the population.

Mr President, I would emphasize one other point. I hope that more account will be taken, both in the planning and the implementation of regional policy, of the existence of important voluntary organizations in these regions, particularly cooperatives that are already engaged in trade and commerce, organizations that have been set up voluntarily and funded voluntarily by the people themselves. These organizations have a lot of expertise, a lot of knowledge, and are already carrying out development projects. Why not utilize these structures to bring about more development in these areas? We can use the structures that are already there instead of setting up new structures which will not be as acceptable generally as the structures set up by the people themselves. I would appeal to the Commissioner to recognize that in many of our countries there is a highly developed cooperative structure ready and willing to be used in order to carry out these projects.

IN THE CHAIR: MR ZAGARI*Vice-President*

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

Mr Lalor. — Mr President, I am happy to join with the others who have gone before me and who have complimented Mr Travaglini for his excellent and comprehensive report. In passing, I would like to note that this report is somewhat belated. Although this is no reflection on the rapporteur — in that it concerns programmes submitted prior to 1977. Hopefully, however, it is in time to influence the preparation of

the second generation regional development programme which is aimed at covering regional development in the period from 1980 to 1985. Similarly, this report fails to make the point that the programme in question was a first approach at Community level, a fact which justifies a sympathetic approach to its examination. On the basis of the experience gained as well as the observations made by Mr Travaglini in his report I think the second generation programmes should represent a significant improvement.

This important report contains many of the criticisms that we in the European Progressive Democrats have been making of Community regional policy up to now. For example, no Member State has generated an infrastructure development programme over a period of years. There has been failure to link projects that are submitted for aid to other national and Community development programmes. I think I can justifiably say that bureaucratic bungling and bad administrative preparation of projects is one of the main reasons why all the money available to the Regional Fund is not spent annually.

The report raises the whole question of economic convergence in the development of EEC policies in a coordinated fashion that will have an impact at different national levels. It highlights the classic tension between the national governments on the one hand and the Community institutions on the other with regard to overall economic planning. I think it can be said that the regional effects of the Community policies is a point that we have always been insisting on. That is to say that in the application of Community policies, whether it be in the industrial or market organization sector, account should be taken of the impact of such policies on the advancement of the depressed regions. Regional impact assessment must be constantly to the fore in drafting Community policies that could lead to economic divergence rather than convergence. I believe that coordinated and integrated use of Community instruments can be achieved with existing mechanisms and particularly through the programme for regional development elaborated and submitted by Member States. In this context it is not clear what is intended by 'integrated measures' in point 10 of the motion for a resolution in Mr Travaglini's report. If, however, it refers to the Commission's proposed integrated operations which concern programme areas it should be noted that the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning has taken a negative attitude to this concept on the grounds that attention should not be diverted from programmes.

In his report Mr Travaglini raises the essential question of restricting the geographic areas. We in the European Progressive Democratic Group are convinced that regions in need of development must be identified on the basis of Community criteria. National criteria are more suitable for settling national disparities and are merely indicative of the Community

Lalor

requirements. But in applying a Community policy for regional development I feel that the regions must be identified on the basis of Community criteria, so that the disparities and imbalances at a Community level can be properly attacked and remedied.

What then, you may ask, should Community criteria be? Let me say that we in the European Progressive Democrats advocate the following criteria: a preponderance of agricultural difficulty in an area; a history of outward migration; unemployment levels substantially above the Community level; gross national product per head substantially lower than the Community average; the level of industrial development substantially below the Community average; the existence of climatic and geographical disadvantages; poor demographic structure and under-developed social infrastructure. I think that those could provide very useful criteria for a Community regional policy. It should not be left to national governments to determine what these criteria should be.

We have already heard various speakers today: my colleagues, Mr O'Donnell and Mr Maher. We heard Mr Harris state that Ireland as a whole has been declared an under-developed region. I think this is justifiably so, and I think that it is indicative of the situation as it exists in my country that the European People's Party, the Liberal and Democratic Group and the European Progressive Democrats have nominated Irishmen as the opening speakers on this topic. I see that the European Democrats have John Taylor from Northern Ireland obviously waiting to speak on this issue and I see my friend, Mr Paisley, waiting to speak as well. So I think it is indicative of how seriously the Irish people — both North and South — regard this issue and of how we feel. As Mr O'Donnell said, 61 % of West Germany is, by national definition, regarded as under-developed. However, it should be pointed out that there are far more under-developed areas in the Community as a whole.

The challenges facing the European Community are many, but the implementation of a real and effective regional development policy remains one of the most fundamental. The Community must choose between saving its poorer regions and protecting the richer ones; between developing its poorer regions or allowing further economic concentration in its richer regions. This can only be achieved by a realistic and effective overall European regional development policy, the purpose of which is to stress the need to strengthen the unity of the economies and to ensure harmonious development by reducing the differences existing between the better-off regions and the backwardness of the less favoured ones.

President. — I call Mr Skovmand on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

Mr Skovmand. — (DK) Mr President, one of the major problems with technical development is that it can lead to serious differences between the regions in the individual countries and a modern state must therefore strengthen the weak regions and apply a brake to the development of the stronger ones. This is just as true in the case of Denmark as in the case of France, Ireland or West Germany, and it is obvious that the necessary decisions must be made in the individual countries as they know where the problems lie and what can be done. It is, therefore, unfortunate that the Community should interfere so much in regional policy. In Denmark, there has been an unmistakable ironing-out of differences between the strong and weak regions since the middle of the 1960s. Since 1975, however, this levelling process has been less marked, as a result of the Community starting to interfere in the policy of the Danish Government and oppose aid to a series of weak regions. There is in fact a danger of the process grinding to a halt completely. In spite of this, we are expected to vote here today on a motion proposing that even more power should be given to the Community and even less to the individual countries. We in the People's Movement against the European Community must oppose this motion for a resolution and we urge everyone else to do the same.

President. — I call Mr Petronio.

Mr Petronio. — (I) Mr President, in the report submitted to us for examination and possible adoption, Mr Travaglini rightly quotes the Treaty of Rome and the words with which the initiators of European economic, and possibly political, union expressed their sense of commitment with regard to the problem of regional imbalances, i.e. that the basic task and purpose of the Community was to ensure harmonious development by reducing the differences existing between the various regions and the backwardness of the less favoured regions. This then is the statement of fundamental principles, about which, I think, we can have no doubts. Otherwise, Europe would be and would remain a free trade zone, a more or less common agricultural market which might also in addition be able to make political statements. As far as we are concerned at least, there can be no doubts about the basic aim of eliminating imbalance, of bringing about convergence between the poor and the rich regions — this economic, social, moral and perhaps even historical mission.

Nevertheless, Mr Travaglini is right in drawing attention in his report to the fact that these imbalances continue to exist, sometimes even in acute forms, and observes that attempts are frequently made to solve new imbalances — which might be purely a result of the short-term economic situation — for example, by means of the non-quota section — while no serious action is taken with regard to other imbalances which in some cases are very long-standing. This view is also

Petronio

borne out by a study produced by the European Parliament's Directorate-General for Research and Documentation, which concludes that, from a statistical point of view, there was admittedly a reduction in the imbalances between the various regions between 1977 and 1979 whereas in fact these imbalances had worsened. This seems self-contradictory but in reality the data given by the researchers of the European Parliament and the Commission confirm this statement which is not merely a general interpretation of the situation but represents the results of work carried out by a team on the basis of certain facts.

In other words, it was stated in the preamble to the Treaty that the aims of the Community were harmonious development, convergence of the economies and elimination of regional imbalances. After many years, however, we are forced to recognize the fact that, in spite of the instruments which have been devised or revived with a view to achieving this aim, we have still got nowhere in our attempts to make the divergence between one region and another as small as possible. We find it unacceptable that this European Regional Development Fund should be described, as has been the case, as a sort of anti-agricultural instrument, since we take the view that its endowment, its financial sustenance, is still very modest. Even if the Council should agree to increasing it to 1 600 thousand million units of account, a slight increase in agricultural prices — an 'adjustment' as these things are known — would be enough to cancel out practically the entire sum we had managed to squeeze out of the Council, not to mention the fact that it has even been proposed that instead of 1 600 thousand million units of account it should be reduced to 1 100 thousand million or 1 200 thousand million, which would mean that we could do no more than deal with dairy produce surpluses or boost certain funds, such as the guidance section, which, however, all though the necessary goodwill is present, does not come into it, as Mr Filippi has, incidentally, recently demonstrated.

This regional policy is an important matter. Mr Travaglini's report states, for example that 75 regions are interested in this policy and that the area covered by these 75 regions is over half the entire area of the Community, 55 % to be precise, and that some 38 % of the population of the Community live and work there — the 38 % which, like us, is trying to see to it that this undertaking has a political future in addition to a certain economic future. The Fund is therefore of enormous significance and several problems are coming to light, one of which was stressed by Mr Pasquale on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy, i.e. the need to streamline the regulation governing the Fund, which at the moment is so unnecessarily involved that it is impossible to put projects or programmes into practice without considerable delays, with a result that everything remains a dead letter or only comes into effect so long after the machinery has been set in motion that, in practical terms, it results in very little or nothing at all.

And then there is the question of improving the way in which the Member States and regions assess the impact of our economic aid in real terms, not only as regards structural measures, but also as regards the labour market and employment. This is not merely a question of obtaining dry statistics but of getting a clear understanding of precisely what a single unit of account, or a thousand or ten thousand units of account, can actually contribute towards alleviating the unemployment problem in a certain region. Nor should we forget, furthermore, that the accession of Greece will give rise to still further problems over and above the vast number which already exist.

Finally — and this is something we should take into account when we come to discuss the budget — is the fact that our European budget should be such as to guarantee that appropriate action will be possible at regional level, by increasing own resources. In other words, a European fiscal system is called for.

President. — I call Mrs Boot.

Mrs Boot. — (NL) Mr President, Member of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen — in particular my colleagues from the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, almost all of whom are here today — I should like to begin by saying what a great honour it is for me today to speak on behalf of my group, particularly on such an important subject as regional policy in the Community. This is the first report on regional development programmes. Mr Travaglini's report is an initiative report, and in this respect he is following a tradition in this House which reaches as far back as 1960 on regional policy issues; on a number of occasions, the European Parliament has stressed in plenary session the importance of a European regional policy.

Regional policy is pursued at two levels — Member State and Community. Fortunately, there is no fundamental contradiction between these two levels, although in practical terms, the Member States all too often adopt a national approach which turns out to be to the detriment of other Member States or the Community as a whole. The aim of regional policy is not so much to bring about a general redistribution as to avoid significant imbalances within the Community. To enable it to achieve this aim, the Community can make use of three instruments: the quotas, the quota-free part of the Regional Fund and the regional development programmes. Since the Council adopted its resolution in February 1979, we may regard these regional development programmes as the most appropriate instrument for the effective coordination of the regional policies pursued by the Member States and the Community. My group is therefore particularly pleased to see the production of a report on precisely this subject.

Boot

I shall restrict my remarks to a few brief, general marginal notes, as it were. My task is made all the easier by the fact that there is a wide measure of agreement within the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning on the Travaglini report. The regional development programmes are regarded as a framework within which money may be allocated from the Regional Fund, and also as an effective instrument for coordinating and improving regional policy. It was thought that the latter point in particular was of great importance in view of the fact that regional policy is one aspect of economic policy as a whole. This is true at both levels — Member States and the Community. At a time when the disparities between the various national economies are being acutely felt, we must use every means at our disposal to exert influence on those factors which are influential in the convergence of the national economies.

By the formulation of regional development programmes by the Member States and their coordination in a Community context, the Member States are forced to realize that an effective regional policy is only possible on the basis of prior economic coordination, although so long as regional policy accounts for such a small share of the Community budget, the Community can play only a very limited coordinating role.

Mr Travaglini's report rightly points out that economic coordination is not the be all and end all. Mr Travaglini refers to the qualitative — as well as the quantitative — basis of regional policy. As regards the quantitative aspect, it is regrettable that a number of Member States are deliberately withholding comparable statistical data.

As regards regional development objectives, I should like to point out that it is not necessary to develop all the aspects at regional level; a number of aspects require delaying or conservation measures, for instance, the over-population problem, or the protection of the countryside. All these matters are essentially part and parcel of an integrated regional economic and regional planning policy.

The qualitative aspect of regional planning requires more detailed examination. The important thing here is not only the creation of a wider range of qualitative objectives — such as the quality of living accommodation and the level of services — but also the qualitative aspects of such things as employment policy, for instance, the continuing relevance of occupational training, the question of part-time or full-time employment, the nature of the work and working conditions, such as dirty and dangerous work, irregular hours, shift work, and so on. This will make it possible for us to tackle specific problem groups on the employment market, such as women and young people.

In the excellent explanatory statement attached to the motion for a resolution, the point is made on a number

of occasions that account must be taken of the regional consequences of the various forms of Community policy and projects. Studies of the effect of these are essential, whereby attention should be devoted not only to whether the project is being properly executed, but also to the short, medium and long-term repercussions of a project for all the parties and regions affected.

We must also make a start on strengthening the position of regional authorities as part of the activities of the European Regional Fund. These authorities should not be consorted merely incidentally, but should be involved intensively in the overall policy process going on in a particular region. The benefits of this kind of approach are a higher degree of involvement of the regions in Community affairs, utilization of local and regional knowledge and the early detection of discrepancies between intentions and reality, as well as an intensification of the democratization process at Community level.

As I said earlier, the aim of regional policy is to eliminate serious imbalances. A study published recently by Mr Cardol and Mr Van Engelenburg, of the European Parliament's Directorate-General for Research and Documentation shows by way of statistics that regional disparities within the Community increased sharply between 1970 and 1977. I therefore feel that we should do everything in our power to support the Commission in its work on regional policy. Up to now, the Council has played a too great and too retarding a rôle in the decision-making process. We have only to think of the Council meeting of July, which failed to ratify even the minor regulations covering specific Community projects. My group will be putting forward proposals for institutional improvements this week.

(Applause)

President — I call Mr Cardia.

Mr Cardia. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, two relatively recent publications — one by this Parliament's Directorate-General for Research and Documentation and the other by the Commission — have enabled us to place this debate in a frame of reference sufficiently realistic to dispel any optimism.

Although the difference between north and south is admittedly not as dramatic within the Community as it is at international level, it nevertheless remains the major problem facing this Community with the persistent mass unemployment and large regions of poverty which it entails. The first of the publications I mentioned — an analysis of regional imbalances within the Community over the period 1970-1977 — tells us that the difference between the rich and poor countries of the Community has increased considera-

Cardia

bly. For example, the difference between, say, the Federal Republic of Germany and Italy in terms of gross *per capita* production increased over the seven years from about 40 to 50 %, and the difference between France and Italy from 30 to 45 %. It tells us that within the individual countries, the differences between the rich and poor regions have increased and that, finally, the divergence, still in terms of gross *per capita* production, between rich regions — such as some regions of Denmark, or the Federal Republic or France — and poor regions — such as parts of Ireland and the south of Italy, particularly Sicily and Sardinia — have increased still further.

The statistical analysis thus confirms the point which has been made frequently, including today, in this House, i.e. that Community integration insofar as it is left and continues to be left to spontaneous market forces, tends to be in the interests of the relatively rich at the expense of the relatively poor, thus increasing the extent of polarization and inequality at both national and Community level. Clearly, as has already been pointed out this evening, this situation will get worse with the accession of the three other southern European countries.

The second publication to which I referred is the draft fifth report by the Commission on the activities of the European Regional Development Fund in 1979 which, as the Commissioner is well aware, is not likely to do much to improve the picture suggested by the statistical analysis in the near future. Indeed, it strikes me that the situation has deteriorated still further in certain respects which I might sum up briefly as follows: there is the fact that the commitment appropriations for regional development policy, even after the increases of 1979-80 and those contained in the proposals for the 1981 budget — which as you know were strongly opposed by certain governments including those of the Federal Republic and France — still remain at a rather modest level. And then there are the delays in actually making the payments, which from 1975 to 1979 did not exceed 53 % — this figure speaks volumes — of the sums earmarked. Then again there is the fact that Community aid tends almost exclusively to be used as a substitute for expenditure by the individual Member States themselves and the fact that an average of 70 % of the monies from the Fund are destined for the financing of public works, which in many cases remain non-productive for a long time, while only 30 % is used for the financing of directly productive projects with an increasing tendency towards a still greater reduction in the proportion spent on financing of industrial or directly-productive projects, i.e. 32 % in the period 1975-79 as against 28 % in 1979. Furthermore, there is the vagueness of the regional development programmes which do not precisely specify and quantify the development objectives and the methods to be used to achieve them. On top of this, there has been, at least up to now, a lack of serious coordination between the regional development policies of various

regions — at least in cases where they have been institutionalized — the Member States and the Community, nor has there been any coordination among the various Community policies or between Community policies and national policies. This lack of coordination can clearly be seen in the delays and limited financial resources provided for specific non-quota projects and integrated projects of the Naples variety. Then there is the fact that the part played by the regions as such in the drawing up and implementation of the Community regional development policy is minimal or non-existent, and this is aggravated by the fact that only some Member States are run, to varying degrees, on a regional basis, whereas others tend rather to take a centralistic and technocratic approach to problems of regional development and planning.

A study of the two documents to which I have referred suggests the following conclusions. The overall process of Community integration should not in future be dependent on spontaneous market mechanisms which are dominated by the more powerful economic and political groupings. Certain elements of public and democratic direction and planning of the complex process of development should be introduced, whilst taking account, of course, of essential commercial and market considerations, not simply for reasons of ensuring a balance in the development of the various regions and the various parts of the Community, but also and, I would say, chiefly at this present moment, so that we will not be the losers in the vast struggle currently in progress, and which has been exacerbated by the recession, over the new international division of resources, labour and the various sectors of production.

We must establish a closer link between economic development and the balanced and rational utilization of our territories and natural and human resources. Regional development policy must not continue to be regarded as a mere palliative for the distortions and imbalances which arise if things are left to run their natural course, or as a sort of aid to poorer, more peripheral and more backward regions such as Ireland or Sardinia, but rather as an additional, supplementary instrument for guiding a development which covers the entire territory of the country in a balanced fashion. In a word, there must be a dramatic change of direction, on a democratic basis, in the running of the Community and the individual Member States. Otherwise there can be no hope of spontaneous market integration freeing itself from the domination of the strongest and the laws of concentration and centralization, which nowadays hold full sway. Nor will it be possible to avoid increasing inequality in the distribution of the various sectors of production and of revenue over the various regions or to hope that a regional development policy might be effective.

The report on the regional programmes, which, although the result of highly complex discussions in the Committee, bears the name of Mr Travaglini who

Cardia

in fact drew it up and is a man of great experience and a convinced regionalist, does not, however, go into all the aspects of the change of approach and direction which I mentioned — nor indeed could it have done so. Nevertheless, it is symptomatic that, with an eye to a multiannual medium-term Community programme for 1981-1985 which contains or could contain elements of democratic planning and with an eye to a revision, which is becoming constantly more urgent, of the regulation governing the regional fund, it calls for clear coordination with a view to ensuring harmonious regional and Community development of all the common policies from the agricultural policy to the social policy to transport and energy policy, and of their regional impact, which would necessitate integrated action by area and programme, on the basis of increasingly clear-out democratically produced models and plans for the development of the territory, and would also mean that the funds available for such purposes would need to be increased and that specific priorities would have to be established by means of the direct participation of the regions in the drawing up and implementation of development programmes of a new type. This would be a step in the right direction, even if it might strike some people here and outside as very modest. Hence the virtually unanimous vote by the Committee on Regional Policy, which I can reaffirm in this House on behalf of the Italian Communists whilst nevertheless repeating the request that regional development policy should be accorded, both in this Parliament and in the Community as a whole, the full prominence which is its due, both by virtue of the Treaty and in view of the pressing needs, demands and expectations of the people of Europe.

I should now like to address a very brief observation to Mr Giolitti in connection with the amendment tabled by Mr Travaglini to the effect that the validity of the old regional programmes should be extended to the end of 1981. I can understand the practical motive behind this request, but I wonder whether or not it would be somewhat out of keeping with the requirement on which I think both the Commission and the rapporteur are agreed — to the effect that the new regional programmes should cover the whole of the next five-year period, which in fact begins with 1981. I should like to ask Mr Giolitti whether or not, in his view, the proposed extension of these programmes causes a contradiction since we will have to ask the regions to prepare new programmes for the period 1981-1985.

President. — I call Mr Clément.

Mr Clément. — (*F*) Mr Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, we cannot and shall not be able to call this continent 'Europe' so long as there remains within the Community the disparities which we know exist between the centre of Europe and the peripheral regions. One only has to compare the Ruhr to the

Highlands, or the Ile de France to Donegal or the French overseas départements, to see just how far we still have to go.

Realizing just how great the differences are, the Community has drawn up a regional development policy on a European scale. The regional development programmes which are a fundamental element of this policy are hindered, it seems to me, by three sets of difficulties.

First of all the very concept of a region covers two distinct cases. Of course there exists the economic and social concept of a region, which is identical throughout the Community. That is the sense in which one can speak of a peripheral or underprivileged region. Shortages of employment, geographical distance, transport difficulties and a rural character are the criteria by which such regions are defined. However, there also exists an administrative, perhaps even political concept of the region, which varies from one Member State to another. This variation makes it difficult in a number of cases to adopt standard measures throughout the nine nations with the differences in their history, their geography and their institutions which now constitute the European Community. Looking at this concept of the region, it seems unacceptable to me that for example, the regions of France should negotiate agreements directly with the Community. On the other hand, they most certainly should be involved, perhaps even consulted, in the making of decisions which concern them. And admittedly, a resolute policy of decentralizing economic decision-making will be needed. Admittedly, such a policy implies the transfer of part of the funds available for regional development to the local and regional authorities. And finally admittedly my own country's policy on the question is inadequate. On the other hand, speaking for myself, I could not think of putting the French regions on the same political level as the French Republic where foreign affairs were concerned.

The second kind of difficulty which regional development programmes encounter is the lack of transparency of the Community's contribution or, rather, the fact that a number of governments erect barriers which prevent the beneficiaries of regional policy from knowing exactly where the Community funds which are intended for them actually go. The truth of the matter is that to raise this problem is to raise the problem of Community aid overlapping other forms of aid. It is my belief that most representatives of underprivileged regions in this Assembly would consider that Member States who use Community funds to reimburse themselves for part of the cost of their own regional programmes are guilty of nothing less than embezzling Community money. By way of an example, may I remind the Assembly that in Copenhagen in December 1977 the nine Heads of State signed a protocol which has been published, which provided for the French share of the ERDF to be increased

Clément

from 15 to 17 %, with the stipulation that the extra 2 % were to be spent on the French Overseas Departments for the next three years. Translated into cash terms, that provided approximately 60 million EUA for those Overseas Departments. Knowing their relatively small size, becomes clear that such a sum is essential to the financing of supplementary regional development programmes. And it is at that point, ladies and gentlemen, that it becomes clear that the problem of controlling the use of Community funds cannot be separated from the problem of regional development programmes.

I should like to make a third and last observation. The regional development programmes are a major element in the European land use policy, but not the only one, and in this connection I would like to make the point that use of the EAGGF and the Social Fund in the Community policy for regional development gives rise to the need for adequate coordination between the various Commission departments on one side and the Government of the Member States on the other. It is furthermore quite ludicrous that the European Investment Bank, which is one of the most appropriate sources of finance for the peripheral regions, is not able to take any action in certain regions. I hope you will allow me to express my regret that this is in particular the case for the French Overseas Departments which are excluded from the EIB's area of influence in accordance with Article 18 of the Bank's statutes.

I would like to say in conclusion that the Community needs to be consistent in its regional policy. It is all very well to talk of the political will to raise the level of the most underprivileged regions to that of the richest. What is also needed is for the resources intended for the policy to be used in it, and not diverted elsewhere.

President. — I call Mr Almirante.

Mr Almirante. — (I) Mr President, I shall make a few brief points as Member for Southern Italy.

Firstly, I, and indeed we, thank the rapporteur, Mr Travaglini, for his clarity and courage. We hope that this first step will not turn out to be a step backwards in the context of the imminent approval of the new budget, bearing in mind that the 1980 budget was rejected by a large section of this Parliament, particularly because of the inadequacy of the Regional Development Fund. Finally I would like to point out, Mr President, that this debate so wearily followed by Parliament, is much more important than the previous publicity-orientated debate on world hunger, because whereas peoples may die of hunger, continents die of imbalances. Europe will be born only through a balanced policy taking account of the needs of indivi-

dual countries, and especially of the country on behalf of which I speak, Italy.

President. — I call Mr Costanzo.

Mr Costanzo. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Travaglini's report has, in my view, the merit not only of having brought out the limits and contradictions which often characterize the regional development programmes of some Member States, but also and above all of having drawn the attention of all of us to the essential rôle of such programmes, which certainly represent the most suitable basis for a systematic coordination of the policies implemented by the local and regional authorities, the Member States and the Community with a view to achieving a better balance among the different areas. However, this coordination requires more than just a suitable basis.

In my view, the chief need is for a 'coordinator', i.e. the political power to coordinate. Then, it is necessary that, instead of a policy of Community aids for regional development, there should be a real common policy for developing the regions and improving the balance among them. The resources of the Regional Fund cannot go on being used for occasional and episodic aids to this or that project submitted to the Commission by a Member State.

The projects to be aided must instead form an integral part of the regional programmes, which must, however, be systematically implemented in every part and not merely in those parts which are Community-aided. At all events, what matters most is that the regional policies of the Member States should be coordinated, harmonized and unified as far as possible, i.e. that we should at last achieve a common regional policy.

The regional fund is often seen as a 'solidarity fund' for emergency aids or for dealing with short-term crises and imbalances, whereas these aids should really be granted only to areas suffering from structural imbalances and historical difficulties and not to correct short-term imbalances frequently caused by other Community policies.

More than 20 years after the signing of the Treaty of Rome, we have to note that the disparities among the various regions and the delays in development have by no means been eliminated. Yet this is a basic aim of the Community. In some cases the disparities have increased, and not only because of the inadequacy of the financial resources of the Regional Fund, but above all — in my view — because of the absence at Community level of a serious effort at coordination of aid policies and instruments, and of practical operational planning.

Costanzo

The periodic report on the social and economic development of the regions of the Community, which the Commission is to submit shortly, must take account of the regional implications of all Community policies, and especially of their effects on employment and development.

The structural policies, an especially the common agricultural policy, must be developed with much greater incisiveness than has so far been shown by Community action. In that context, for the Mediterranean regions it will be necessary to take account of the special requirements of the agricultural sector arising from the policy of enlargement and the external trade policy, as well as of the rôle which agriculture can play in the implementation of an overall regional development plan, particularly in some peripheral areas of the Community.

We all know that the most disadvantaged and underdeveloped regions of the Community are the peripheral ones in the North, and especially, those in the South around the Mediterranean. The Mediterranean regions, characterized by the predominance of the agricultural sector in their economy, pay the highest price both for the enlargement of the Community and for the preferential trade relations with the non-Community countries of the Mediterranean basin and the ACP countries. The regional development programmes for those Mediterranean regions must also take account of these conditions and requirements.

Mr. President, the Travaglini report leads us to conclude that, if the regional development programmes must be the frame of reference for Community participation, and if it is desired that such participation should not continue to be merely a 'cash-desk' service, the Community must be associated with the planning process in the Member States and must at the same time succeed in giving the local authorities a more important rôle in the Community regional development policy.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr De Pasquale.

Mr De Pasquale. — *(I)* Mr President, in my capacity as Chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy, I too would like to express the greatest appreciation of the competence and passion with which Mr Travaglini has approached and completed this task. Moreover, these qualities are inherent in him, and I am not therefore saying anything new.

I also wish to pay tribute to the contribution which the whole Committee made to the Travaglini Report, to the seriousness of the discussions and the political will expressed in this effort. That said, I would like to

stress to the Commission and Council — none of whose members or officials I see present here — but especially to the Commission, the need for everyone to make an effort to ensure that the guidelines indicated by Parliament do not remain a dead letter. We know that this depends also on us, albeit to a limited extent. We think it essential for the Commission to give an ever greater and increasingly forceful stimulus to a transformation of the instruments of regional policy. In this context, I wished to speak before Mr Giolitti solely in order to put to him certain questions to which I think he will wish to reply.

Our Committee, and Parliament as a whole, have always fought for higher financing of the Regional Development Fund. We have achieved some success in this regard. Now the Commission has submitted a draft budget for 1981 which seriously threatens all non-compulsory expenditure, and first and foremost the Regional Fund. I think there is no doubt that Parliament will fight with all its energy to provide the Regional Fund with adequate financing.

Indeed, I would like to ask Mr Giolitti if he can also give us this assurance on behalf of the Commission, given that we shall undoubtedly have to fight another battle together to defend the proposals made to us for the Regional Fund for 1981.

With regard to the nature of regional aids, I think the representative of the Commission will have noticed the general dissatisfaction of Parliament. A change in the regulation governing the Fund is essential. Mr Giolitti is in favour of postponing the deadline envisaged for renewal of the regulation, and we do not entirely agree with the reasons which he has publicly given for this. But it is not about this that I would like to speak. I would like to ask Mr Giolitti for information on the preparations for changing the regulation of the Fund, because we are very concerned about the procedures for allocation of the Regional Fund and the other funds intended for regional policy.

The procedures proliferate. Now we have at least three of them: the quota procedure, i.e. financial contributions with delayed payment, the non-quota procedure, i.e. specific programmes for specific actions with delayed payments, and now the British procedure, consisting of advanced payments of 90 % on programmes submitted by the British Government.

I think that overall there is a need to move towards unification, simplification and a greater incisiveness in the procedures of the Regional Fund, and to this end I should also like to ask what policies are being considered within the Commission.

The Travaglini Report has the great merit of having shown that Parliament intends to move away from contributions to projects, and towards aid on the basis of programmes. The Commission rightly criticized the

De Pasquale

programmes submitted in 1977, and these criticisms were shared by Parliament and our Committee.

The question I should like to put to you now is this: what is the Commission doing to ensure that the new programmes are true programmes and a genuine response to the guidelines which the Commission laid down with regard to choices, concentration of aids and financial transparency? Is there a political will to follow these principles in a fruitful, open, continuous and critical relationship with the Member States and the regions?

The Treaty does not state that regional programmes must be drawn up behind the closed doors of the Commission by national or Community technocrats. Of course, the work of the technocrat is essential, but I think a democratic relationship in drawing up the programmes would encourage everything that we are asking for in terms of publicity, of bringing the peoples of Europe closer together and involving them in a common effort to develop European integration.

Another question I would like to put concerns the coordination of the Community and European Investment Bank funds. This principle has also been affirmed, but no substantial step seems to have been taken in this direction. What stage have we reached, and what instruments are envisaged to ensure that this coordination is effective and beneficial to the weaker areas of the Community?

Of course, I do not wish to 'swamp' with these questions the reply which the Commission will give to the Travaglini Report and the guidelines which our Committee suggested through that report. I wish to raise these questions so that the representative of the Commission may be aware that we must all make a considerable joint effort to maintain the size of the Fund, alter the nature of regional aids and achieve true regional programmes. I would remind you that a resolution or an authoritative and solemn vote by Parliament, however essential, are not enough to meet these needs. There must also be the political will on the part of all the institutions to achieve tangible results in this field.

President. — I call Mr Giolitti.

Mr Giolitti, Member of the Commission. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, first and foremost I wish to express satisfaction on behalf of the Commission because I have seen that the almost unanimous agreement — with only one dissenting voice — which Mr Travaglini deservedly obtained for his report in the Committee on Regional Policy has been repeated in Parliament as a whole.

It seems to me that with this debate Parliament, on the basis of the excellent report provided by Mr Travag-

lini, and by means of a critical examination of the regional development programmes submitted to the Community by the Member States, is now making a wider and more general contribution to that overall re-examination of Community policies and their effects on the Community budget to which the Commission is now committed. The conclusions of this in-depth analysis will of course be a matter for the new Commission, because the deadline for this task, as has been announced, is June 1981; but the present Commission intends shortly to provide the new Commission with a preliminary analysis and preliminary draft proposals. This critical and constructive contribution by Parliament, in the form of this debate, therefore comes at the right time. There is no doubt that, as I expected, this has been another opportunity to note the inadequacies of the Community regional policy. Frankly, I share this negative judgment. It has been an opportunity to note the lack of a true Community regional policy in keeping with the scale and nature of the problems of regional imbalance arising in the Community — the famous problems which now go under the name of 'convergence'.

Ladies and gentlemen, I must also note that the proposals made in formal documents by the Commission have been seriously obstructed by the Council's decision-making procedures and delays. One of the most obvious examples available to the Members of Parliament concerned with this subject is that of the regulations relating to the specific measures to be financed by the non-quota section.

I think I can now say that a new phase of regional policy can be glimpsed, and the Commission is committed to acting resolutely and vigorously in this new phase, at three levels — firstly, through the report on the socio-economic situation of the regions of the Community, which will, I think be submitted in two or three months time, i.e. before the deadline envisaged; secondly through tasks which the Commission must carry out in connection with the mandate which I mentioned earlier, to be completed by June 1981; and finally through the proposals which, on the basis of the report and of this general analysis of the development of Community policies, the Commission will make for the new Regional Fund regulation.

I would therefore say that there are three basic elements which enable one already to sketch out a new, more promising and encouraging phase for the development of Community regional policy. This contribution by Parliament, and particularly by the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning and by Mr Travaglini with regard to the programmes is therefore, I repeat, particularly useful and timely. The good quality of the programmes is essential in order to move, as the Commission proposes to do, from aids for projects — to use a formula — to aids in the basis of programmes. And this brings out to the full the basic elements of that new strategy which is

Giolitti

beginning to emerge and on which the Commission has been providing guidance for some time.

The overall element is by no means in contradiction but rather closely linked with the need — vigorously and effectively stressed by the Travaglini Report — for vigorous and precise decisions on priorities, designed to permit an effective concentration of aids and avoid their dispersion. This inevitably leads to the consideration of coordination among the various instruments, even to the point of turning this coordination into true integration.

I shall confine myself to summarizing very briefly what seem to me to be the guiding principles of the analysis and the argument in the Travaglini Report. What I want to stress above all, what I find of greatest interest for the Commission in the Travaglini Report and the debate to which it gave rise, is the practicality of these approaches. We are really moving from theory to practice, because we have had many opportunities to talk of these concepts, but one must acknowledge — and I am the first to do so — that it has proved difficult in this field to move from words to action.

These are the very brief remarks which I thought it desirable to make on behalf of the Commission about what seem to me to be the essential aspects of the report and the debate; but I wish to make some additional remarks on some aspects which, although more specific and detailed, cannot be omitted even in a very brief survey such as that which I am now making.

I accept once more — because it is not the first time that we have had occasion to speak of this — the challenge to make the greatest possible use of the contribution which can and must be made by what we usually call the regional and local authorities, a generic term which we use to cover the various institutional situations in the different countries. I am pleased that in the course of this debate there has also been mention of the importance of, and the role which can and must be played by, the cooperative movement, which should be associated with this effort to activate the regional and local level in both the planning and the implementation stages.

Mr Travaglini's report, and I think also a number of the speeches in this debate, rightly stressed the need for a careful, continuous and constantly updated analysis of the results and for an equally continuous, frequent and regular transmission of information. They call for a flow of information not merely of a statistical or quantitative kind, but also of a qualitative nature, particularly from the Commission to the Parliament. I welcome this invitation and respond to it by a commitment which the Commission undertakes towards Parliament, but with one warning: of course we shall see that the flow of information is as frequent and as regular as possible but, with regard to analysis and assessment of the results, one must always bear in

mind that in this field the results achieved cannot be measured in the short term but must be looked at over quite a long period of time.

I shall now reply to the specific questions which have been put to me, and especially to the four questions addressed to me in the last speech by the Chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy. But before going on to answer these four questions, I wish to reply to the question put to me by Mr Cardia on whether it is desirable to extend for one year the validity of the regional development programmes currently administered by the Commission. I would reply that I think it is desirable, not to make a formal extension for one year — it is not a question of extending the present programmes for a year — but without rigidly adhering to the deadline envisaged of early 1981, to allow a wider margin of time to enable programmes which may be submitted in 1981 to take account of the recommendations arising from the debate on the Travaglini report, and also from the guidelines which the Commission will work out on the basis of Parliament's suggestions.

I now turn to the questions put to me by Mr De Pasquale. I can assure him — with regard to the question on the budget — that the Commission holds very firmly to the position it took up with its proposals in the draft budget, and especially the proposal which it made with regard to the financing of the Regional Fund for 1981.

With regard to the preparation of the new Regional Fund regulation — for in my view it is that which is required and not merely a few changes here and there — we are at a stage of reflection involving above all the report which is being drawn up. The early drafts of the report us with ideas and guidelines, but when we have the report are already providing itself — as I said, I hope it will be available in a couple of months — it will provide us with practical indications which will enable us to clarify valid proposals for the new Regulation. Apart from the indications with which the report will provide us, we shall of course have to draw on the study which we shall make of the overall context of Community policies and their development, within which regional policy must be seen.

With regard to the effort which the Commission must make — as Mr De Pasquale told us — to improve the regional development programmes, the Travaglini report itself acknowledges that we have done this in due form through the observations and recommendations sent to Member States. Now Parliament has provided us with further food for thought, and we shall therefore exert further pressure to ensure that these improvements are made to the programmes.

With regard to the method for drawing up these programmes, it is clearly not up to the Commission to decide on it, since these are regional development programmes submitted by the national governments.

Giolitti

The degree of participation at various levels of responsibility and representation, in the drawing up of these programmes is obviously beyond our control — it cannot be imposed by the Community institutions, but is a matter for the Member States and their institutions, under the terms of the relevant legislation.

Finally, I hope Mr De Pasquale will allow me not to reply here and now to the vast and complex question on the coordination not only of the funds but of all the financial and structural instruments of the Community. I would ask him to seek on another occasion such a reply, which would require a long speech, for this is clearly not the time to make it.

Mr President, I shall conclude by assuring Parliament that the Commission will make proper use of the contribution which Parliament has made to the critical assessment of the Community's regional policy. The Commission will respond to the urging of Parliament, so that the frequently invoked aim of harmonious development of the Community may be pursued in the future with greater vigour and consistency than it has been in the past.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

12. Agenda

President. — In view of the many items still to be dealt with on today's agenda, Mr Hahn, rapporteur for the last item down for debate this evening, has requested that his report on European Music Year (Doc. 1-345/80) be postponed to the next part-session.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

13. Regulation on support for projects to exploit alternative energy sources

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-214/80) drawn up by Mr Sassano on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-627/79) for a regulation amending Regulation No 726/79 as regards the granting of financial support for projects to exploit alternative energy sources.

I call Mr Sassano.

Mr Sassano, *rapporteur*. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report before you concerns a modification to Council Regulation No 726/79 which aims to double Community aids for the liquefaction and gasification of coal.

The European Parliament must be fully in favour of an increase in financial aid to projects designed to exploit energy sources which are alternatives to oil. Indeed, we are faced with a constant increase in the price of oil and with a demand for oil products which will probably exceed the possibilities of supply in the next few years, so that it is necessary to exploit all energy sources to the full.

The present Commission proposal is however not entirely satisfactory, for two reasons which I shall now summarize.

Firstly the Commission proposal concerns only liquefaction and gasification of coal. In my view, and in that of the Committee on Energy and Research, this is not enough. Why increase the funds intended for liquefaction and gasification, without increasing, at least to the same extent, the aids intended for renewable energy sources of fundamental importance such as geothermal and solar energy? Partly as a result of the pressure exerted by me and by the Committee on Energy and Research, the Commission has agreed to submit a new proposal for increasing the funds intended for solar and geothermal energy, and I would like here to ask the Commission to confirm this. My second objection to the Commission proposal relates especially to Parliament's budgetary powers.

In accordance with Council Regulation No 1302/78 relating to the granting of aid to projects designed to exploit alternative energy sources, on the basis of which Council Regulation No 726/79 was drawn up, the Council of the European Communities has arrogated to itself the power to fix unilaterally the maximum amount of aid for projects. The European Parliament has already vigorously protested against this procedure, and repeats this protest now.

The Commission has already partially responded to Parliament's protest about the unilateral fixing by the Council of a ceiling for aid, by adding the words 'for guidance purposes' in both the first and second paragraphs of the Sole Article of the amended Regulation. However, this does not prevent the maximum level of aid being fixed by means of a regulation. Parliament maintains that the allocation for individual programmes should be fixed jointly by Parliament and the Council as budgetary authorities, in the context of the annual budget procedure. It is therefore proposed to add one sentence to the Commission proposal in order to stress the purely indicative nature of the figures given.

Sassano

The Commission proposal also contains an entirely unsatisfactory provision on the basis of which the Council, by unanimous decision, can modify the distribution by an amount greater than 10 % of the amount for each sector. The motion for a resolution now before Parliament proposes the deletion of that provision, and I would like to urge you strongly to fight to safeguard the powers of Parliament by supporting this amendment.

The Committee on Budgets has also examined the Commission proposal and has expressed a view in agreement with that of the Committee on Energy and Research with regard to the budgetary aspect I mentioned. The Committee on Budgets added that, should the Council once again follow its method of fixing definitive amounts, it would then be necessary to resort to the conciliation procedure. On behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research I give my full support to that proposal.

Moreover, I consider it important that the Members of Parliament should be kept continuously informed of the way in which funds intended for projects have been and will be used, and for that reason the motion for a resolution calls on the Commission to provide such information at frequent and regular intervals. In this way the European Parliament would be in a position to monitor the development of the programme and carry out more efficiently the task for which it was elected.

In conclusion, I would say that I am fully aware of the fundamental importance for the European Community of the liquefaction of coal which will provide us with the hydrocarbons necessary for industry, transport and petrochemicals.

The strengthening of the energy research structures can confer significant advantages on the Community in the supply of energy.

It is true that renewable energies, including solar energy, will be more intensively used in the long term, but if the Community devotes larger sums to research it will be possible significantly to reduce the development time.

I therefore wish to express my agreement with the principle of increasing the funds intended for the exploitation of alternative energy sources, including the gasification and liquefaction of coal. Furthermore, I urge the Commission to submit immediately a new proposal for increasing the funds intended for other alternative sources such as geothermal and solar energy, and I protest vigorously once more against the violations of the European Parliament's budgetary powers to be found in Regulation No 1302/78 on which the Commission's present proposal is based.

Ladies and gentlemen, I hope you will vote in favour of this motion for a resolution.

(Applause)

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

Mr Adam. — Mr President, the Socialist Group supports the report by Mr Sassano and the two amendments that have been tabled by Mr Seligman. We welcome the proposed expenditure. But the work on these projects will not be a fruitful use of Community resources unless, alongside it, there is much greater support for our own coal industries resulting in a significant increase in Community coal output. This point cannot be overstressed.

Now, there is no dispute that the Community must reduce its dependence on imported oil and increase the role of coal in its energy strategy, particularly in electricity generation. Yesterday, at the OPEC meeting in Vienna, Saudi Arabia increased its oil price by a further \$ 2 per barrel, to bring it in line with the other OPEC prices. This is a clear sign of the unrelenting upward pressure on prices and reinforces the correctness of Community strategy.

In the longer term it is not sufficient simply to replace oil in power stations. Alternatives are needed for a whole range of liquid and gaseous fuels as natural resources are depleted. And, of course, transport and the chemical industry are the prime examples of this, to which Mr Sassano has just referred. It is therefore of crucial importance that the Community should increase its financial support for projects to exploit alternative energy sources, and in this the liquefaction and gasification of coal, given the present technology that we have, is the best means the Community has of maintaining an adequate energy supply into the 21st century.

I want to emphasize, too, the importance of including underground gasification of coal in this programme. I appreciate that successful techniques will take longer than surface projects, but success will do two things: firstly it will greatly increase the total recoverable coal energy, and secondly it will be a significant boost to older coalfields where such reserves are located. The appropriations under the Council Regulation are almost used up, and I hope that the Council will quickly approve the Commission's proposals and the allocation of funds to suitable projects. I underline the word 'suitable'.

The Socialist Group wants these allocations to be more carefully considered. The written question that I put earlier this year, No 451/80, sought information on the allocation of these funds. The answer was not printed in the Official Journal, presumably because it was too long; but according to the reply I received, out of four projects approved, one was to the private sector taking 25 % of the funds allocated, and out of twelve further requests for aid, while only three were in the private sector, these 25 % of the submissions sought very nearly 50 % of the total aid available.

Adam

It is the view of the Socialist Group that the Community funds should not be going to large multinational companies, which are capable of financing their own research programmes. Community funds should be very firmly under public control and accountability. Nor should research and development in this area of vital importance be concentrated in multinational hands. The Community must challenge this supremacy with its own funds. That is why we support Mr Seligman's Amendment No 2.

I hope further that the Commission will declare its support for the acceptance of paragraph 3 of Mr Sassano's motion for a resolution, which calls for detailed information on the allocation of funds. The solution of the energy crisis which the Community faces cannot be left in unscrutinized hands, Mr President.

(Applause)

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

Mr McCartin. — Mr President, I would like on behalf of my Group, the Christian-Democratic Group, to welcome this document by Mr Sassano and to congratulate him on his very worthwhile elaboration of all the implications of this subject and the whole energy crisis.

I do not claim to be an expert on this subject, but I welcome his proposal for further investment in developing the liquefaction and gasification of coal. Since we have just been debating regional problems and since a large percentage of whatever coal will be used in this Community for one process or another must be imported and transported over long distances, these are industries which could well contribute in a worthwhile way to the development of underdeveloped regions. New industries must be planned and considered carefully in the light of the regional problems which we have in this Community. There is no question about our overdependence on oil, there is no question about the need to develop our coal industries, and there is no question that this Community cannot survive without the use of atomic energy; nevertheless, I think we should not put all the emphasis on the spectacular sources of energy but should consider a wide variety of possible sources with which some of our needs could be met.

I want to draw attention to the amount of research that has been done in my region of the Community, if you like, in the Republic of Ireland, into the whole question of biomass. This research is at a well-developed stage, not only to the extent that we know what our climate and soil conditions can produce per hectare, but also we have done research into the utilization of

this in generating-stations. At the moment, a comparatively small amount of money is saved, but at least £ 4 to 6 million of imported oil is saved annually through the use of wood by-products. Now, it is quite clear from the research which has been done in Ireland that one hectare of biomass can produce something approaching the equivalent of 5 to 6 tonnes of oil per hectare. This is a significant amount of energy, and 2.3 % of our land resources could produce at the moment something like 10 % of our energy requirements. Going further, you could say that all of our energy requirements could be produced from something like 20 % of our land. Furthermore, as far as the production of food is concerned, with modern techniques there is no question but that the amount of food required could be produced from considerably less than the land area which is available in the European Economic Community at the moment. Nevertheless, no worthwhile assistance is available from the European Economic Community for the development of this important energy source, even though the peat resources of Ireland, which are making a worthwhile contribution both to employment and to the generation of energy, are being further depleted. On the other hand, grant aid is at present available to convert cut-over boys to agricultural production, despite the surplus of certain agricultural products which we have in the Community at the moment. Surely it would be much more sensible to grant increased assistance to the further exploitation of the idea of biomass. It does not carry with it any environmental hazards; it is a clean and useful way of promoting employment in the regions and helping to solve our energy problems.

While the usefulness of wind as a source of energy has long been proved in some countries in the European Economic Community, I think sufficient emphasis has not been placed on this as another possible source of energy at the present time. In rural communities, particularly in connection with agriculture, much more use could be made of wind energy to reduce the cost of food and so reduce our dependence on imported fuel. The use of wind energy is certainly not exploited to the extent that it could be. Some experiments are going on on this too in Ireland, and some experts are convinced that a very considerable contribution could be made, particularly in the western half of our country, where wind from the Atlantic can play an important part in the generation of energy. The European Economic Community must not rely on a solution provided by individual nations. I think the solutions to the energy problems of this Community must be found at Community level, and I would join with Mr Sassano in emphasizing the importance of promoting research and development and increasing assistance.

In Ireland, we have made considerable progress in the utilization of peat reserves, but in view of the fact that energy is such a serious problem in the Community, is it not ironic that we can get grants for the development of agriculture in marginal areas and yet where private individuals have prepared watertight plans for

McCartin

the development of peat resources, which can give employment in underdeveloped areas and reduce our dependence on oil, no grants from the Community or the national level are available?

I think the European Economic Community has a serious obligation to take a closer look at all this and, following the lessons we have learned from the Regional Fund, not to rely entirely on information provided by national governments on how the money is spent but to keep a firm grip on every unit of account that is spent and ensure that the Community is kept informed of what is being done and how the money is being spent.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Seligman to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Seligman. — Mr President, the Commission is asking for an additional 50 million units of account for these demonstration projects on coal liquefaction and gasification. To my mind this is quite inadequate. I have tabled an amendment to paragraph 1 of Mr Sassano's excellent report, which I am glad he accepts and I am glad Mr Adam accepts on behalf of the Socialists. The object of this amendment is merely to stress the vital importance of properly supporting this important source of alternative energy. We must develop new economic liquid and gaseous fuels to replace imported petrol and diesel oil, especially for use in motor cars and heavy vehicles, and we must do this without radically changing their engine system. Electrical power stations can perfectly well use coal and nuclear power, but motor cars and heavy vehicles cannot. And the most promising substitute for petrol is liquefied coal. Gasified coal is another possibility. Hydrogen and alcohol from biomass are still too expensive for that purpose, except in specialized cases like Brazil. So far the only successful liquefaction process has been at Sasol in South Africa, that is, apart from the liquefaction process used by the German Government during the Second World War, and that was a similar process. However, the Sasol process is very expensive and very inefficient. It is an indirect system and it is a two-stage process. Modern researchers are aiming at a single-stage direct process, which should be 60 % efficient instead of 40 %. I know it is a little way away, probably ten years away, but still this is what we should be aiming at.

Now, Members will know that there is at the moment a glut of oil. Giant tankers are being used to stock surplus oil, but this does not mean that the oil crisis is over. It is not over, not by any means. Commissioner Brunner claims a reduction of 12½ % in Community oil imports in the first eight months of this year. The USA claims a much bigger saving in oil imports, but these reductions, I am afraid, are only temporary.

While they are partly due to the increase in fuel prices, they are mainly due to the economic recession and the collapse of many industries in our country. We have also had a remarkably warm winter even in Northern Ireland, and this has caused a major reduction in the consumption of fuel oil, about 8 %, but European consumption of motor fuel has actually increased during this period by 2 %. So where is the conservation? When economic growth is resumed, and I hope it will be one day, our oil demands are going to rise rapidly and we shall again be dependent on the tender mercies of OPEC, that is, unless we start taking conservation really seriously. So far we have only nibbled at it. If we are going to escape from the grip of the oil producers, we must find a cheaper way of extracting liquid fuel from coal.

I am told that our European scientists, including many in Britain, have found brilliant technical solutions to this problem. We do lead the world, but if we starve our scientists of resources, how can we hope to keep up with our world competitors? In July the American President signed a new Synthetic Fuels Bill, which will allocate 83 billion dollars to developing synthetic fuels — 88 thousand million dollars! And what are we planning for Europe? One hundred million — one thousand times less. What a pathetic effort! What a ham! Europe is going to be the laughing-stock of the world if we go on like this. Admittedly, our German friends, through Ruhr coal, have jumped on the American bandwagon. They are joining the USA and Japan in launching a massive SRC2 liquefied coal project in Morgantown in West Virginia. That is going to cost one billion, four hundred million dollars. So where does that leave the rest of Europe? Under this proposal we are considering today, I understand that 23 organizations have put in requests for assistance with coal gasification and liquefaction, which added together come to 271 million units of account. Yet all we are considering — in this resolution — is an extra 50 million units of account.

Mr President, the Commission, knowing that this money is needed — and they must know it, because they told me — has nevertheless cut the 1981 energy budget by 37 %. This is unbelievable. If Europe is going to achieve its objective of reducing dependence on imported oil, to 40 % in 1990 and thus master oil-induced inflation and unemployment, it is vital that we increase our financing of demonstration projects for coal liquefaction and gasification, as well as many other measures which Mr Sassano has referred to, such as solar and geothermal. Therefore I call on the whole House unreservedly to back Mr Sassano's resolution, but I do think we should review the position very soon, not only to see if the Commission has spent the money we recommended for them, but also because they may need some more money very shortly if they do the job properly.

(Applause)

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

Mr Veronesi. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Sassano's report gives us a clear picture of the problem facing us. We shall vote in favour of the motion for a resolution. Indeed, we agree with the reasons which Mr Sassano gave for it. Moreover, we have discussed this question at length in committee, and we voted unanimously in favour — also in committee — of the motion for a resolution which is now before us.

The Italian Communist and Allies Group wish rapidly to raise only two questions, which have already been touched on by the report. The first is the procedural question covered by paragraphs 4 and 5 of the motion for a resolution. It seems to us that the attention of Parliament must be drawn to the need to defend its specific prerogatives in the budgetary procedure. It would be a serious matter if doubts or uncertainties remained on this question, and Mr Sassano was right to make it explicit.

The second question, which is much more important in substantive terms, relates to the failure to increase aid for geothermal and solar energy projects. We are well aware of the significance and importance of adequate support for research into liquefaction and gasification of coal. We understand the timeliness, nay the urgency, of an adequate development of these technologies, both because coal is a notable resource of the Community and because ever more threatening clouds are gathering on the oil horizon, as was clear recently from the meeting of the OPEC countries. However, the role of geothermal and solar energy — which are, moreover, already suitable for use at low temperatures — must not be underestimated. If we wish to make the Community energy policy effective and complete, we must not lose sight of its overall implementation. It is therefore incomprehensible that the measure which we are debating should have ignored the other alternative sources. I myself have never given credence to the popular myths about them, but I think it is our duty to assess their potential objectively for what it is worth. In the short term, this requires adequate financial provisions, and we therefore formally call upon the Commission and Council to provide these. If necessary, we would be prepared to approve Mr Seligman's second amendment, if it also contained a reference to the other alternative sources such as geothermal and solar energy. In other words, we call for a real strengthening of Community energy policy. This is what we wished to stress, and we reaffirm our support for the motion for a resolution before us.

President. — I call Mr Paisley.

Mr Paisley. — Mr President, I would congratulate my colleague on the Committee on Energy and

Research for his excellent report. I trust it will have the full backing of the whole House.

There is no part of the Community generally, and of the United Kingdom particularly, which is more in need of intervention in the energy field than Northern Ireland, which I represent in this House. Electricity prices in Northern Ireland are 21 % higher than in any other part of the United Kingdom. Coal is between £ 9 and £ 12 dearer per tonne than in the rest of the United Kingdom. And gas is three times — 300 % — dearer than in any other part of the United Kingdom.

With the refusal of the London Government to apply to this Community for a grant to let Northern Ireland share in North Sea gas, electricity is going to be more and more our principal energy supply. At Kilroot in County Antrim a new power station is being constructed, but of course it is oil-fired. Because of British Government cutbacks stage two of that station has now been halted.

It is essential that stage two of the Kilroot station go ahead, but that it be, as this Community has recommended, on a conversion basis i.e. a conversion from oil-firing to coalfiring. I trust that the Commission will take this matter into consideration and emphasize to the United Kingdom Government the need for Northern Ireland's energy not to be wholly dependent on oil. I trust that the Commission will make known to the Northern Ireland Office of the United Kingdom Government that substantial grant aid will be available for such a conversion.

Now if the United Kingdom Government and the Government of the Irish Republic can deal at long last effectively with the IRA terrorists, then the electricity interconnector between the north of Ireland and the Republic of Ireland could be re-established. The Republic needs electricity. Northern Ireland has an overcapacity and could sell to the Republic. As I would be delighted to help to bring light to that part of Ireland, I hope this will be accomplished.

A common energy policy for all nations of this Community is imperative. Energy is surely a field, Sir, in which a common policy and real cooperation will harvest real benefits for all peoples of the Community. I agree with the report where it expresses dissatisfaction that increases are proposed only for funds to be allocated to coal gasification and liquefaction and not for equally important energy sources such as geothermal and solar energy. I trust that this matter will be reconsidered by the Commission and that it will give a ready response to the strong call from this report to reverse this decision.

I welcome the fact that the United Kingdom Government are spending almost £ 2 million sterling in exploration for geothermal energy sources in Northern Ireland and I trust that this will be grant-aided by the

Paisley

Commission. All sources of energy, Sir, must be sought and then these sources exploited in the service of all the people.

President. — I call Mr Beazley.

Mr Beazley. — Mr President, I should very much like to lend my support to Mr Sassano and his report and also to the new proposals which he has mentioned that we are looking forward to receiving from the Commission. Naturally I also support the amendments of my colleague, Mr Seligman.

I fear that in the West, and in the European Community in particular, our reactions to the havoc which is being caused by our dependence on oil imports have in no way matched the gravity of the situation. We appear to have accepted the continuous increase in the price of oil and the inflation which it has brought in its train. Some people even justify the situation and take for granted the rigid limitations to the growth of our economy which inflation and a lack of circulation of petro-dollars imply. Whilst the Venice communiqué's first paragraph stated that if we cannot solve the energy problem we cannot solve any other, there has been much too much acceptance of the aphorism that the substitute for oil is oil.

This is clearly not the case. The West, and the European Community in particular, must use science and technology to create the means which will lead us out of this most vicious of vicious circles. But science and technology need programmes and money. This report takes us a small step forward in the right direction. It is, however, essential that the Member States should recognize more clearly than they do at present the advantages to be gained from concerting their efforts in joint research programmes and joint demonstration projects. We have already heard what the preliminary draft budget for 1981 holds in store, and that is a reduction. I hardly need remind the House how far this is from meeting the situation which faces the nine Member States of our Community. The estimates of these same Member States show that the Community is still dependent in 1990 on oil to the extent of 44 % of which 38 % will need to be imported, whilst the main new component of our energy balance to meet the Community's increased energy requirements in 1990 is nuclear power.

Here we are dependent on the building and commissioning of 150 nuclear power stations to supply 15 % of our requirements, a quantity slightly bigger than that expected to be played by coal production in the Community in the same year. Present progress in the nuclear sector would appear to put this forecast very much at risk. However, by 1990, and during the following decade, it is most likely that oil supplies will be much less freely available than today and the cost will be even more punitive than today. This makes

more feasible and economic many processes of producing oil from coal and using coal instead of, or combined with, oil than could previously be considered. The cost and the shortage of oil supplies will keep the economies of the West in thrall unless we find alternative energy sources. It will strictly limit the Community's ability not only to help itself but to help others and for others to help themselves. The effect of this on the Third World to meet even its minimum aspirations will be disastrous.

We are therefore left with two major courses of action to improve the situation; the first is energy saving and the second the exploitation of new energy sources. I will restrict my remarks to the latter. My colleague, Mr Seligman, has already spoken of the importance of demonstration projects to produce liquid fuels derived from coal for the transport industry. I would like to add a few words of great importance to the chemical industry and in the use of coal in power stations with fluidized combustion, gasification, etc.

We all know the large part played by oil in the production of petrochemicals, with an enormously wide field not only of fuels and basic chemicals but of modern industrial and consumer products like plastics and synthetic fibres. Whilst important work has been done in making use of coal in this area for many years there is still a vast amount of work to be done which will take many years to complete. Let us remember that the liquefaction and gasification of coal provide many other advantages: not only will they avoid the wastage of very many valuable chemical products which may be extracted prior to burning, but they will greatly assist the handling of coal at power stations and its transport not only within the coal-producing Member States of the Community but also in those Member States which have little or no coal of their own. Some forms of gasification of coal being developed at the present time will supply 1½ times as much power for every tonne of coal used. Finally, let me say a few words about the other two areas which this report supports for demonstration projects: the exploitation of geothermal fields and of solar energy. In the long run there is no doubt that the exploitation of solar energy is vital to the provision of future energy supplies, but it is acknowledged that it will take many decades before this can be achieved in any really significant way.

Meanwhile, however, much good work has been done in simple forms of utilizing solar power which could contribute in part to the energy supplies of the developed world but which could be further developed to play a more significant role in the less developed economies.

Yesterday's issue of *Le Figaro* indicated that by the year 2020 the size of the energy demand of the developing countries would be equivalent to the world's total present production of oil. How accurate this figure is I cannot tell — what is important, however, is

Beazley

that the developing world does not only need food but energy as well. The Third World has suffered much more seriously than even the Western world from the shortage and cost of energy supplies. Many of its more fragile economies require simple means of providing energy which can take advantage of local resources and be operated by local communities where present solar developments may be very helpful. The work being done in the geothermal field will also be applicable in many such areas.

I therefore fully support this report and repeat my call for much greater efforts backed by appropriate sums of money to be provided by Member States for joint research programmes and development projects in the energy field as a whole and in alternative energy sources in particular.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish first and foremost to thank Mr Sassano for the report which he has presented here, and for the text of the explanatory statement accompanying the motion for a resolution. I would also like to thank all the Members who have taken part in this debate.

I think that we are all fully convinced that energy supply is the basic condition for the development and economic growth of the Community, and that in the long term the Community must resort to other energy sources to eliminate or reduce its dependence on oil.

It was not by chance that the Venice Summit on 23 June 1980 also came out decisively in favour of greater use of coal and of the development in the longer term of production of synthetic fuels derived from coal. We therefore maintain that the importance of coal is likely to increase in the next few decades, since this fuel on its own could have a significant influence on the energy balance of the Community.

I do not think there have been any objections on this point. The need to speed up the process of study and research has been stressed by all the speakers in this debate. Whereas the first-generation technologies can be regarded as already tried and tested, it will thus be possible to begin the process to make available a new technology as soon as possible.

As you know, we have already launched a series of demonstration projects in the sector of liquefaction and gasification of fuels. I shall cite a few facts briefly, partly because I should like to say to Mr Sassano and the Members who have explicitly called for this that the Commission accepts paragraph 3 of the motion for a resolution, i.e. it agrees to provide the information needed by Parliament for the action which it intends to take, and partly in order to avoid such comments as

those made by Mr Adam which, in any case, have no basis in fact given that the project he mentions — entrusted to a private firm — has been withdrawn.

We published a first invitation in 1980 and received 12 proposals for demonstration projects, three of which were financed by the Commission in the first phase. The second invitation led to the submission of 23 proposals by the end of July 1980, of which eight were from the United Kingdom, six from the Federal Republic of Germany, three from France, three from Italy, two from the Netherlands and one from Denmark. Of these 23 proposals, four had already been submitted in response to the first invitation, but the projects in question have been updated. The total estimated expenditure for the projects is equivalent to 724 million units of account. For six of them the cost will vary between 50 and 100 million units of account, for seven of them between 10 and 50 million, and for the remaining 10 it will be less than 10 million. If all the proposals obtained the Commission's approval, 271 million units of account would be required.

In October the Commission will decide to allocate the remaining quota out of the 50 million units of account, i.e. 32 million units of account, to a certain number of projects chosen from the 23 submitted.

In order to continue this action and finance the other priority projects, the doubling of the 50 million ceiling — and this has been stressed by all — is not only urgent and decisive, but represents the indispensable minimum, Mr Seligman. I think that if we were to debate the financial needs of the Community budget, we would be exceeding our brief. This question should probably be raised again on the occasion of another debate. At all events, as I was saying, this doubling is urgent, and represents an indispensable minimum given the scale of the investments made and the usefulness of the projects.

I must tell you very frankly that we have been calling for the doubling of this maximum from November 1979 onwards, not only because of the intrinsic value of the gasification and liquefaction projects and the high cost of implementing them, but also as a result of a carefully considered Community decision. It seems to me that there has been no objection to a coal conversion programme either.

With regard to the observation made by Mr Sassano and other speakers on the question of solar and geothermal energy, I must say that the demonstration projects on solar and geothermal energy have got off to a slower start, and we thought it best as a matter of priority, and in view of the urgency and importance of what was at stake, to concentrate the financial effort by calling for the doubling of the amount intended for solid fuel projects.

Mr Sassano, I must however say — and confirm to you — that this does not mean that the Commission is

Natali

abandoning demonstration projects for solar and geothermal energy. On the contrary, I am pleased to be able to tell Parliament that in October we shall transmit to the Council and Parliament a proposal to double the amount of the credits envisaged for geothermal and solar energy.

One last observation made by Mr Sassano and other members concerns budget problems. I wish to tell you that we share Parliament's reservations about the method for determining the financial ceilings, and we hope that they can be fixed, as proposed in the motion for a resolution, on the basis of the annual budget procedure.

For this reason the Commission — as envisaged by the amendment, which we accept — must fix the maximum amounts only for guidance purposes, and we agree on the amendments to paragraph 2 of the Sole Article of the draft regulation, as recommended by Mr Sassano. We also agree on the desirability of deleting the sentence under which the Council could modify the distribution of the sectoral amounts.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are all well aware that this provision can be described as modest. However, we believe it is significant, as is the announcement I have made about the proposal which we shall submit in October on the geothermal and solar energy projects. We do not pretend to be solving all the problems, which are vast, but we certainly believe that this provision indicates the road we intend to follow, and — I repeat — we are particularly grateful to the rapporteur and all the speakers in this debate who have substantially supported the solution proposed by the Commission.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

14. *Urgent procedure*

President. — I have received the following motions for resolutions with request for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure:

- by Mr Michel and others on the urgent introduction of social aid measures for workers in the iron and steel industry (Doc. 1-402/80/rev.)
- by Mrs Salisch and others on behalf of the Socialist Group on the crisis in the steel industry (Doc. 1-414/80)
- by Mr Linde and others on behalf of the Socialist Group on the sentencing to death of Mr Kim (Doc. 1-407/80)

— by Mr Fanti and others on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group on the sentencing to death of Kim Dae Jung (Doc. 1-419/80)

— by Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the Socialist Group on the Adams case (Doc. 1-410/80).

The reasons supporting these requests for urgent debate are contained in the documents themselves.

I shall consult Parliament on these requests at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

15. *Directives on the fuel consumption and engine power of motor vehicles*

President. — The next item is the report without debate (Doc. 1-340/80) drawn up by Mr von Wogau on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on the

proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-710/79) for:

- I. a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the fuel consumption of motor vehicles
- II. a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the engine power of motor vehicles.

I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) Mr President, the Commission would first of all like to thank Mr von Wogau for the work he has done. However, I must also say that the Commission has considerable reservations with regard to the new recital proposed in the preamble, since it is convinced that the present wording of Article 2 does not lend itself to a different interpretation from that which the European Parliament itself desires and well understands.

President. — I call Mr de Ferranti.

Mr de Ferranti. — Could I just add a word, as the chairman of the Working Party on Technical Barriers to Trade, to the remarks made by Mr Natali, and thank Mr von Wogau for the work he has done.

As a matter of interest, Mr President, when this directive was first presented to us, it read as if it was an attempt to approximate laws governing the consumption of fuel in motor vehicles and engine power. In fact it relates to the methods of measurement of the fuel consumption and engine power, which is very desirable in the interests of the consumer. I would like to make the point that even on these technical questions it is important for the description that appears in

De Ferranti

front of Members of this House to give the right impression. A great deal of difficulty can be caused if the wrong impression is given by the way in which the directive is described. Obviously, Mr President, in the case to directives of a technical nature, one does not want a long and elaborate description which only gives the subject a bad name. But we do want a reasonably accurate description so that we can do our work properly.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

The proceedings will now be suspended until 9 p.m.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 8 p.m. and resumed at 9 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR KATZER

Vice-President

President. — The sitting is resumed.

16. *Directives on safety belts and interior fittings of motor vehicles*

President. — The next item is the report drawn up by Mr von Wogau on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on the proposals from the Commission of the Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-83/80) for:

- I. a directive amending Council Directive 77/541/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to safety belts and restraint systems of motor vehicles
- II. a directive amending Council Directive 76/115/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to anchorages for motor vehicle safety belts
- III. a directive amending Council Directive 74/408/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the interior fittings of motor vehicles (strength of seats and of their anchorages) (Doc. 1-343/80).

President. — I call Mr von Wogau.

Mr von Wogau, rapporteur. — *(D)* Mr President, fellow Members, as you can see from the agenda it

was suggested that both reports be considered without debate. However, as several people have asked to speak on these reports I should like to take this opportunity to explain why we requested that they should be taken without debate and how we view the future discussion on the question of technical barriers to trade. Parliament receives a very large number of individual directives. These directives are very carefully considered in the Working party on technical barriers to trade set up by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. The working party is extremely painstaking in its work, which is then considered by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. If we find that these technical directives have no political content we propose making the work of Parliament easier by dealing with the texts without debate. This also serves as an example of how to cut down the work of Parliament. However, if we find that there is some political content in the technical details — and, in fact, this happens very often — we want a political debate to take place. We believe, above all, that the question of open frontiers within Europe should be discussed in depth at least once a year: matters relating to the customs union and the removal of barriers to trade. This kind of debate should not be held at midnight on Thursday . . .

(Mixed reactions)

. . . but at a time when it will have a suitable impact from the publicity point of view. I cannot conceal the fact that I am very disappointed at the decision taken by the Bureau this afternoon. We said as early as February and March of this year that we wanted to have a debate in October on opening frontiers within Europe during which two reports would be presented, one dealing with customs union and the other with the removal of barriers to trade. Now we find that this report, which should originally have been discussed on Tuesday, was held over until Thursday and anyone who knows Parliament's way of working must realize that this inevitably means that the report would be dealt with on Thursday evening when it will have little impact from the publicity point of view. As everyone is aware of the problems which still exist at the Community's internal frontiers and everybody who works in constituencies knows that constituents will come up to us and say that it is scandalous that this situation should still exist in a Community, we believe that the Bureau should have changed its decision and scheduled the debate on these reports for a suitable time during the October part-session.

I should like to take this opportunity to make a brief political comment on the report on the fuel consumption of motor vehicles. The report and the Commission's proposal for a directive state that the maximum limits of fuel consumption should no longer be fixed at national level but by common European decision.

The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs regards this proposal as very sensible, but feels at the

Von Wogau

same time that the Commission should have made this clear in its report and its proposal.

I call upon my fellow Members to approve the two reports, given these circumstances.

President. — I call Mrs Nielsen to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

Mrs Nielsen. — (DK) Mr President, first of all I should like to tell Mr von Wogau that it was not that we Liberals wanted to prolong Thursday's debate. We know in advance that Thursday is a long day. Nor was it because we wanted to speak to an empty Chamber, nor that we hoped the public would not be present. The public can come whenever it chooses. We knew it had been agreed that this item was to be adopted without debate. We agreed to that yesterday, but when it was pointed out to us later that some Members had elected to speak we felt that we too had something we wanted to say.

I should like to address myself to the harmonization in respect of industrial products. We Liberals would stress that harmonization includes the elimination of technical barriers to trade, which reduce or prevent the free exchange of goods, as specified in Articles 30-36 of the Treaty of Rome.

For with the complete elimination of financial barriers to trade such as customs duties by the end of the 1960s, the establishment of a common market now depends on the removal of technical barriers. The economic recession of recent years provided fertile ground for national measures to protect domestic producers against external competition. The Commission itself has said that the number of cases referred to it more than quadrupled between 1974 and 1978 and that the number of complaints lodged is only a fraction of the actual number of infringements.

Technical barriers to trade include legislation setting quality and technical standards for the sale of goods, certification, test and approval systems and rules which give the superficial impression of consumer protection. Although many of these rules seem at first sight to be justified and proper, they frequently cause the fragmentation of the common market, especially for smaller manufacturers who cannot afford to change their products to meet export specifications and are thus prevented from selling outside their home markets. The result is that the free movement of goods has been only partially achieved. Danish industry includes large numbers of small and medium-sized firms whose operations are consequently hampered. Some of these firms are therefore at a considerable disadvantage in competing with companies in the larger Member States.

While the Commission has attempted to simplify the complaints procedure and has urged national govern-

ments to display greater understanding of the problem, I do not think that even hundreds of individual decisions can be expected to provide a real solution to the problem. So long as individual governments continue to think it right and to their advantage to introduce measures to protect their domestic industries the common market for industrial goods will remain fragmented and the Treaty of Rome held in contempt.

There is one aspect which seems to me to be playing an increasing role; I am referring to the rise in public procurement. I have tabled a question to the Commission on the subject, and am looking forward to its reply with some interest. I asked what the Commission is doing at this very moment to combat the increasing practice of public authorities' giving preferential treatment to domestic industry in their purchasing policies. Public calls for tender are frequently worded so as to fit the products of national industries like a glove. This kind of favouritism implies that on the one hand manufacturers in other countries will be prevented from competing on an equal footing with domestic industry, and that foreign investment in manufacturing subsidiaries will go to those countries where this type of malpractice is most prevalent, that is to say those countries which have the largest home markets.

The larger Member States are therefore far better placed to attract American and Japanese investment for example. I am very much looking forward to hearing what the Commission is currently doing in this field.

In conclusion I should like to hold the Commission to its avowed policy that free trade absolutely must be safeguarded as essential to the operation and growth of the internal market, and that it is resolved to intervene rapidly and vigorously, and has therefore given high priority to the campaign to eliminate technical barriers to trade. Of course in times of crisis there is always pressure in the individual countries for protection against imports. It is common knowledge that with increasing unemployment and high inflation some people regard this as a way of solving their problems. I should like to point out that the very existence of the Community is at risk if we allow individual Member States to divide up the market for the benefit of their domestic industries. A fundamental principle of the Treaty of Rome is involved here. Many of these technical barriers to trade have indeed been introduced in recent years, after the removal of economic barriers, and I feel we cannot put too much effort into combating them, as in the long run all industries in the Member States will benefit from free competition on equal terms.

As I said we did not wish to prolong the debate. We felt there were some important things that had to be said, as the matter was opened to discussion. But I should like to say in conclusion that if, as I hope, we are given the opportunity of an extended debate, we of the Liberal Group will have many more and exhaustive

Nielsen

contributions to make as we of course, as I hope you realize from these few words, feel that we are dealing with a vital subject.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) I should like, very briefly, to make a few clarifications, Mr President. Before the sitting was suspended I considered that we had finished discussing point 175, but it now seems to me that we are discussing 175 and 176 together. I must therefore, Mr President, repeat the statement which I made on point 175, the thanks I gave to Mr von Wogau and the comments, Mr von Wogau, that the Commission wishes to make on that famous recital of which you have spoken, as it considers that principles in accordance with the wishes of Parliament were stated in Article 2 and that there is no need to stress them in the recital.

As regards the more general discussion, Mr President, I must say in relation to the speeches of Mr De Ferranti and Mr Nielsen that on this occasion the Commission has not — as, moreover, the rapporteur himself stressed — tackled more general matters concerning the policy of liberalization of trade. We have before us a series of directives which move along this line, but we know very well that we shall have to undertake a more wide-ranging debate, and I should like to take this opportunity to say that Mr Davignon is considering how to follow up the implementation of Articles 30 and 36 after the famous Cassis judgment of Dijon. I am not, therefore, able, Mr President, to enter into the more general matters which were the subject of Mr De Ferranti's and Mr Nielsen's comments; I can only say, as regards the two items on the agenda and the substance of the five directives, that they represent — as Mr von Wogau has fittingly stressed in the report — a further step forward along this road. We know that the way ahead is long, fraught with obstacles and difficult, but the Commission wishes now to reassert its desire and will to maintain the principles of our Community. It is with this statement that I wish to renew my thanks to the committee, and to Mr von Wogau in particular, for the two reports which he has submitted to us.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

17. Directive on insurance contracts

President. — The next item is the report drawn up by Mr Turner, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, (Doc 1-237/80) on

the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-247/79) for a directive on the coordination of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to insurance contracts.

President. — I call Mr Turner.

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — Mr President, this directive harmonizes the most important part of the law of insurance — that is, the law governing the relationship which is set up between the policyholder and the insurer. If we succeed in harmonizing this law, it will bring great benefits to the consumer — the policyholder. It will give them simplicity in their contracts of insurance and uniformity, so we shall have the same type of contract throughout the EEC. Of course, insurance is an extremely complex matter and it would be ridiculous to suggest that one could ever have very simple insurance contracts; but in so far as they can be simplified, this directive, if it were put into effect, would, I think, achieve that result.

Secondly, it would have an equally good result for all of industry, who, of course, insure their premises and their activities on a very large scale and very often across frontiers, because they would from now on be able to have the same type of insurance protection for all their enterprises and properties wherever they were in the EEC, regardless of country.

Finally, it would be of great benefit to the insurers, because it would enable them to compete with each other in each other's countries on an equal footing, which they are not able to do now. When I say 'compete on an equal footing', I must add that the Council of Ministers has now spent three years trying to sort out the second directive on insurance services and has so far failed to achieve any result. That has got to be done before this directive is put into effect; but it is most important that both directives should be put into effect at the same time, so that we can have a harmonized system of law throughout the EEC.

This directive is not intended primarily to protect the consumer: its object is to harmonize law, to produce a uniform law. Of course, the Legal Affairs Committee has been extremely careful to make sure that the consumer is properly protected, but the main object is to have uniform law. Any suggestion that we could have a minimum directive giving minimum rights for consumers is therefore completely misplaced, because that would result in nine different laws and no harmonization at all, and that is not the object. So it is a misconception to say that one wants to have a minimum directive giving minimum protection to consumers.

What we have aimed at and, I think, have achieved is a true balance between the rights of the policyholder and the rights of the insurer. There are two main

Turner

pillars in this directive. The first one sets out the rights and duties of the two parties — the policy-holder and the insurer — at the time that they negotiate the contract; the second pillar sets out the remedies which are to be given to either party when something goes wrong in the contract though both parties were acting quite honestly — in other words, when there has been some misunderstanding between the parties.

Now, taking the first point, what this directive does is to say that the policy-holder shall use ordinary, typical common-sense when he is describing the risk he wants to insure to the insurer. It says that the insurer shall only complain about the description given to him if any typical insurer — any prudent or ordinary insurer — would have been misled by what he was told.

That is the cornerstone of this directive — the relationship between the two parties; the Legal Affairs Committee gave a great deal of thought to this relationship. We altered what was given to us by the Commission. The Commission's proposal was certainly the rock bottom, the most rudimentary kind of contract you could obtain, and we raised the standard to what I have given to you. I believe, having had many talks throughout the continent of Europe with both sides, the consumers and the policy-holders, that that compromise is a fair balance which they want.

The second point is this: the Commission's proposals would have left the policy-holder with an obligation to tell the insurer anything which might influence him in his decision about what the premium should be. That is an absolutely open-ended invitation to the insurers to say, when things go wrong and they go to court, 'I might have been influenced if I had been told this'. No policy-holder could ever know what might influence a particular insurer, and that is why the Legal Affairs Committee has gone not for what might influence the insurer, but for what should influence a prudent insurer, and anybody can decide what a prudent insurer should be influenced by.

The second pillar, as I said, comprises the remedies. Supposing the policy-holder has misled the insurer by disclosing less than he ought to have done, less than the typical person would have disclosed about his risk, then the policy-holder, if he did this honestly, by genuine mistake, is paid a part of the risk which he lost which is proportional to the failure he made to give a full disclosure. I will give a simple example: if you have a cottage with a thatched roof and you fail to tell the insurer that it has a thatched roof, and so he gives you a policy with a premium of X, whereas if he had known it had a thatched roof, he would have doubled it to 2X, when the cottage is burnt down the policy-holder gets half the value of the cottage, not the whole value, because he misled the insurer to that extent, even though quite innocently. That is called the proportionality rule, and it is almost universal on the continent. It is not known in Britain and it is not known in Holland, but apart from that it is common

on the continent. The Legal Affairs Committee adopted this rule of thumb for this directive, and I am quite convinced it is the best rule of thumb that one could adopt.

I would urge on this House that they support this proposal; it is not political, it provides a framework for the very heart of insurance law, a framework of law, and it does not prevent consumer interests within that framework from urging their governments to elaborate this or elaborate that to give particular protection to their consumers in this or that respect. But what is vital is that the actual framework of the law must be uniform in all nine countries, and I hope that the House will support this directive.

President. — I call Mrs Seibel-Emmerling to speak on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, draftsman. — (D) Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is incumbent on me, pursuant to Rule 44 (4) of the Rules of Procedure, to explain the opinion of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. The members of this committee were totally unanimous in regretting the fact that our committee was not involved in the discussions until the stage where Mr Turner's report had already been adopted by the Legal Affairs Committee. We believe, however, that the opinion of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection is absolutely indispensable for the whole area of insurance. It is in this area in particular that the consumer can suffer irreparable damage unless he is given adequate legal protection. The committee therefore expected the Commission to put forward a proposal which would provide a comprehensive system of rules governing insurance and would assign insurers, policy-holders and third parties a balanced measure of rights and duties. Instead, the committee found itself confronted with a patchwork in which consumer rights had been neglected to a frightening extent.

The committee was pleased that Mr Turner eliminated some of the particularly objectionable aspects in his report. Nevertheless, our committee still regards this report as totally unsatisfactory in a number of respects. We cannot harmonize at the expense of the consumer. I therefore submit on behalf of the committee Amendments No 1-9, which were adopted in committee by a convincing, if not quite unanimous, majority. These amendments are all aimed at redressing to some extent the imbalance between the contracting parties for the benefit of the consumer. On this point we are all agreed: that the consumer who is to be protected is — if I may call him this — the final consumer and not industry with its insurance contracts; when industry concludes insurance contracts the partners are equally strong and equally well versed in insurance matters.

Seibel-Emmerling

We have in mind protection for policy-holders who are not in such a position of equal strength.

The most important amendment we have tabled is the one which asks that Member States should be able to lay down more rigorous provisions on consumer protection. We would find it unacceptable if the Commission proposal were to be considered as a maximum. For this reason, Article 12 of the proposal for a directive simply must be amended. Moreover, the committee could not understand why the Commission in, say, the proposal on consumer credit, was totally in favour of a directive setting minimum standards, whereas in this case it is seeking to prevent any developments which might benefit the weak, and, indeed, is attempting to undermine the existing legal position of consumers on the insurance market by means of a directive which imposes maximum rules.

Mr President, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection asks you to approve its amendments. I would also like to ask for a correction to be made to Amendment No 9. A typing error, involving the repetition of two words, for which I apologise, has cropped up in all the translations. I would ask you to delete the words 'in respect of the claim and' in the fifth and sixth lines of paragraph 4 of Amendment No 9. I would ask my fellow Members once again to adopt our amendments.

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

Mr Fich. — (DK) Mr President, I should like to give the Socialist Group's views on the Commission's proposal on the harmonization of insurance contracts, and on Mr Turner's report.

Harmonization can take several forms, and our Group feels that the worst alternative has been chosen here, putting the consumer, i.e. the insured person, at a disadvantage. We feel that the Commission has adopted the wrong policy here and we regret that Mr Turner has so largely accepted it. We are not alone in taking this view. The Commission's Consumer's Consultative Committee has criticized the proposal, as have the European consumer organization, the European cooperative movement, the European family organizations and the European Trade Union Confederation.

What, then, is wrong with the proposal? Well, first of all, the main thing wrong with it is that it is what we call a maximum directive, i.e. harmonization here means the elimination of some of the good points of present systems. Some consumers in some countries are therefore penalized. What should have been done was to adopt the minimum form of harmonization, which would raise standards for everybody.

The second point is the introduction of a certain form of proportionality into insurance which we cannot accept. The example given is that if a policyholder does not do enough to avoid a loss, he cannot be sure how much the insurer will pay out.

The third point is that insurance contracts may be drawn up in a language other than the policyholder's own. But why should the consumer accept a policy drawn up in another language? It might well be because a quotation from an insurance company in another country is cheaper than one from a company based in his own country. But that weakens his legal position, I have not said anything new here; the Consumer's Consultative Committee made these points to the Commission as long ago as July 1977 and one cannot but regret that the Commission did not take them into account. The European Parliament when it debated the first consumer programme in 1974, said exactly what I have just said. I am therefore taking the same line that Parliament took six years ago.

We feel that the free movement of services has been given priority here over the protection of the consumer, and that is something we heartily oppose. We therefore intend to support the amendments tabled by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection as well of course as those tabled by our own group. If these amendments are adopted we shall not feel obliged to vote against the Turner report.

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

Mr Janssen van Raay. — (NL) Mr President, fellow members, it is my pleasant task as spokesman for the Christian Democratic Group to congratulate Mr Turner warmly and to compliment him on his work. This is no mere platitude. We, the members of the Legal Affairs Committee — and I believe that I am the first member of this committee to speak after Mr Turner himself — know that he has done a very considerable amount of work on his own. He has carefully examined the Commission's proposal for a directive drawing on his legal background as counsel for both policyholders and insurers and has tried hard to strike as fair a balance as possible between the interests of insurers and policyholders. I firmly believe that he has been successful in achieving a fair compromise between the interests of these two groups.

To stress the practical importance of this directive I would simply mention the claim that perhaps as few as 2 % of the citizens of the European Community are not insured. All the others have concluded insurance policies of one kind or another. The harmonization which the proposal seeks to introduce is therefore of direct, practical value. Unlike the members of the

Janssen van Raay

Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, I find that the drawing up of this directive is in itself a contribution to consumer protection, for the perfectly simple reason that it seeks to introduce fair competition and harmonized competition and that the result of this competition in the field of insurance is to give the consumer in all nine (and soon ten) countries of the European Community a broad measure of protection. All the insurance companies will seek the consumer's business and he will be free to choose, his choice being made easier by the harmonization of legislation in this area. This is really the most important premise.

Furthermore, I believe that Mr Turner has succeeded in improving the position of the policyholder in comparison with the original proposal, a fact which we welcome, although I fully understand the complaint made by the previous speaker. We are all frustrated at the fact that we receive documents so late. I received the 31 amendments translated into Dutch only this morning. I do not hold this against anyone but we all have to work under difficult circumstances. Nevertheless, I can assure the Member that we examined these amendments very seriously and that while I understand fully the reasons behind them, we must nevertheless say that we, the Christian Democrats, do not agree since we find that the interests of policyholders are adequately safeguarded.

I should like to give you an example. Amendment No 1 reads as follows: 'considers that in general the directive does not provide a suitable balance between the rights and duties of the insurer and those of the insured person'. Of course this will win the votes of those who believe that the balance is weighted against the insured person but you will also gain the votes of those who believe that the balance is weighted against the insurer. This text does not in itself make a choice and I believe the fact that Amendment No 1 finds support from both directions is the best proof that an excellent balance has been struck. We therefore feel that we should welcome and support Mr Turner's report. I am not going to begin here to go through all 31 amendments. We have considered them seriously and the way we vote tomorrow will show what we think of them.

The directive also appeals to me as a Dutchman since the United Kingdom and the Netherlands are the two countries which have not adopted the principle of proportionality in their own laws. This is one of the most important things about the European Community, namely, that this kind of practical legislation allows countries to take over the good ideas of other countries. We therefore also support the important principle of proportionality which is contained in this directive. In short, we are particularly pleased with this directive in the form in which we have now amended it. We congratulate Mr Turner and ourselves, and believe that the adoption of this directive will constitute a major practical advance in the interests of our respective electorates.

President. — I call Mr Tyrrell to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Tyrrell. — Mr President, Members of this House, I think I had better start, in the light of the first two speeches that have been made after the rapporteur's, by reminding the House that the Community does not stand for harmonization for harmonization's sake; the Community does not stand for it; the Commission has said on a number of occasions in recent years they do not want it; the people of Europe do not want it; my Group does not want it. Harmonization is acceptable to the extent that it is both necessary and reasonable to facilitate the effective exercise of freedom to provide services. Now, in some cases, it may be that this would lead to a uniform law; in other cases a uniform law is quite unnecessary. Thus, whilst associating myself with what Mr Janssen Van Raay said of Mr Turner, I would draw this nuance between us — a uniform law is not necessary in order to provide effective exercise of freedom of service.

There is the desirability of establishing genuine freedom of services in the insurance industry and to that extent some harmonization is necessary, and that we accept. It is necessary both in the interests of the consumer and of the industry itself. I would say, again in the light of earlier comments that have been made, that great care has obviously been taken by the Commission and by the Committee on Legal Affairs to see that the balance in this complex directive is fair as between the insurer and the policyholder.

In approaching the insurance industry, however, with a harmonization directive, even greater care than normal is necessary. The industry is a complex industry; it is a vast industry; it is a worldwide industry and I am referring, of course, to the Community insurance industry. The Community insurance industry makes a massive contribution to the community's balance of trade with the rest of the world. So harmonization is only justifiable when freedom to provide services is established.

But the Commission proposal designed to provide freedom of services, which dates back to January 1976, is still awaiting the decision of the Council of Ministers over three and a half years later. The Court at Luxembourg has reached the decision that part of Article 59 and part of Article 60 were of direct application, at least so far as discrimination on the grounds of nationality and residence is concerned.

So that was an advance. But it is no substitute for a comprehensive directive. It would be quite wrong for the industry to face the disruption that harmonization of contract law would bring unless it is a corollary to a services directive.

For that reason my group has down amendments Nos 12 and 14 to provide that this harmonization directive

Tyrrell

should not come into effect until the services directive which it supports comes into effect. So in Amendment No 14 we propose that the proposal for a directive should not be enacted until after the enactment of the second Council directive on the coordination of laws and that its subsequent enactment should seek only to harmonize insurance contract law in the European Community to the extent that it is strictly necessary in the light of the eventual shape of the second Council directive.

I now turn to the scope of the directive we are considering. As it stands at present it extends to risks outside the Community. By the amendment in the name of Lady Elles and myself on behalf of the Group, the scope would be limited to risks situated within the Member States.

There was a similar amendment put down in committee which failed by one vote — it is enough for the purpose of this directive that it should be limited to risks inside the Community.

If the risks are outside the Community, insurance companies will in any event have the choice of law, but why should they have to choose some foreign law instead of being able to choose one of the Community laws? Laws which have served well over many years. It would put them at a disadvantage against foreign competitors when insuring outside the Community. For that reason we have put down our amendment No 15. It will preserve flexibility.

I turn now rapidly to the detail of the amendments. Amendment No 10 in the name of Mr Kirk and myself deals with time-limits and I think that he will be moving that amendment later, so I shall say little about it except that I hope it will be observed that it shifts the balance in favour of the consumer. That indeed is its purpose.

Amendment No 11 deals with Article 6. The Legal Affairs Committee considered that this article should be limited to contracts of less than one year. We cannot see convincing reasons for this. There are reasons, but they are not sufficiently convincing. Again, we propose to restore the Commission text. That, I would point out, will benefit the policyholder.

I come to our amendment No 13 to Article 2 (6) which raises the question of language. There is some misconception about this. There are three possible versions: in the Commission's the language of the policy would be the language of the Member State in which the law is applicable.

Now which law is that? Well, it depends what is in the services directive. In the draft services directive that would mean free choice for the parties, the insurer and the policyholder. The Legal Affairs Committee amended that so that the language would be in accordance with the provision of the services directive.

But suppose there is none when that becomes law? If it became law in its present form — the draft proposal — then again there would be free choice for the parties. So we propose certainly: let the parties choose the language. Why not?

Now I come to the question of salvage — my amendment No 17, also in the name of Lady Elles and myself on behalf of my Group. On that we have put down an amendment which limits the liability of an insurance company to the sum insured.

A moment's reflection will, I am sure, persuade anyone who cares to think about it that it would be playing with fire to expose insurance companies to risks the extent of which they could not possibly calculate. One has only to think these days of oil pollution at sea and the hundreds of millions of damage that might be caused, or saved, if persons acted unwisely under the policy. So we propose to limit it to the insured sum, but we add a proviso for the protection of the policyholder. If the policyholder expends more on the instructions of the insurance company, then that would be recoverable.

I come now to the question of warranties, perhaps the most difficult of all. It is our amendment No 16, Article 3 (3) of the proposal. The amendment leaves the question of principle as it was in the directive and accepts the Legal Affairs Committee's amendments. It leaves proportionality in the proposed directive, but with the proviso that the parties to the contract may agree otherwise.

Now, why should they be allowed to agree otherwise, it may be asked. Only in the Netherlands and in the United Kingdom is there at present no proportionality law. Is it necessary to harmonize British and Dutch law in this way?

It is not necessary. The law has stood the test of many generations. The Dutch insurance industry and the British insurance industry have served the Community and their countries well, and the world too, by leaving the choice to the parties whether they want proportionality in their contracts or not.

One is in effect extending consumer choice and it would mean that if the British and Dutch insurance companies stuck to their present and well-tested rules and the consumer did not like it in the face of competition from the other Member States, it would be open to the Dutch and British insurance companies to make changes. That is the purpose of the amendment.

I would conclude by saying that in the United Kingdom at least this will be the first major legislative intervention in the field of insurance law. Our law has been built up over very many generations by practice, experience and as declared by the judges. One hopes that in these measures of harmonization, which we

Tyrrell

accept, every precaution will be taken to preserve the industry against damage and disruption.

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

Mr De Gucht. — (NL) Mr President, it is clear that those of us who are in favour of extending and harmonizing the common market, in this case the market for insurance, welcome this proposal for a directive, particularly as provision has also been made for protecting policyholders in a field which is acknowledged to be highly technical and complex and in which the dominance of the insurer sometimes restricts the insured person's freedom of choice and contract. For this reason we welcome the fact that the principle of proportionality is to be introduced generally, so that insured persons, save in exceptional cases, are no longer suddenly left without compensation in respect of a claim despite their trust and the premiums paid.

On this point, I think that there is some difference between the example which has just been given by Mr Tyrrell and the situation in, say, Belgium. This principle does protect the consumer and it can happen that certain companies, having collected the premium, then try their hardest to avoid providing cover, which also leads, to distortion of competition, something which we can now eliminate. Even from the insurer's point of view it makes economic sense that a reduced premium, calculated on the basis of an underestimated risk, should entitle the policyholder to reduced compensation instead of no compensation at all. Often a far-fetched and irrelevant factor, which is not notified and which may have scarcely any effect on the premium, is sufficient, as matters stand at present — I should say according to Belgian law — to justify the refusal of any benefit under the policy. This is unfair from the standpoint of the policyholder and from the point of view of insurance practice is an unreasonable attitude for the insurance companies to take.

We therefore welcome the introduction of an obligation on the policyholder to declare any circumstances of which the insurer ought reasonably to be aware coupled with the principle of proportionality in the case of sanctions. In this context it seems to me that the text of Articles 3 and 4 of the proposal should be harmonized and simplified in respect of the policyholder's obligation to describe the risk and the rule of proportionality at the time of settlement of the claim.

Article 3 deals with the conclusion of the contract and Article 4 with changes made while the contract is in force. There is no reason to treat changes differently from the original giving of vital information for the assessment of the risk at the time the contract is concluded. There is no need to impose different obligations and different rules governing proof. I believe,

therefore, that Article 3 (1) and Article 4 (1) could both state that the policyholder should notify the insurer of any circumstances of which he ought reasonably to be aware and which he ought to expect to influence the assessment of the risk both at the time of the conclusion of the contract and when notifying changes affecting the risk. This would mean that notification pursuant to Article 4 (1) would not merely be confined to factors explicitly mentioned in the policy.

The sanctions provided for in Article 4 (5) on the other hand could simply be made the same as those in Article 3 (3) (c). Then there is no point in making Article 4 (5) require the policyholder to prove that the circumstance which he failed to notify was irrelevant. There is therefore no sense in reducing the obligation imposed on the policyholder in Article 4 and in distinguishing it from that imposed in Article 3 while compensating for this by proposing a further or heavier burden of proof. By definition, Articles 3 and 4 deal with relevant circumstances in addition to those for which notification is explicitly requested by the insurer both at the time of and after the conclusion of the contract. In both cases the same reasonable obligation to notify should be imposed on the policyholder with identical sanctions and burden of proof. In my humble opinion, Articles 3 and 4 could be made consistent in this way. If the Commission agrees with this it can adjust its text accordingly.

President. — I call Mr Bonde.

Mr Bonde. — (DK) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, some people have compared membership of the European Community to an insurance policy. That is a reasonable comparison, as the premiums go up all the time. But it is probably the only insurance that guarantees you will suffer accidents. Some of these take the form of maximum directives, forbidding the Member States to make more progress than the Community has been able to agree on. But the insurance directive we are debating today is not simply a policy against progress. It guarantees regression. It is an attempt to turn the clock back to the last century as far as the protection of policyholders is concerned.

This is not simply the view of the people's movement against membership of the Community; the Danish Consumer Council has said the same thing in a letter to the Ministry of Justice. I should like to quote from their conclusion: 'We find it unacceptable that this draft directive should have been put in the form of a maximum directive, as parts of it do not even reach the standards of the 1930 Insurance Contracts Act'. Yes, 1930! It goes on to say that other parts do not meet the standards put in practice under the Insurance Contracts Act and that the Ministry of Justice itself, when setting up the Committee on Insurance Contracts, had instructed it in its terms of reference to consider whether existing legislation on insurance

Bonde

contracts was satisfactory from the policyholders' point of view — implying the need for further progress. But according to the proposal before us today, you are in danger of not getting a penny or an ECU.

The proposal is opposed not simply by the Danish Consumer Council, but by consumer organizations in all the Member States of the Community. It is typical that the Commission's Environment and Consumer Protection Service was not involved in drafting the proposal. The real task of that unit seems to be to put up a smokescreen for consumers in the Member States while the Commission helps the larger Community insurance companies swallow up the smaller ones.

The proposal should be withdrawn immediately and we shall urge the Danish Government to announce that it will veto all maximum directives on principle. If this insurance directive is introduced we shall need insurance companies to insure people against the inadequate cover provided by the insurance companies. Would that kind of insurance be permitted, Mr Commissioner, or will you listen to the Consumer Council and drop all plans to introduce maximum directives in this field?

President. — I call Mr Kirk.

Mr Kirk. — (DK) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I think we have good reason to be satisfied with Mr Turner's excellent report. It is a very important subject, as the introduction of a binding code for European insurance companies in their dealings with their customers must be in the latter's interest.

Insurance companies are obviously more international in their operations than most other types of company, and I therefore feel we should welcome Mr Turner's success in picking out the major defects of the Commission's proposal and remedying them in such a way that the directive should help both policyholders and probably the insurance companies as well.

We must conclude that one way of improving competition between companies in the long run would be to cut premiums.

I was also pleased to note that, at least for one fleeting moment, the Socialist Group was able to be represented by a Member to put forward what it regards as the consumer's interests. Ah, here comes another one! The Socialist Group is the largest group in Parliament — from time to time! But I do not think its spokesman knew what he was talking about when he spoke of minimum and maximum directives, for in the nature of things insurance contracts concluded across frontiers cannot be governed by what is normally understood as a minimum directive; that would be impossible to implement in the individual Member States.

I am sorry to say that Mr Fich has clearly not read Mr Turner's report, but simply leafed through the Commission proposal; as my friend Mr Tyrrell pointed out, Mr Turner and the committee objected strongly to the Commission's proposal on precisely the question of the language in which the policies were to be written, and amended the proposal to make it by agreement between the policyholder and the insurance company. I regard that as a most satisfactory solution.

Mr President, Mr Tyrrell and I have tabled an amendment which I think will improve the report. It combines the Commission proposal and Mr Turner's suggestion in the report in respect of Article 3 (2) (b) (i). It relates to the period for the amendment or possible termination of insurance contracts. It is obvious that in these circumstances the general consumer would like a reasonably long period while the business world would prefer to act more quickly. We have therefore tabled amendment No 10, which I hope Parliament will adopt tomorrow, as I regard it as a clear improvement.

Finally, Mr Bonde of the Movement against the European people, has obviously forgotten what you dial 999 for. I hope that those against harmonization and against better conditions for the European people will realize that they have missed the ambulance.

In conclusion I would also point out that there is an error in the Danish version — which probably went over Mr Bonde's head too — by which the meaning has been completely distorted. It occurs in the amended text proposed for Article 10 (3) (c), the Danish reading (in translation) 'provided that the contract was not agreed upon the basis of a fixed term' instead of, as it should, 'provided that *the premiums* were not agreed upon the basis of a fixed term'. I would suggest, Mr President, that we have the Danish version corrected accordingly.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) Mr President, all the speakers have said that great efforts have been made recently to provide a Community framework for the insurance sector. There have been many proposals for directives, some of which have already been adopted while others are still being considered. The directive we are discussing is part of this process.

I wish to express the Commission's gratitude to Parliament, which has brought out the importance of activities in this sector, and particularly to thank the committees which examined this proposal, especially the Legal Affairs Committee and its rapporteur, Mr Turner, for dedicating so much time and attention to it and, as Mr Janssen van Raay and others have said, for succeeding in striking so fair a balance between the interests of policyholders and insurers.

Natali

I am now facing a serious dilemma, Mr President: I should like to be able to end our meeting swiftly, and yet it is my duty to clarify the Commission's position on the various amendments. You know that we have also discussed this matter in the enlarged Bureau, and I am afraid that I shall have to steal some time to clarify the position of the Commission on a series of amendments which have been tabled.

There is a series of amendments tabled by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling has spoken on these amendments this evening. I wish to make some general observations on this matter. We consider that this proposal for a directive which concerns insurance contracts should not be considered as an automatic extension of the choice of law, provision for which was already made in the second coordinating Directive on insurance and damages, known as the Directive on the freedom to provide services. Any addition to the circumstances in which the choice of the law to be applied to insurance contracts may be exercised will require specific, separate measures, in respect of which it will be appropriate to consider the possible need to further harmonize the law on contracts. At the moment, it is simply not possible for an insurer to be in a position to impose his own national law on private citizens. One objection which is often raised to this is that the harmonization proposed would be a retrograde step for some existing national legislations. I am not very expert on this matter, but I should like to say to Mr Bonde that, as far as I am aware, the protection ensured by our directives is not inferior to that ensured by the Danish law of 1930. It is not therefore true to say that our measures are a retrograde step on matters of protection. This might, perhaps, have been said of previous drafts but no longer corresponds to the truth.

It might, however, still be said that all this is valid for the moment, but that the Member States should be free to make progress in the future. This should be a directive laying down minimum requirements: this is what is stressed in Amendments Nos 2 and 8. It is asserted that this directive lays down maximum requirements, while a directive laying down minimum requirements is what is needed. In fact, the problem does not seem so simple to me. Many of the provisions of the directive are already of the kind which lay down minimum requirements. Consider, for example, the provisions of Articles 7 and 9. Moreover, the provisions for rescue costs in Article 8 are so clearly intended to protect the consumer that I wonder if more would be possible in this direction.

I should also like to say on this matter that I have heard the opinion of the Consumers Committee invoked, but I seem to remember that in this very Chamber, and by some of those very speakers who have today invoked the opinion of the Consumers

Committee, it was stated to be inappropriate to consult this Committee since a parliamentary committee existed. The Committee is valued at certain times and attacked at others. However, other provisions exist which are not concerned to establish a greater or lesser degree of protection, but rather to define criteria for making choices between different possibilities. I am thinking in particular of the most important provision of the directive, that is, the principle of proportionality established by Article 3 (3). A choice had to be made between this principle and the principle of causality which is at present followed in Germany. If, contrary to our opinion, Amendment No 8 is adopted, Germany could continue to maintain the principle of causality in its legislation on the basis that, in its opinion, it provides more favourable conditions for the party insured. I note with pleasure that both the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and the Legal Affairs Committee have recognized that the real aim of the directive would not be achieved if such a possibility were conceded.

The neutrality and transparency of conditions of competition are at the basis of this directive. Insurance companies must have the same opportunities for competition. Competition must not be distorted by differences in the law on insurance contracts. This directive contains the points which experts have considered most important from the point of view of competition and attempts a harmonization in the light of this objective.

If Amendment No 8 were introduced, harmonization would not be possible. Individual parties insured can in any case derogate from the provisions of the directive under Article 12, as they can estimate what would be advantageous to them — which might obviously not be advantageous for others.

Parties insured are not necessarily at a disadvantage in negotiations with insurance companies if they are supported by consumer organizations, including — for example — the automobile clubs. I therefore consider that Amendments Nos 2 and 8 should be rejected.

As regards the other amendments tabled by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, we shall certainly consider the points raised. The solutions proposed could be inserted in a possible second directive on insurance contracts.

As regards Amendments Nos 5 and 6, I am certainly particularly interested in the possibility that a machine distributing insurance policies for journeys by air, located in an airport, might be able immediately to issue the documents indicated in Amendment No 5. However, I do not know if, at the present stage of technology, we are able to guarantee a service of this kind, or if, in order to meet this need, we might possibly have recourse to Japanese machines, for example.

Natali

Provision is already made in Article 6 for the points raised in Amendment No 7, unless my interpretation of this Amendment is wrong.

We cannot accept Amendment No 9, which would protect insured parties who are dishonest. Those who are honest — and they are consumers too, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling — would have to pay the consequences.

The intentions of Amendments No 10 and 11 seem valid to me, from what I have understood. I admit to Mr Tyrrell that I was eagerly awaiting his explanation of Amendment No 12, because I did not really understand it. He has not mentioned it, and I am therefore forced to think that even he, who drafted it, is like me doubtful about its validity.

Amendment No 13 is not desirable: why should it be possible to choose the language in cases where there is no choice as to the law which is applied?

We cannot accept Amendment No 14. If we did accept it, this would run counter to the proposal which we have put forward. I think Mr Tyrrell should understand that while we consider — and the rapporteur himself agrees with us — that this proposal for a directive is a proposal which must go forward, to decide that its enactment should be delayed means, in practice, nullifying all the work which has been done by the various committees.

As regards Amendment No 15, the law of a third country may be chosen for risks outside the Community. However if the law of a Member State is chosen, it must be the law stated in the present directive.

We cannot have a situation where two separate sets of national laws are in force.

Amendment No 16 seems inadequate, except where provision is already made under Article 12. Amendment No 17 reduces protection for consumers, and it is not, therefore, desirable that it should be adopted.

Next there is a series of amendments put forward by Mrs Vayssade, Mr Megahy and Mr Sieglerschmidt, on behalf of the Socialist Group. Many of these amendments, Mr President, seek restoration of the text of the Commission proposal; obviously I can only be in favour of this. However, there is no amendment proposing that Article 3 (1) of the Commission text should be restored. Since what remains of Articles 3 and 4 flows from the precise terms of Article 3 (1), I am not certain that a coherent result can be obtained if Amendments Nos 25 and 29 are adopted.

I should now like to speak briefly — and I apologise for the length of this speech — on the amendments to the Commission text proposed in the report of the Legal Affairs Committee. In large measure, the Commission could accept them. However, we would

prefer, Mr Turner, not to delete words from the preamble and we have reservations about changing Article 2 (6) in respect of the legal validity of translation.

We have basic reservations concerning Article 3 (1) and Article 4 (5). There are two reasons for objecting to Article 3 (1). The first is that it shifts the balance away from benefiting the insurer to the advantage of the party insured. What the person insured knows is a matter of fact, but what he should know is a matter of opinion: the opinion of someone else, who might not be particularly sympathetic. I am surprised that consumer representatives have not raised this point. The second is that this amendment moves away from the path to harmonization. National tribunals would give different judgments on the circumstances which should be made known to a party insured.

As regards Article 4 (5), it does not seem to us desirable to mix the principles of proportionality and causality. It is better to have one principle and to abide by it. We are, therefore, against this.

Having said this, I should, however, like to thank the Legal Affairs Committee for the long, difficult and valid work which it has undertaken, and so thank the Members of Parliament who have spoken in this debate and all the Members of Parliament who have been present during this sitting.

President. — I call Mr Turner.

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — Mr President. I would like to say first of all to Mr Fich and Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, who want a minimum directive, that they really cannot have that when one is harmonizing law. I am very grateful to Mr Janssen van Raay and Mr de Goede who pointed out that we have achieved in this committee a good balance between the two interests. I believe that is the basis of all our work. I would stress to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection that there is scope for elaboration by national law to protect consumers within the framework of this directive. What you cannot do is call it a minimum directive, otherwise you end up with nine different laws. You must have a common framework, but within that there is scope for further protection of consumers.

Of course I entirely agree with Mr Tyrrell when he says we want a comprehensive directive covering all insurance. That is absolutely right. That is one reason why I do not feel that one can allow proportionality to be an optional factor because you do not get harmonization when you have a vital part of the law optional to the parties.

As to Mr Natali, I am glad that he stressed balance rather than minimum or maximum. Minimum and

Turner

maximum are irrelevant in this directive; it is balance that we are looking for. I thank him for thanking us for the work we have done.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

Before I hand over the Chair to my colleague, Mr Gonella, I should like to take this opportunity to convey to him the hearty congratulations of this House on his 75th birthday. I think it is marvellous that he should be seeing out his birthday here.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR GONELLA

Vice-president

18. *Use of appropriations available within Section III of the budget of the Communities*

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Key, drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on the use of appropriations available under Items 1300 and 2400 of Section III of the general budget of the European Communities (Doc. 1-334/80).

Mr Key, rapporteur. — Mr President, may I wish you many happy returns of the day. Seventy-five years is a great number to reach. One would only wish there were seventy-five people in this Chamber tonight to listen to the debate.

Early last year a report concerning the representation expenditure of the Commission came to the attention of what was then the Control Subcommittee of the Committee on Budgets. That subcommittee wished that the matter be carefully considered in the full knowledge of the facts, and accordingly the Court of Auditors was called upon to give an opinion on the expenditure in question. The Court of Auditors issued an excellent report which provided excellent information, and the whole issue was examined thoroughly by the new Committee on Budgetary Control in September and November of last year. Indeed a special public meeting was held and the President of the Commission, Mr Jenkins, and Mr Tugendhat, the Commissioner responsible for budgetary matters, helped the committee in its work. In addition we had the excellent services of Mr Johannsen and Mr Mart of the Court of Auditors. This comprehensive report was put

before the House last December and the committee's findings were fully endorsed by this House.

Briefly, in our resolution we deplored the failure of some Members of the Commission to comply with the existing internal rules concerning mission expenses and entertainment allowances, as well as the lack of rules in many cases. We did however note, contrary to what was implied in many newspapers and press articles, that the vast bulk of expenditure in question was incurred correctly. We expected that sums drawn from the Community budget in circumstances which did not respect the operative rules would be repaid, and we undertook to pronounce further on the issues in a later report. Indeed the report before you tonight deals with these issues. In the discharge report in respect of the 1978 financial year which was considered in this House last May, Mr Battersby, the rapporteur, confirmed that the necessary repayments by Members of the Commission had indeed been made. He was able to do this following discussions with the Court of Auditors. Furthermore, I can say that the Committee on Budgetary Control is satisfied that the new rules are operating effectively. The committee has also checked the pace of expenditure in this area during the first four months of 1980 and found them to be reasonably acceptable. This latter verification was in line with a paragraph of the resolution adopted by the Parliament last December.

I would also remind the House that following a recommendation of the Committee on Budgetary Control, the amount available to Members of the Commission under Item 1300 for mission expenses was cut back by 37 000 EUAs and a ceiling was placed on expenditure for air taxis. These steps reduced the scope of any substantial misuse of appropriations on this line of the budget. Thus, both the House and the Committee on Budgetary Control acted in a comprehensive manner in responding to what was a delicate situation. The Committee on Budgetary Control followed up the matter at its meeting on 23 June this year when the Commission furnished a written and an oral statement on the pace of expenditure for the first four months of this year. Indeed, to quote one example which received a lot of publicity last year, namely the use of jet air taxis: in the comparable period in 1979 73 air-taxi flights were made. In the first four months of this year the number of flights was 21.

Finally, at its meeting of 10 June 1980 the Committee on Budgetary Control adopted the report which is before you this evening. I would direct the attention of the House to paragraph 7 of the explanatory statement. This paragraph explains why the committee considers that this specific issue can now be regarded as closed. However, there are two observations I would like to make.

The first is that I was surprised that a rather exaggerated and tendentious article about this affair should have appeared very recently in a well-known monthly

Key

magazine. I was extremely surprised that it did not mention anything about Parliament's role in this affair or the response of the Commission and Parliament. I know that the chairman of the committee, Mr Aigner, wrote to the editor of this journal to ask for a correction. The sad thing is that the reply from that editor is not satisfactory. I am afraid one of the big problems in this whole affair is that on many occasions certain members of what is termed the journalists' profession have exploited some of the more extravagant issues in this case and have not then followed it through to see what we did about it.

Secondly, and rather more seriously, I sincerely hope that we shall never again have a repeat of the situation which gave rise to the resolution of last December. If we should have a similar situation in future. I am convinced that this House would in fact table a motion of censure against the Commission or any other Institutions that abuse powers and public money. With those introductory remarks, Mr President, I recommend the report for the approval of the House.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) Mr President, first of all, please allow me to join in the good wishes which have been expressed to you. You know that I am doing this not only on behalf of the Commission, but because of my own personal friendship and admiration.

As regards Mr Key's report, I should like to say that, as has been said, during the last twelve months expenditure under Items 1300 and 3400 in respect of mission and entertainment expenses incurred by members of the Commission have been submitted to detailed examination by the Court of Auditors and Parliament's Committee on Budgetary Control. It is my pleasure to report that Mr Key, rapporteur of the Committee on Budgetary Control, is satisfied with the new rules applied to this type of expenditure and the way they are being strictly observed. The Commission will continue to do everything to ensure that they are scrupulously respected.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

19. *Discharge to be granted to the Management Board of the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training*

President. — The next item is the report by Mr Ryan, drawn up, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary

Control, on the discharge to be granted to the Management Board of the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training in respect of the implementation of its appropriations for the financial years 1975, 1976, 1977 and 1978 and the comments accompanying this decision (Doc. 1-344/80).

President. — I call Mr Ryan.

Mr Ryan, rapporteur. — Mr President, the report which I am now presenting on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control illustrates the way in which the committee follows up the implementation of the budget, to ensure that Community funds are spent in the manner which the House intended when adopting the budget. It concerns the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training. This centre has, of course, assumed dramatic relevance in these times, when, while there are over 3½ million young people unemployed in Europe, many enterprises operate below capacity because of the scarcity of skilled, trained personnel. Such massive unemployment of young people is socially scandalous, economically stupid and politically dangerous. This tragic situation should, therefore, focus our attention upon the great importance of the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training. With enlightened educational programmes, there could be a significant drop in unemployment and hope, instead of frustration and desperation, for many of our young citizens.

Although I draw attention to the relevance of the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training to Europe's current crisis, the House may be assured that the judgment which Mr Kellett-Bowman and I brought to bear on the Centre was not influenced by these considerations, because our mandate was confined to that of the Committee on Budgetary Control, which was to inquire into issues of financial management, and my comments will relate to them. By way of preface, however, I would wish, and I am sure I speak on behalf of the House, to pay tribute to the work and dedication of Dr Roger Furst, the director of the Centre, Mr Reeve, Mr Adams and all the other members of the staff. In order that in future the work of this centre may be better understood by Members of Parliament, and through them by the public, you will find in our report a recommendation that the Centre should be represented at meetings of the Committee on Budgetary Control and the Committee on Budgets when they are preparing the estimates for future years.

An interesting feature of the activities of the Community is the existence of a variety of satellites which carry out very specific tasks. The administrative and control arrangements for these bodies vary considerably. Some of them enjoy only limited autonomy within the aegis of the Commission, e.g. the Data-Processing Centre or the Official Publications Office, which carry

Ryan

out specialized tasks and are really part of the Commission structure, although for practical reasons they have operational freedom. On the other hand, there exist a number of full satellites which have their own financial regulation, separate budgetary provisions and significant independence of operation. My report concerns one such satellite, which is not only independent in its day-to-day operations but is also located at a considerable distance from Brussels, the principal working-place, and from other temporary working-places of the Community. I speak, of course, of the European Centre for Vocational Training in Berlin. To assist Members of Parliament and the public in general, my written explanatory statement runs to 46 pages. It describes the role of the Centre, its origins and the procedure which governs its operations. My oral contribution can therefore be brief. Moreover, my colleague and co-rapporteur, Mr Kellett-Bowman, who participated in the control visit to the Centre, will undoubtedly have much more pertinent and worthwhile comments to make.

As Parliament is aware, the Committee on Budgetary Control's function is to see that the funds are spent as intended by the budgetary authority, that there are no irregular procedures or infringements of proper accounting methods and that there is no inefficiency, extravagance or waste in the use of the Community taxpayer's money. On the basis of the on-the-spot inquiries which Mr Edward Kellett-Bowman and I made and the reports of the former Audit Board and the Court of Auditors, my report recommends the grant of a discharge to the Centre in respect of its use of appropriations for four financial years: 1975, 1976, 1977 and 1978.

The report includes one of the rather rare actions that Parliament can take, and that is a decision; we also append a resolution of recommendations.

A discharge decision, a decision uniquely within the competence of Parliament, is important for two reasons — firstly, because it paves the way for a positive approach to the consideration of future appropriations, such as the appropriation for 1981, and secondly because refusal of a discharge would amount to a motion of censure and, conversely, granting a discharge constitutes a vote of confidence. From the point of view of parliamentary control the report amounts to a catching-up operation. A discharge has not been granted in earlier years, largely because of certain concerns over growing pains or teething troubles experienced by the Centre in its initial period of operation.

I would like to emphasize that there was never any evidence of any irregularity and the concerns were about a certain lack of conformity to Community practices. All these have now been cleared up satisfactorily.

I should like to draw the attention of my colleagues to the questionnaire and answers in Annex II, which

furnishes a great deal of information about the Centre's administration.

The conclusions of the Committee on Budgetary Control call for a number of changes that would enhance the role of Parliament, make financial procedures more transparent and enable the Centre to operate in a flexible and effective manner. I believe their justifications are self-evident. Their adoption would result in a strengthening of the powers of Parliament and an improvement in democratic control and responsibility.

I refer to the standardization of the final grant of discharge and the budgetary authority's control over significant transfers. The motivation for these changes is in accordance with the financial disciplines already adopted by this House with regard to the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, located in Dublin. The paragraphs regarding staff recruitment and mobility and the need to safeguard flexibility of operation and the importance of improved contacts between Parliament and the Centre are, I trust, well argued and accepted. The issues of cost-effectiveness and the use of data-processing equipment, which was a matter of some concern to the Budgetary Control Committee, will be gone into later when the committee receives the next report of the Court of Auditors.

With these comments, Mr President, I recommend the adoption of the report to the House.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) Mr President, the Commission is grateful to Mr Ryan for his proposal for a discharge decision for the implementation of appropriations for the European Centre in Berlin. I must, however, say as regards the resolution that I have some comments to make both on the motion for a resolution and on the report presented this evening by Mr Ryan. Firstly, the Commission is invited to present a written report before 1 February on the measures taken in the light of the observations accompanying the discharge decision. I would be grateful to you, Mr Ryan, if — in consideration of the short period of time available for drafting such a report — in accordance with Article 74 (2) of the financial provisions for the Centre you would make this request directly to the Management Board of the Centre as regards the recommendations which directly concern it. As regards the discharge decision, I agree with Mr Ryan that the special financial regulation applicable to the Centre no longer applies as it does not take account of the fact that the granting of a discharge now falls exclusively within the terms of reference of the European Parliament. We, Mr Ryan, are preparing a proposal to amend this regulation.

Natali

Unfortunately, I regret that I cannot accept the other two proposals put forward by the rapporteur on the special financial regulation. Firstly, it is not appropriate to insert this special financial regulation in the general financial regulation, which is at the basis of the implementation of the general budget. This is because the Centre has its own budget, completely separate from the general budget, which is drawn up and adopted by the management committee according to special rules. Secondly, you regret the fact that transfers within the budget of the Centre do not require the approval of Parliament. I should like to make it clear that the present system under which the Commission decides on matters of transfers within the budget of the Centre was adopted by the European Parliament on 6 April 1976. The reason for this procedure is that the subsidy for the Centre is entered under a single article of the general budget, Article 3010, and the financial regulation for the general budget makes provision for a decision by the European Parliament only in the case of transfers of appropriations between the chapters of the general budget. Mr Ryan's proposal would jeopardize the unity of the financial regulation.

As regards the problem of recruitment, the Staff Regulations of the Centre lay down specific procedures for recruitment which are different from the provisions of the Staff Regulations of the Commission of the European Community. The Commission believes that staff should be recruited in accordance with special rules as the staff in question work for organs run by a tripartite management board and, therefore, do not fall within the terms of reference of the Community institutions. If Parliament's resolution on the recruitment of non-specialized staff were implemented on this matter the staff of the Centre would become Community officials, and there would be a fundamental change in the nature of the Centre and its organization which would make it, in effect, a branch of the Directorate-General of the Commission. As for the specialized staff, I should like to remind you that the Director is responsible for their recruitment. In consequence, the Commission does not intend to propose changing the Staff Regulations on this point.

Finally, we approve the proposal made under point 9 to invite Centre representatives to take part in meetings of the parliamentary committee. I consider that it is normal and desirable for the directors of the Centre to provide the Members of Parliament concerned with explanations about their work programme.

President. — I call Mrs Gaiotti De Biase.

Mrs Gaiotti De Biase. — (I) Mr President, colleagues, I should not like to be responsible for delaying the celebrations for your 75th birthday by speaking more than is necessary.

If I have asked to speak on this report, it is in order to raise a problem on which I know my opinions are shared by the chairman and members of the Committee on Youth. This is not the time to state our conviction, expressed more than once, of the importance of the role which the Centre for Vocational Training in Berlin has, and could further develop, and of the need for a Community training policy which could include the Centre's programme.

I am speaking because of an omission — probably involuntary — on the part of the rapporteur, as the Committee on Youth would have liked to be asked for its opinion in advance. Paragraph 9 of the motion for a resolution proposes that the Centre may be asked to give its views and invited to participate in meetings of the competent committees of the European Parliament; but in paragraph 18 of the explanatory statement, the only two committees referred to are the Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. This is not the first time the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport has had to complain of a want of interest on the part of Parliament which, after having set it up, seems to have forgotten its existence. The problems of vocational training are not only social, but also involve general aspects of training, teaching choices and choices concerning youth policy and culture. I trust that the rapporteur will have no difficulty amending paragraph 18 of the explanatory statement to this effect.

President. — I call Mr Kellett-Bowman.

Mr Kellett-Bowman. — Mr President, it is unusual for this committee to have its reports discussed in the House before 11 p.m. — we usually burn the midnight oil. I think some people are under the impression that budget control is a dark science and cannot stand the light of day. However, tonight is an improvement.

(Laughter)

Now, in conjunction with Mr Ryan I looked at certain features of operations in the Centre. My particular interests were data processing and the cost-effectiveness aspect. Data processing has economic and industrial implications of vital interest to Western Europe. There is a need to ensure, at Community level, that everything possible is done to secure effective coordination, at least at the institutional level. This is a subject to which we will return in this House when we have further reports from the Court of Auditors. While mentioning them, I should like to thank them for all the help they have given Mr Ryan and myself and all the help they generally provide for the committee's work.

I cannot sit down, Mr President, without replying to something that Mr Natali said just now. He was talk-

Kellett-Bowman

ing about the financial regulations and the fact that we in the Committee on Budgetary Control feel that the general financial regulations of the Community are paramount and superior to any others that may be lying around in the Community and that it was to this end that we made this report.

I think Mrs Gaiotti de Biase will be pleased to hear that the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment intends to visit Berlin before the turn of this year and while there to go and look at the Centre. The Committee on Budgetary Control is also very happy about that. We do not think that we should be the only contact between Parliament and these satellite and decentralized bodies. I hope we will be able to complete our political control work on the various satellites in the years ahead and place them on a sound footing.

Mr President, the committee and the House are very lucky that someone of the calibre of Mr Ryan has been able to concentrate on this work. I think his report is a valuable control document and I commend the discharge to the House.

President. — I call Mr Ryan.

Mr Ryan, rapporteur. — I have no desire to detain you, Mr President, and in making this comment I attach no blame whatsoever to Mr Natali, who has so many topics to cover. However, if he looks at the latest edition of the report, paragraph 1, he will find that Parliament requests the Commission to furnish the report by 1 February next, and not 1 November, as he stated in his speech to the House. I trust that the additional three months will give the Commission adequate time to report to the House.

Finally, I feel that it is a pity he spoiled your birthday, Mr President, by not generously conceding all the points made by Parliament. I know that, personally, he would have wished to do so, and we look forward to a better response on the next occasion.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

20. *Agenda for next sitting*

President. — The next sitting will take place at 9 a.m. tomorrow, Friday, 19 September 1980 with the following agenda.

- Decision on requests for urgency
- Second Blaney report on the common organization of the market in flax and hemp
- Joint debate on three motions for resolutions on Community aid to the departments of Guadeloupe and Martinique devastated by Hurricane Allen
- Joint debate on two motions for resolutions on fisheries
- Motion for a resolution on the persecution of the members of the Bahai Community in Iran
- Joint debate on two motions for resolutions on events in Bolivia
- Motion for a resolution on protecting the site of Tyre
- Motion for a resolution on the termination of Mrs Maria Antonietta Macciocchi's appointment with the French University
- D'Angelosante report on Petition No 1/79

10.30 a.m.: Voting time

After this time: The motions for resolutions will be put to the vote after the closure of each debate.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 10.55 p.m.)

ANNEX

AMENDMENTS

relating to the motion for a resolution on the
European Community's contribution to the
campaign to eliminate hunger in the world



Motion for a resolution on the European
Community's contribution to the campaign to
eliminate hunger in the world

(Doc. 1-341/80)

Amendment No 6

tabled by Mr Bersani, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Michel, Mr Narducci, Mrs Rabbethge, Mr Vergeer and Mr Wawrzik
on behalf of the EPP Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

After the first recital, insert the following new recital:

- declaring its willingness to make available, on the occasion of the budget discussions, one per cent of the total budget appropriation over and above the sums entered by the Commission for 'cooperation with the developing countries' (Title 9), by way of emergency relief to combat hunger in the world,

* * *

Amendment No 7

tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Preamble, last indent

Delete the words:

'... and of the deterioration ...'

* * *

Amendment No 8

tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 1

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '1. Affirms that the campaign against hunger is a moral imperative for all the more fortunate and wealthy nations;

* * *

Amendment No 9
 tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 3

Indent (a) to read as follows:

- '(a) to draw up a coherent series of measures for the campaign against hunger, taking account of the global North-South negotiations and the adoption by the UN of a strategy for the Third Development Decade,'

* * *

Amendment No 10
 tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 4

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '4. Considers that the Community's primary aim in combating hunger must be to help each developing country to achieve a position in which it has sufficient food to feed its own population, either from its own agricultural resources or from its ability to pay for imported food,'

* * *

Amendment No 11
 tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 5

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '5. Emphasizes, in this connection, the need to step up efforts to establish a new and more equitable system of international relations which will ensure that a higher proportion of the world's resources are devoted to creating wealth and abolishing under-nourishment,'

* * *

Amendment No 12
 tabled by Mr Fergusson
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 5a (new)

After paragraph 5, insert the following new paragraph:

- '5a. Deplores the unparalleled amounts spent by the USSR on its arms budget which obliges the aid-giving nations in self-defence to divert huge resources which could otherwise be used to help the hungry and developing countries more fully;'

* * *

Amendment No 13/corr.
tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 13a (new)

After paragraph 31, insert the following new paragraph:

- '31a. Requests that urgent action be taken to increase the percentage of food aid given by Member States through Community channels, so that this should become the normal method of giving such assistance;'

* * *

Amendment No 14
tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 10a (new)

After paragraph 10, insert the following new paragraph:

- '10a. Urges the oil-producing countries to draw up amongst themselves a series of agreed measures which they intend to take in order to cushion the effects of the price of oil on the countries of the Third World which is *widening* the gap between the rich and the poor of the world;'

* * *

Amendment No 15
tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 14

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '14. Requests the Commission and Council, in order to help increase the transfer of resources to the rural development of the developing countries, to enter a substantial sum in the 1981 budget for the revival and strengthening of the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) under proper conditions of control and supervision;'

* * *

Amendment No 16
 tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 16
 Delete this paragraph

* * *

Amendment No 17
 tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 18
 This paragraph to read as follows:

- '18. Considers that all contributions by the Community towards agricultural and rural development should be conceived within the framework of the economic growth strategies adopted by the individual recipient developing countries, in particular:
- to orient production structures more closely to internal requirements without, however, disregarding the importance of exports for the development process;
 - to encourage the development of rural areas on the basis of integrated programmes designed to develop agriculture, create craft and agri-industrial activities and improve services and infrastructures, and to do so in a manner which ensures a balanced distribution of the population throughout the country concerned;

* * *

Amendment No 18
 tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 28a (new)
 After paragraph 28, insert the following new paragraph:

- '28a. Expresses the hope that, in drawing up aid programmes with recipient countries, the Commission will pay particular attention to the importance of providing adequate water supplies to meet the needs of the population;'

* * *

Amendment No 19
 tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 31
 Delete this paragraph

* * *

Amendment No 20
tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 33

This paragraph to read as follows:

'33. Asks the Council and Commission to consider the possibility of establishing emergency reserves of food aid in developing countries, and to determine the most suitable centres and methods of control over these stocks;'

* * *

Amendment No 21
tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 44

Add a new indent (c) to read as follows:

(c) the effect of European imports of food from developing countries on the latter's balance of payments;'

* * *

Amendment No 22
tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 46

This paragraph to read as follows:

'46. Calls on the Commission and Council to consider, within the framework of the Community's existing agreements in this field, taking early action:

(a) . . . ;'

(rest unchanged)

* * *

Amendment No 23
tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 52

This paragraph to read as follows:

'52. As envisaged in paragraph 32 above, requests the Community to take an active part in the preparations for . . . ;'

(rest unchanged)

* * *

Amendment No 24
tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 53

This paragraph to read as follows:

'53. Agrees that there is an urgent need for international guidelines governing the activities of multinational companies; draws attention to the guidelines already agreed by the OECD countries; requests the governments of the Member States to give explicit instructions to their representatives so that the work in progress in the United Nations and its agencies may soon produce concrete results following the lines already laid down by the OECD.'

* * *

Amendment No 25
tabled by Mr Ferrero

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 41

This paragraph to read as follows:

'41. Calls on the Council and Commission to make every effort to ensure that the Food Aid Convention is renewed when it expires in July 1981 and that the quantities to be provided are adequately increased.'

* * *

Amendment No 26/rev.
tabled by Mr C. Jackson

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 3

Paragraph 3 to read as follows:

'3. Requests the Council and Commission on the basis of the following guidelines and proposals:
— to draw up a coherent series of measures for the campaign against hunger, taking account of the global North-South negotiations and of the adoption by the UN of a programme for the Third Development Decade, in the form of a long-term strategy for aid, which concentrates on the poorest regions and on rural development.'

* * *

Amendment No 28
tabled by Mr C. Jackson

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 4a (new)

After paragraph 4, insert the following new paragraph:

- "4a. Notes that Lomé III is the most advanced agreement of its kind in the world, but believes the Community should plan for a more broadly based relationship including other developing countries in the future;"

* * *

Amendment No 29
tabled by Mr C. Jackson

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 7a (new)

After paragraph 7, insert the following new paragraph:

- "7a. Believes that in the short term the Community can best concentrate its internal efforts on improving the effectiveness of its aid, including the provision of technical and educational assistance;"

* * *

Amendment No 30
tabled by Mr C. Jackson

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 7b (new)

After paragraph 7, insert the following new paragraph:

- "7b. Requests the Commission to institute, as a matter of priority, an external, objective review of the proven effectiveness or otherwise, of the general aid methods in use, with particular reference to the promotion of rural development and increasing food production;"

* * *

Amendment No 31
tabled by Mr C. Jackson

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 8

This paragraph to read as follows:

- "8. Resolves to give further study to, and to report on, the balance between Community-financed aid and Member State bilateral aid;"

* * *

Amendment No 32
tabled by Mr C. Jackson

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 13a (new)

After paragraph 13, insert the following new paragraph:

'13a. Requests the Commission to reconsider its aid criteria in the light of Parliament's resolutions, debates and reports on world hunger, and to make an explicit statement of the criteria employed in granting aid.'

* * *

Amendment No 33
tabled by Mr C. Jackson

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 13b (new)

After paragraph 13, insert the following new paragraph:

'13b. Believes that where regimes that do not respect human rights are concerned, aid should be restricted to food aid, medical aid and possibly rural development aid. All such aid should go directly to those in need of assistance, and its distribution closely monitored.'

* * *

Amendment No 34
tabled by Mr C. Jackson

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 13c (new)

After paragraph 13, insert the following new paragraph:

'13c. Considers that, subject to giving priority to the poorest regions, aid should preferentially be provided to those countries that not only use it for the purpose for which it is intended, but also use it effectively. In this context, the Community should insist on greater freedom of inspection, making use of the Court of Auditors where required.'

* * *

Amendment No 35
tabled by Mr C. Jackson

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 13d (new)

After paragraph 13, insert the following new paragraph:

'13d. Requests the Commission to give greater priority to ex-post evaluation, which can confirm the true value of aid and lead to significant improvements in the effectiveness of aid.'

* * *

Amendment No 36
tabled by Mr C. Jackson

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 14a (new)

After paragraph 14, insert the following new paragraph:

'14a. Believes that private investment also has a valuable role to play in the development process, and resolves to give further study to, and to report on, measures to encourage private investment in developing countries;'

* * *

Amendment No 37
tabled by Mr C. Jackson

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 14b (new)

After paragraph 14, insert the following new paragraph:

'14b. Considers that European Community aid for family planning and population control may be an important aspect of the campaign to eliminate hunger, and resolves to carry out a further study and to report on this;'

* * *

Amendment No 38
tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 53a (new)

After paragraph 53, insert the following new paragraph:

'53a. Resolves to give further study to the encouragement of private investment in developing countries;'

* * *

Amendment No 39
tabled by Mr Johnson

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 24a (new)

After paragraph 24, insert the following new paragraph:

'24a. Considers that the problems of population growth in many developing countries exacerbate the pressures on food supplies and other resources and therefore calls for greater support by the European Community as such, and by the Member States, to countries requesting assistance in the field of health and family planning, such assistance to be given either through bilateral aid programmes or by increased contributions to multilateral aid agencies such as the World Health Organization and the United Nations Fund for Population Activities;'

* * *

Amendment No 51
tabled by Mr Fanti

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

After the last recital insert the following new indent:

‘— deeply disturbed by the failure of the extraordinary session of the UN General Assembly to reach an agreement on the ‘global North-South negotiations’;

* * *

Amendment No 54
tabled by Mrs Squarcialupi
on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 24a (new)

After paragraph 24, insert the following new paragraph:

‘24a. Requests the Commission:

- (a) to extend the interventions of the European Development Fund beyond infrastructure and supplies of medical equipment to cover the training of staff specialized in the pharmacological and contraception problems encountered in specific areas of the world, if necessary in cooperation with the World Health Organization and other agencies;
- (b) to make a study of the present-day market in medicines in Third World countries, the prices of the products and the possibilities of commencing independent production — at least of certain medicines — so as to begin a gradual disengagement from international markets;
- (c) to encourage further by means of suitable action programmes Community producers and others to undertake research into medicines and vaccines which will cure and prevent endemic diseases;
- (d) to seek out new forms of cooperation in the implementation of health education programmes, including family planning, especially amongst women since they can have an important influence on the health of the population particularly by helping to reduce infant mortality;
- (e) to encourage greater support by the Community as such, and by the Member States, to countries requesting assistance in the field of health and family planning, such assistance to be given either through bilateral aid programmes or by increased contributions to multilateral aid agencies such as the World Health Organization and the United Nations Fund for Population Activities;

* * *

Amendment No 55
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Preamble, fourth indent

Replace this indent with the following:

‘— whereas there are more than thirty million victims of every age-group of this cynical destruction and their number, according to World Bank estimates, will increase at an exponential rate over the next few years;’

* * *

Amendment No 56
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Preamble, fifth indent

This indent to read as follows:

- '— whereas hunger and malnutrition are not an ineradicable biblical scourge, but one of the consequences of the underdevelopment of the countries of the Third World and of the extreme poverty suffered above all by the rural populations of those countries;'

* * *

Amendment No 57
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Preamble, sixth indent

Replace this indent with the following:

- '— whereas the moral duty to solve the problem of hunger in the world does not diminish the urgency of the problem; whereas, on the contrary, the continuing extermination through hunger and malnutrition of scores of millions of human beings constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security because of the dangerous concentration in vast areas of the world of suffering and misery that has not been slow and will not be slow to create an explosive situation;'

* * *

Amendment No 58
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

After the sixth indent add the following new indent:

- '— convinced of the need to make it obligatory to intervene in cases where failure to do so would be tantamount to failure to come to the assistance of a person in danger and that the right of peoples to self-determination cannot and must not be construed as a right of governments arbitrarily to decide the fate of their peoples;'

* * *

Amendment No 59
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

After the sixth indent add the following new indent:

- '— whereas according to UNICEF records, out of the 15 million children who each year die of hunger and malnutrition in the world, 13 million would not die if they were born in an industrialized country;'

* * *

Amendment No 60
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

After the sixth indent add the following new indent:

- '— whereas the technical measures capable of guaranteeing the survival of scores of millions of human beings already virtually on the point of death are many, varied and well-known, as are the measures that would permit the economic development of the Third and Fourth Worlds.'

* * *

Amendment No 61
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

After the sixth indent add the following new indent:

- '— recalling the Universal Declaration on the final elimination of hunger and malnutrition, adopted by all the member countries of the International Community at the World Food Conference of 16 November 1974.'

* * *

Amendment No 62
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 1

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '1. Reaffirms that the right to be free from hunger is an inalienable right of the human being; declares that it is the duty of the European Community to contribute to the effective exercise of this right by all mankind, as affirmed in the 'Pact on economic, social and cultural rights', adopted on 16 December 1966 and ratified by many of the governments of the Community Member States.'

* * *

Amendment No 63
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 2

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '2. Solemnly requests the Council, the Commission and the governments of the member countries:
 - (a) to make the elimination of hunger and malnutrition the primary objective of the entire development cooperation policy,

- (b) to adapt, at the very next meeting of the ACP-EEC Council of Ministers and Consultative Assembly, the technical and financial cooperation machinery provided for by the Second Convention of Lomé to the objective specified in point (a),
- (c) to direct the entire Community effort, within the framework of the global North-South negotiations scheduled for January 1981 in New York, towards attaining the objective specified in point (a);'

* * *

Amendment No 64
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 2a (new)

After paragraph 2 insert the following new paragraph:

- '2a. Deeply regrets that the United Nations special session devoted to the formulation of a strategy for the Third Development Decade and to an examination of the North-South dialogue was wrecked by the intransigence of a few industrialized States which used electoral considerations and hair-splitting technical arguments to block the adoption of a document on practical international measures to eliminate hunger and malnutrition;'

* * *

Amendment No 65
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 3

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '3. Requests the Council, the Commission and the governments of the member countries to take account of the proposals set forth below for the purpose of defining a comprehensive Community strategy for the campaign against hunger and malnutrition and to adopt them as the EEC joint position at the forthcoming North-South Conference responsible for coordinating and conducting the 1981 global negotiations;'

* * *

Amendment No 66
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 4

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '4. Considers the principal cause of the present extermination of populations through hunger and malnutrition to be the absence in the governments of the 'rich' countries and many of the developing countries of the political determination needed to tackle the problem by means of a package of practical and coordinated measures capable of increasing agricultural and food production in the developing countries and of securing a more balanced international market, greater price stability and an improvement in the purchasing power of the populations suffering extreme poverty;'

* * *

Amendment No 67
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 5

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '5. Considers the elimination of hunger and malnutrition to be the central problem facing the international community; accordingly calls upon the Council, the Commission, the new member countries, all the other Eastern and Western industrialized countries and the oil-producing countries to step up their efforts to secure a doubling or a tripling of harvest yields in the tropical and sub-tropical regions, where death from starvation is a daily reality, in order to achieve the objective of self-sufficiency in food supplies for the individual and for the population as a whole;'

* * *

Amendment No 68
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 6

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '6. Considers that military expenditure and exports of arms should be among the primary sources from which the internal 0.7 % is found; therefore invites the Commission to study the practical possibilities of setting up at European level a 'VAT against hunger' on the territory of the nine Member States and to submit a report within six months of the adoption of this resolution;'

* * *

Amendment No 69
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 6a (new)

After paragraph 6 insert the following new paragraph:

- '6a. Instructs the Commission to study a proposal for converting the assembly lines of war material and other related products in the sector of development cooperation and to report to it on the subject within six months of the adoption of this resolution;'

* * *

Amendment No 70
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 7

This paragraph to read as follows:

7. Urges the Member States of the EEC to attain the objective of contributing at least 0.7 % of the GNP in public development aid by 1983 and 1 % by 1990 by means of a system of binding deadlines agreed at Community level;
- also invites the Member States to allocate, this year, the difference between their present contribution to public development aid and the rate laid down in United Nations General Assembly resolution No 2626 (0.7 %) to special measures to combat hunger and malnutrition coordinated at Community level;

* * *

Amendment No 71
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 7a (new)

After paragraph 7 insert the following new paragraph:

- 7a. Urges the Council, the Commission and the governments of the Member States to accord priority in their public development aid to:
- the financing of projects to reduce poverty and hunger by increasing the production of foodstuffs for internal consumption, especially in the less-developed countries,
 - the financing of energy sources and mineral resources;

* * *

Amendment No 72
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 7b (new)

After paragraph 7 insert the following new paragraph:

- 7b. Urges the Member States of the EEC to divorce public development aid from internal political and economic interests and to allocate the equivalent of at least 0.7 % of the GNP to development aid and the elimination of hunger rather than to military aid or other national security measures;

* * *

Amendment No 73
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 7c (new)

After paragraph 7 insert the following new paragraph:

- 7c. Appeals to the peoples and governments of the industrialized countries in both east and west and to the oil-producing countries to contribute, by allocating at least 0.7 % of their GNP to public development aid, to that major international financing drive which, as mentioned in the Brandt report, is the only means of reducing the number of deaths from hunger or malnutrition;

* * *

Amendment No 74
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 9

Add the following to this paragraph:

'9. ...; hopes therefore that the negotiations on the guidelines for the reorganization of the international public debt by the countries concerned will be concluded as quickly as possible and in keeping with the general principles adopted by the UNCTAD Trade and Development Board in resolution 165 (S-IX) of 11 March 1978;

the following special measures should be taken:

- the parties concerned should give consideration to writing off the debts, both public and private, of the 25 poorest and least-developed countries, and an international compensation organization could intervene to offset the more important losses suffered by the creditor countries;
- the automatic writing-off of debts will form part of lending agreements in order to protect the developing countries concerned from any unforeseen deterioration in external conditions outside their control;

* * *

Amendment No 75
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 9a (new)

After paragraph 9 insert the following new paragraph:

'9a. Considers that writing off the debts of all the less-favoured developing countries could make good the shortfall in public financial aid for development until the donor countries comply in full with the obligation to contribute at least 0.7 % of their GNP; in other words, a country which currently contributes only 0.3 % in public development aid should each year cancel a proportion of its credit to the less-favoured countries equivalent to the difference between what it contributes and what it should contribute;

* * *

Amendment No 76
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 10

This paragraph to read as follows:

'10. Requests the Council, the Commission and the Member States to expedite the immediate adoption of measures to deal with the developing countries' balance of payments deficits, which this year amount to more than \$ 70 000 million; considers in particular that international finance organizations should increase their support so as to enable commitments and loans to the developing countries to grow steadily and consequently proposes:

- that the capital of the World Bank be doubled so as to allow its capacity to grant loans and other facilities to be increased four-fold,
- that the number of IMF quotas be increased so as to enable a contribution to be made to the financial aid granted to low-income countries with a balance of food

payments deficit to allow them to meet the cost of food imports, particularly in view of their domestic shortages and the increased prices of imported goods, which make these additional food-financing facilities necessary;

* * *

Amendment No 77
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 10a (new)

Insert the following new paragraph after paragraph 10:

'10a. Draws attention to the fact that the policies of the international and monetary organizations and their programmes for action in favour of individual states or regions must conform fully to the priorities and objectives fixed by the international community in the UN General Assembly and its subsidiary bodies;'

* * *

Amendment No 78
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 10b (new)

Insert the following new paragraph after paragraph 10:

'10b. Considers that, in addition to the financial organizations for development cooperation which already exist, there should be an international institution solely to help the poorest peoples and countries and that it should not be dependent on contributions from individual States;

hopes therefore that a World Development Fund, as described in the Brandt report, should be set up with the power to take binding decisions, this power to be shared equally by industrialized countries and developing countries;

this Fund should be financed from an 'international development tax' on international trade, and particularly the trade in arms, on arms production, on the exploitation of the marine resources of the oceans and on the other riches held in common by mankind;'

* * *

Amendment No 79
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 10c (new)

Insert the following new paragraph after paragraph 10:

'10c. Furthermore, all countries, and in particular those states having nuclear weapons and other countries with large-scale military forces, should gradually reduce their military spending by common agreement and reinvest the money at present spent on armaments in the campaign against extermination through hunger and malnutrition;'

* * *

Amendment No 80
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 11
Delete this paragraph

* * *

Amendment No 81
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 12a (new)
Insert the following new paragraph after paragraph 12:

'12a. Considers that, while the agricultural development and self-sufficiency in food of the developing countries are indeed priority objectives, technical and financial support must be given in the meantime to measures which will facilitate the distribution and the direct consumption of food by large masses of the developing countries' populations, particularly the most vulnerable groups;'

* * *

Amendment No 82
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 13
This paragraph to read as follows:

'13. Hopes that, at the UN Conference on Least-Favoured Countries scheduled for 1981, the Member States will insist on the need to develop the economies of the poorest and weakest countries to encourage the forms of development which produce greater self-sufficiency, to accelerate progress in agriculture and industry and to ensure a fairer distribution of national income;'

* * *

Amendment No 83
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 13a (new)
Insert the following new paragraph after paragraph 13:

'13a. Calls on every industrialized country that has not already done so to undertake to provide a minimum of 0.15 % of its GNP in public aid to the least-developed countries by 1985 and 0.20 % by the end of the decade;'

* * *

Amendment No 84
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 13b (new)

Insert the following new paragraph after paragraph 13:

'13b. Wishes to see the creation of a programme of emergency action and medium and long-term measures in favour of the areas of absolute poverty in Africa and Asia; the programme should provide additional aid amounting to \$ 4 000 million per annum over the next two decades in the form of grants or other types of assistance to underwrite projects concerned with regional planning, eradicating the diseases most closely connected with poverty, improving conditions of hygiene and the quality of drinking water, reafforestation, the development of solar energy, prospecting for oil and minerals, and investment in industry, transport and infrastructures;

* * *

Amendment No 85

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 14a (new)

Insert the following new paragraph after paragraph 14:

'14a. Points to the lack of knowledge in Europe about the problems and tragedies of extermination through famine and malnutrition and instructs the Commission to study the possibility of creating programmes and documentation centres to provide education on development and underdevelopment particularly for people of school age and to present a report within six months of the adoption of the present resolution;

* * *

Amendment No 86
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Sub-heading (b)

This heading to read as follows:

'(b) *with regard to food production and the campaign against hunger in the developing countries: national plans for agricultural development*'.

* * *

Amendment No 87
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 15

This paragraph to read as follows:

'15. Takes the view that, in order to meet the increased investment in the developing countries' agricultural sector, the industrialized countries and international financial institu-

tions ought to take the measures needed to increase the flow of public aid finance to the developing countries;

the developing countries' requirement is estimated to be \$ 8 300 million at 1975 prices and should reach \$ 13 000 million by 1990 (at 1975 prices);'

* * *

Amendment No 88
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 17, first indent

This indent to read as follows:

- '— provide further appropriate financial assistance commensurate with the needs and based, *inter alia*, on multiannual financing measures and financing provided jointly with Member States or international organizations;'

* * *

Amendment No 89
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 17a (new)

Insert the following new paragraph after paragraph 17:

'17a. Considers

- that increased production or a greater volume of food aid will not be sufficient to overcome the problem of hunger; the principal cause is the poverty of the populations it afflicts, particularly those in the countryside: it therefore understands that, while the food may be there, the people may not have the money to buy it,
- that a system of direct grants to the starving in the form of the allocation and rationing of locally produced food is the road to be explored in the hope of finding a solution to the problem,
- that one of the most important duties of the international community will be to support projects providing food aid to consumers and other schemes for direct distribution on a wide scale as a means of increasing food production by boosting consumption amongst the poorest and most hungry;'

* * *

Amendment No 90
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 18, second indent

This indent to read as follows:

- '— to orientate production structures to domestic requirements as a matter of priority, reducing, if need be, the area under crops for export until an adequate degree of self-sufficiency in food is reached;'

* * *

Amendment No 91
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 19

The beginning of this paragraph to read as follows:

'19. Stresses the importance for agricultural and rural development and for the campaign against hunger of such factors as: (rest unchanged);'

* * *

Amendment No 92
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 20

This paragraph to read as follows:

'20. Considers that agrarian reform is essential in the majority of developing countries to ensure greater productivity, increase the incomes of the least-favoured social groups and eradicate hunger and malnutrition;

to this effect particular attention will have to be given to agricultural research and storage and the use of fertilizers and other products;

considers nonetheless that this reform must take shape from within and that it would be presumptuous to want to export models for development which are those of one particular civilization to all parts of the world;'

* * *

Amendment No 93
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 21

Add the following:

'21.; requests the Council and Commission to direct part of the Community's technical and financial assistance towards this type of project and to increase the Community's aid to NGOs;'

* * *

Amendment No 94
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 22

This paragraph to read as follows:

'22. Draws attention to the invaluable role played by training and education and calls on the Community to give priority to programmes and practical schemes concerned with

vocational training in relation to economic development and the campaign against hunger and malnutrition in the developing countries; in particular finance should be made available for a system of intermediate and specialized technical schooling since this is the sector which is least adequate; the Community's delegations in the ACP and other developing countries would seem the most suitable centres for giving the necessary stimulus and finance to this end as well as any technical and logistic support which may be needed;

* * *

Amendment No 95
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 24

Add the following:

'; requests the Council and Commission to cooperate with the ACP countries within the institutions operating under the Second Lomé Convention with a view to attaining an acceptable level of health in the associated developing countries by the time the Convention has expired; asks in particular that an adequate first aid system should be set up as the nucleus of a more general system of health care including improvements in nutrition, living standards and the most essential infrastructures;

* * *

Amendment No 96
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 27a (new)

After paragraph 27, insert the following new paragraph:

'27a. Calls upon the Council and Commission to study, in consultation with the ACP countries, an early warning project for the prevention of famine capable of contributing in good time to the material relief of the populations concerned;

* * *

Amendment No 97
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 29

This paragraph to read as follows:

'29. Draws attention to the vast quantities of food which are lost after the harvests, *10 % of cereals and 30 % of fruit and vegetables according to the figures of the World Food Council*, and requests the Commission and Council:

- (a) in the context of rural development cooperation policy, to provide for practical measures designed to improve harvesting techniques and the arrangements for storage and conservation, particularly with regard to cereals,

- (b) to introduce *ad hoc* training programmes to help ensure that use is made of these measures on a large scale, and
- (c) to *study an overall plan to combat trypanosomiasis;*'

* * *

Amendment No 98
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 31

Replace paragraph 31 with the following new text:

- '31. Believes that EEC food aid and more generally the whole of the Community's food aid policy and that of the nine individual member countries should be profoundly changed to take account of the real and practical needs of the peoples concerned rather than of the requirements of the governments and the ruling classes of the majority of the developing countries; aid should be channelled to where it is really needed, when it is needed; it must reach its destination and be efficiently distributed to all of the people threatened by hunger and malnutrition;'

* * *

Amendment No 99
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 31a (new)

Insert the following new paragraph:

- '31a. Asks the Commission to consider the possibility of inverting the existing ratio between the quantities set aside for food aid and those for emergency food aid with the aim not so much of contributing to the equilibrium of the balance of payments of the countries receiving 'normal' food aid, but of being able to intervene effectively to help the peoples directly concerned when an emergency arises;'

* * *

Amendment No 100
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 31b (new)

Insert the following new paragraph:

- '31b. Is aware of the damaging results which food aid often produces among the beneficiary peoples, discouraging local production and creating dependence which can prove harmful in the long run and, while recognizing the continuing importance of a rational food aid policy accompanied by financial efforts to achieve self-sufficiency in food for the peoples concerned, wishes in the long term to see the concept of 'food aid' transformed into that of 'nutritional aid', aid to help them feed themselves; the notion of 'malnutrition' too often takes second place to that of 'under-nourishment' and this aid should be used to create nutritional rehabilitation centres, thus saving those millions of people who die each year not so much from lack of food as from a chronically poor diet;'

* * *

Amendment No 101
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 32

Replace the phrase after the words 'developing countries' with the following new text:

'... and requests that the appropriations entered in the budget under the title for food aid in cereals be doubled in relation to those granted in 1980 and be used as a matter of preference for emergency food aid;'

* * *

Amendment No 102
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 32a (new)

Insert the following new paragraph:

'32a. Calls upon the Commission, in cooperation with the representatives of the Member States, to assess case by case with the developing countries concerned the balance between internal production, food imports and food exports within the framework of an overall planning of supplies and thus determine real food aid needs;'

* * *

Amendment No 103
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 33

This paragraph to read as follows:

'33. Deplores the fact that security of food supplies in the developing countries is seriously threatened by the problems existing in the storage of food, transport and infrastructure and calls upon the Council and the Commission to act in close contact with the governments of the member countries to ensure that food aid is used to regulate the market and is stored in the countries concerned;'

* * *

Amendment No 104
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 34

This paragraph to read as follows:

'34. Notes the disparity between the 'supply' of Community products which are often mere market surpluses, and the needs of the countries receiving food aid and stresses the need for Community aid to be better adapted to the food requirements of the peoples concerned; calls upon the Council and Commission to make more regular use of 'triangular operations' and to cooperate with the countries concerned, with the logistic support of the FAO, in the creation of regional or sub-regional food reserves, so as to facilitate the purchase of food stocks in countries closest to the countries receiving aid;'

* * *

Amendment No 105
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 35
Delete the first indent of paragraph 35

* * *

Amendment No 106
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 35a (new)
Insert the following new paragraph:

'35a. Requests the Commission to draw up plans for an efficient distribution network by arrangement with the authorities of the developing countries and examine the possibility of converting, in response to local needs, the military vehicles (ground, sea and air) of the armed forces of the nine Member States into a logistic force for transporting food and other types of aid.

This 'task force against hunger' would transport aid rapidly free of international freight charges and see to its distribution in the recipient country in cases of extreme urgency or particular gravity. The personnel would be trained by (unarmed) troops from the engineers, the medical corps and the catering corps and should be put at the disposal of an *ad hoc* Commission division.'

* * *

Amendment No 107
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 35b (new)
Insert the following new paragraph:

'35b. Requests the Commission to study the possibility of considerably strengthening the Community's delegations in the ACP and other developing countries with volunteer workers; particular thought should be given to setting up a 'civilian service against hunger' as an alternative to military service open to conscientious objectors in the nine Member States and coordinated at Community level; asks the Commission to present a report within six months of the adoption of the present resolution;'

* * *

Amendment No 108
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 37
After the words 'emergency aid' add 'and emergency food aid'

* * *

Amendment No 109
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 38

This paragraph to read as follows:

'38. Requests the Community to mobilize sufficient additional resources without delay to save the millions of men, women and children condemned to death through starvation; asks for the appropriations under the food aid and emergency food aid chapter of the EEC budget for the 1981 financial year to be brought up to a level equivalent to a contribution by the Community and the Member States of 2.5 million tonnes;'

* * *

Amendment No 110
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 38a (new)

After paragraph 38, insert the following new paragraph:

'38a. Asks further that the Community contribute immediately to raising the appropriation laid down in the World Food Programme (WFP) by one thousand million dollars;'

* * *

Amendment No 111
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 41

Add the following new text:

— requests the Council, the Commission and the Member States to speed up the negotiations on the creation of a new International Convention on Food Aid so as to raise the appropriation to a minimum of 10 million tonnes immediately, 18 million in 1985 and a minimum of 20 million in 1990;'

* * *

Amendment No 112
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 42

Replace the 4th indent with the following:

— propose the figure of 500 000 tonnes of cereals as an immediate objective for the emergency food reserve and also propose that an international conference be called as soon as possible to guarantee a minimum reserve of 500 000 tonnes of cereals each year and at the same time plan a progressive increase in the reserve which will be legally binding;

* * *

Amendment No 113
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 42

Add the following new fifth and sixth indents:

- '— a financial facility for food aid;
- an emergency plan for food crises;'

* * *

Amendment No 114
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Title of Section (d)

This title to read as follows:

- '(d) *with regard to international trade in agricultural and food products and the security of world food supplies*'

* * *

Amendment No 115
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 43

Expand this paragraph to read as follows:

- '43. . . . stabilization of their food supplies; asks that the Community promote a Conference on International Trade to be held under the aegis of the United Nations by 1983;'

* * *

Amendment No 116
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 43a (new)

Insert the following new paragraph:

- '43a. Reminds the Commission and the Council of the obligation on all the industrialized countries to respect the undertakings given within UNCTAD and other international organizations and particularly the ban on new trade restrictions or the strengthening of existing measures to discourage imports from developing countries;'

* * *

Amendment No 117
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 44

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '44. Asks the Commission to make an analysis of the cost of the common agricultural policy and its economic and commercial repercussions on the developing countries and their export potential; requests it to submit a report within six months of the adoption of the present resolution;'

* * *

Amendment No 118
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 45

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '45. Asks the Council and Commission to redirect the common agricultural policy to take account of the urgent need to eliminate hunger and malnutrition;'

* * *

Amendment No 119
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 47a (new)

Insert the following new paragraph:

- '47a. Stresses that the Tokyo Round agreement on non-tariff barriers must be immediately implemented by the States that signed it and, in particular, by the nine Community Member States.

Calls upon the Council and the Commission to propose other measures aimed at eliminating by 1990 all the other non-tariff barriers to imports from the developing countries;'

* * *

Amendment No 120
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 47b (new)

Insert the following new paragraph:

- '47b. Considers that the Generalized System of Preferences must be improved and reviewed with the aim of extending its period of validity, making it legally binding, simplifying its procedures and making it universally applicable both as regards products and as regards countries;'

* * *

Amendment No 121
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 50

Expand this paragraph to read as follows:

'50. ... developing countries; calls on the Community also to discontinue any measures likely adversely to affect the developing countries' efforts to strengthen economic cooperation and diversify their production structures; the EEC should also support the developing countries' marketing companies and foster the preferential agreements concluded by these countries among themselves;'

* * *

Amendment No 122
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 52a (new)

Insert the following new paragraph:

'52a. Points out that world food security can be achieved only on the basis of a legally binding international agreement to which all the member countries of the international community must adhere;'

* * *

Amendment No 123
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 52b (new)

Insert the following new paragraph:

'52b. Appeals to all the countries of the international community to widen and make effective the International Undertaking on World Food Security announced by the FAO in 1973 by taking the following measures:

- setting up an International Food Reserve Fund of 12 million tonnes of cereals, half of which to be stored in the developing countries while awaiting the conclusion of the International Convention on cereals;
- opening negotiations to produce a Solemn Undertaking on urgent Food Crises with precise commitments by the governments to adopt various measures should a world-wide food crisis occur;
- creation of an Executive Committee for the Food Crisis under the Secretary-General of the UN. It would be responsible for applying the Solemn Undertaking on Urgent Food Crises, supervising observance of the commitments assumed by the States which have signed the Undertaking, resolving disputes and coordinating aid to the developing countries.

The Committee would be dissolved as soon as the Secretary-General had announced the end of the crisis.

The Executive Committee would be made up of 14 members, 7 for the industrialized countries with either a market economy or a planned economy and 7 for the developing countries which are importers of food.

It would have overall responsibility for administering the Solemn Undertaking on Urgent Food Crises, supervising the various obligations arising from the Under-

taking and resolving any disputes. The specific duties of the Committee would include coordinating the allocation of quotas from the Reserve Fund to the various countries, should the International Convention not yet have entered into force. It would also coordinate all the food aid supplied independently by bilateral donors and specialized international organizations so that the total amount might be used as efficiently as possible, it would supervise the logistic system of food aid and decide on emergency action to deal rapidly with problems arising in the exporting country, whilst the goods are in transit and in the recipient countries. The functions, membership and powers of the Committee would become an integral part of the Solemn Undertaking.

To make the Solemn Undertaking binding in law, it should be ratified by the various national parliaments.'

* * *

Amendment No 124
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 53

Replace this paragraph by the following:

'53. Requests the Community independently to draw up a tough code of conduct for multinational companies based in the Community, making it possible to prevent certain commercial practices by the major agricultural conglomerates, such as the manipulation of transfer prices or 'restrictive trade practices'; feels that the EEC guidelines to protect private investment in the developing countries, which the EEC wishes to enshrine in agreements with States or groups of States and a series of projects designed to encourage European investment, should be amended to make the protection and encouragement of private investment compatible with the provisions of the projected code;'

* * *

Amendment No 125
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 53a (new)

After paragraph 53, insert the following new paragraph:

'53a. Calls for the creation of a new Community instrument making it possible appreciably to improve conditions for private investment in the developing countries, and which would embody the following elements:

- (a) the determination of protected investment by taking account of all development policy aspects (e.g. the impact of production technology on the market of the developing country)
- (b) an obligation on the companies concerned to take into account the social and economic consequences of such investment;'

* * *

Amendment No 126
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 53b (new)

Insert the following new paragraph:

- '53b. — Calls upon the Member States and the Commission to recognize speculation involving essential foodstuffs as being a criminal offence under public law;
- Also calls upon the international community to declare as 'illegal', in the developing countries, any agricultural development policy aimed at exporting products when those products, or products obtained from a different cultivation of the land, could result in a *shortfall* in the food requirements of the population of the country that applies, encourages or tolerates such a policy;'

* * *

Amendment No 127
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 53c (new)

Insert the following new paragraph:

- '53c. Decides that it will draw up an economic charter of human rights under the terms of which any Community or non-Community multinational company that flouts the conditions set out below in any of the Third World countries in which it operates would be deprived by the Community of the right to import into the Community as such the products it manufactures in the Third World or, in the case of particularly serious infringements, would be denied the right of establishment in Europe:
- (a) purchase of raw materials and basic products at a high price, the minimum price to be fixed by the EEC in such a way as to reduce the chances of a deterioration in the terms of trade,
 - (b) reinvestment of profits in the countries in which they were made,
 - (c) respect for trade union and political freedoms, no matter where,
 - (d) acceptance of international standards established by the International Labour Office as regards working conditions,
 - (e) a ban on salaries lower than the average world salaries paid by the multinationals themselves;'

* * *

Amendment No 128
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 54a (new)

Insert the following new paragraph:

- '54a. Calls upon the Council and Commission to draw up a joint position of the member countries in the energy sector
- granting top priority to the maximum use of conventional energy sources, renewable or otherwise (animal and vegetable waste, charcoal, wood, wind and solar energy) which currently cover most of the energy needs of the developing countries;

- contributing to the creation of a world research fund in the energy sector, within the framework of the UN, to finance projects for prospecting for new oil fields and mineral deposits and projects for the use of renewable energy sources;
- laying down an energy assistance plan for the less developed countries studying in particular the possibility of setting up a double market for oil prices for these countries; the shortfall in income for the producer countries could be reimbursed in part by an international compensation office set up using a proportion of the funds for public development aid;
- providing for a general moratorium on the use and production of nuclear energy in the developing countries;

* * *

Amendment No 129
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 55a (new)

Insert the following new paragraph:

'55a. Instructs the Commission to finance a survey on the management, from 1970 to the present time, of public aid to development in the member countries of the EEC and to present a detailed report within 8 months from the date of adoption of this resolution; in particular, this report should indicate what proportion of the aid effectively financed economic development in the developing countries and contributed to combatting hunger and malnutrition, what proportion of the aid directly financed agricultural and food projects to meet the internal needs of the populations concerned, what proportion was used for military or defence aid or was investment by private companies; the survey should also indicate if there is and has been sufficient clarity in the allocation and management of aid, whether these were dictated by political and strategic interests rather than the real needs of the populations and whether and to what extent the national parliaments participated in the decision-making process as regards the destination of aid;'

* * *

Amendment No 130
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 56

Add the following point (c) to paragraph 56:

'(c) prepare a White Paper on the repercussions on the populations of the developing countries of the economic measures applied by the industrialized countries via the multinational companies;'

* * *

Amendment No 131
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 56a (new)

Insert the following new paragraph:

'56a. Urges the Council, the Commission and the Governments of the Nine to comply with the commitments aimed at the practical implementation of the Strategy for the Third Development Decade and to make the results of global North-South negotiations legally binding;

to take the initiative of calling an international conference on the abolition of hunger and malnutrition if the global negotiations do not reach a positive outcome by the first half of 1981;

to call immediately for a meeting of the Security Council of the United Nations on the question of world hunger which, as it constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security, is fully within the competence of the Council under Article 24 of the UN Charter;

pursuant to that Article and Article 25 the Security Council, on the basis of the theory of 'residual powers' granted to the Council by the International Court of Justice, should:

- ensure that international resolutions on the problem of hunger in the world adopted unanimously or by a consensus by all the members of the international community be given legally binding force and made effective immediately;
- instruct the Secretary-General of the UN to take steps to ensure the drafting and swift implementation of a plan, in concert with the specialized international bodies and the Member States to transfer by 1981 the sums allocated to arms expenditure by the individual Member States to the financing of the world fund for the abolition of hunger and malnutrition which the Council could set up if other bodies failed to do so;
- ensure that the results of the global North-South negotiations, the Conference on the abolition of hunger and the Conference on the less-favoured countries, to be held in 1981, are given legally binding force and rendered immediately operative;
- instruct the Secretary-General of the UN to set up and bring into operation immediately, under the responsibility of the Council itself, an international army to combat hunger, with the aim of guaranteeing the immediate physical survival of those who are or will be in danger of death from hunger and malnutrition; this 'UN hunger force', unarmed, would operate under the orders of the UN but would be set up by decrees mobilizing military or other organizations, national or international;

* * *

Amendment No 132
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 57

Insert the following between 'Commission' and 'and to the Secretary-General':

to the ACP-EEC Council of Ministers and the co-Presidents of the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly — so that the text may be debated at the next meeting of the Assembly from 22 to 26 September 1980 —.

* * *

Amendment No 133
tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 12
Delete this paragraph

* * *

Amendment No 134
tabled by Mrs Dekker

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Insert a new paragraph 54a after paragraph 54:

'54a. Requests the Commission to prepare a report for the European Parliament supported by statistics as from 1 January 1981 on the developments and progress of the European Community's structural, financial and technical development policy;'

* * *

Amendment No 135
tabled by Mrs Dekker

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Insert a new paragraph 54b:

'54b. Requests the Commission to institute an automatic information procedure ('fiche') as from 1 January 1981 under which all important measures such as decisions by the European Community particularly in the field of policy on external trade and agricultural policy which may have an effect on the developing countries will be brought to the attention of the other institutions and bodies of the Community competent in these matters;'

* * *

Amendment No 136
tabled by Sir Frederick Warner
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 8
Delete this paragraph

* * *

SITTING OF FRIDAY, 19 SEPTEMBER 1980

Contents

1. Approval of the minutes	307	<i>Mr Josselin</i>	314
2. Documents received	307	<i>Mr Calvez</i>	315
3. Membership of committees	307	<i>Mr Battersby (ED); Mr Papapietro (COM);</i> <i>Mr Remilly (EPD); Miss Quin; Mr Kirk;</i> <i>Mrs Le Roux</i>	316
4. Consultative Assembly EEC-ACP	307	<i>Procedural motions: Mrs Castle; Mr Kirk</i>	319
5. Urgent procedure:		9. Votes:	
<i>Procedural motion: Mr Forth (ED)</i>	308	<i>Procedural motion: Mrs Castle</i>	320
<i>Mr Pannella</i>	308	• <i>Travaglini report (Doc. 1-347/80):</i> <i>Regional development programmes:</i>	
<i>Procedural motion: Mr Fergusson</i>	308	<i>Amendment to paragraph 4</i>	
<i>Mr Sarre (S); Mr Klepsch (EPP); Lady Elles</i> <i>(ED); Mr Martin (COM); Mr Donnez; Mr</i> <i>Van Minnen (S); Mr Fischbach (EPP); Mr</i> <i>Donnez; Mr Sherlock</i>	308	<i>Mr Travaglini, rapporteur</i>	320
6. Regulations on flax and hemp — Report by <i>Mr Blaney on behalf of the Committee on</i> <i>Agriculture (Doc. 1-389/80):</i>		<i>Amendment to paragraph 12</i>	
<i>Mr Provan, deputy rapporteur</i>	310	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	320
<i>Mr Coppeters; Mr Sutra; Mr Gundelach,</i> <i>Vice-President of the Commission</i>	311	<i>Procedural motions: Mrs Kellett-</i> <i>Bowman; Mrs Castle</i>	320
7. EEC emergency aid for Martinique and Guadeloupe — Motions for resolutions by Mr Clément and others (Doc. 1-362/80), by Mr Sablé and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and Mr d'Ormesson and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) (Doc. 1-377/80) and by Mr Vergès and others on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group (Doc. 1-384/ 80):		• <i>Sassano report (Doc. 1-214/80): Alterna-</i> <i>tive energy sources:</i>	
<i>Mr Clément</i>	311	<i>Amendment to paragraph 1</i>	
<i>Mr Sablé</i>	312	<i>Mr Sassano, rapporteur</i>	320
<i>Mr Vergès</i>	313	<i>Amendment after paragraph 1</i>	
<i>Mr d'Ormesson</i>	313	<i>Mr Sassano</i>	321
<i>Mr Sutra (S); Mr Natali, Vice-President of</i> <i>the Commission</i>	314	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	321
8. Fisheries policy — Motions for resolutions by Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the Social- ist Group (Doc. 1-382/80/rev.) and by Mr Calvez and others (Doc. 1-403/80):		• <i>Von Wogau report (Doc. 1-340/80): Fuel</i> <i>consumption and engine-power of motor-</i> <i>vehicles:</i>	
		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	321
		• <i>Von Wogau report (Doc. 1-343/80):</i> <i>Safety-belts and interior fittings of</i> <i>motor-vehicles:</i>	
		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	321
		• <i>Turner report (Doc. 1-237/80): Insurance</i> <i>contracts:</i>	
		<i>Amendments to the proposed directive:</i>	
		<i>Mr Turner, rapporteur</i>	321
		<i>Consideration of the motion for a resolu-</i> <i>tion:</i>	
		<i>Amendment to paragraph 1</i>	
		<i>Mr Turner</i>	323

<i>Amendment to paragraph 2</i>		<i>Democrats, Mr Glinne and Mrs Van den</i>	
<i>Mr Turner</i>	324	<i>Hewvel on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr</i>	
<i>Amendments to paragraph 3</i>		<i>Klepsch and others on behalf of the Group of</i>	
<i>Mr Turner</i>	324	<i>the European People's Party (CD), Mr Scott-</i>	
<i>Amendments after paragraph 3</i>		<i>Hopkins and others on behalf of the European</i>	
<i>Mr Turner</i>	324	<i>Democratic Group and Mr Bangemann and</i>	
<i>Amendment to paragraph 5</i>		<i>Mr Berkhower on behalf of the Liberal and</i>	
<i>Mr Turner</i>	324	<i>Democratic Group (Doc. 1-397/80/rev.):</i>	
<i>Amendment to paragraph 6</i>		<i>Mr Israël</i>	331
<i>Mr Turner</i>	324	<i>Mr Habsburg (EPP); Mr Purvis (ED); Mr</i>	
<i>Amendment to paragraph 9</i>		<i>Hahn; Mr Provan; Mr Natali, Vice-Presi-</i>	
<i>Mr Turner</i>	325	<i>dent of the Commission; Mr Romualdi; Mrs</i>	
<i>Explanations of vote: Mrs Seibel-Emmer-</i>		<i>Dekker</i>	331
<i>ling (S); Mr Janssen van Raay (EPP); Mrs</i>		<i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution:</i>	
<i>Scrivener; Lady Elles (ED)</i>	325	<i>Amendment after paragraph 4</i>	333
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	326	<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Papapietro; Mr</i>	
• <i>Key report (Doc. 1-334/80): Use of certain</i>		<i>Prag; Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Harris</i>	333
<i>appropriations available in the budget:</i>		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	334
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	326	12. <i>Events in Bolivia — Motions for resolutions</i>	
• <i>Ryan report (Doc. 1-344/80): Discharge to</i>		<i>by Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the</i>	
<i>the European Centre for the Development</i>		<i>Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch and Mr Blumen-</i>	
<i>of Vocational Training:</i>		<i>feld on behalf of the Group of the European</i>	
<i>Adoption of the decision</i>	326	<i>People's Party (CD), Mr Fergusson on behalf</i>	
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	326	<i>of the European Democratic Group, Mrs</i>	
• <i>Blaney report (Doc. 1-389/80): Flax and</i>		<i>Carettoni Romagnoli, and Mr Berkhower</i>	
<i>hemp:</i>		<i>on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic</i>	
<i>Amendment to the sole paragraph:</i>		<i>Group (Doc. 1-381/80/rev.) and by Mr Fanti</i>	
<i>Mr Provan, deputy rapporteur</i>	326	<i>and others on behalf of the Communist and</i>	
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	326	<i>Allies Group (Doc. 1-385/80):</i>	
• <i>Clément et al. motion for a resolution</i>		<i>Mr Papapietro</i>	334
<i>(Doc. 1-362/80): Emergency aid for</i>		<i>Mr Fergusson</i>	334
<i>Martinique:</i>		<i>Mr Bersani (EPP); Mr Arndt (S); Mr Israël</i>	
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	326	<i>(EPD); Mr Natali, Vice-President of the</i>	
• <i>Sablé et al. motion for a resolution (Doc.</i>		<i>Commission</i>	335
<i>1-377/80): Community aid to Martinique</i>		<i>Explanations of vote: Mrs Castellina; Mr</i>	
<i>and Guadeloupe:</i>		<i>Pannella; Mr Klepsch</i>	336
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	327	<i>Procedural motions: Mr Fergusson; Mr</i>	
• <i>Vergès et al. motion for a resolution (Doc.</i>		<i>Pannella</i>	337
<i>1-384/80): Community aid to Guadeloupe</i>		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	337
<i>and Martinique:</i>		13. <i>Protecting the site of Tyre — Motion for a</i>	
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	327	<i>resolution by Mr Beyer de Ryke and others</i>	
<i>Procedural motion: Mr Collins</i>	327	<i>(Doc. 1-388/80):</i>	
10. <i>Fisheries policy (contd)</i>		<i>Mr Beyer de Ryke</i>	337
<i>Mr Harris; Miss Brookes; Mr Gundelach,</i>		<i>Mr Habsburg (EPP)</i>	338
<i>Vice-President of the Commission</i>	327	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	338
<i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution</i>		14. <i>Termination of Mrs Macciocchi's appointment</i>	
<i>in Doc. 1-382/80/rev.):</i>		<i>with the French University system — Motion</i>	
<i>Amendment to replace the motion</i>	330	<i>for a resolution by Mr Glinne and others</i>	
<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Welsb; Mr Enright</i>	330	<i>(Doc. 1-395/80):</i>	
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	331	<i>Mrs Roudy</i>	338
<i>Adoption of the resolution in Doc. 1-403/80</i>	331	<i>Mr Galland (L); Mrs Bonino; Mr Habsburg</i>	339
11. <i>Persecution of Bahais in Iran — Motion for a</i>		<i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution:</i>	
<i>resolution by Mr Lalor and Mr Israël on</i>		<i>Amendment to the preamble</i>	341
<i>behalf of the Group of European Progressive</i>		<i>Amendment to paragraph 1</i>	341
		<i>Amendment to paragraph 2</i>	341
		<i>Amendment to paragraph 4</i>	341

<i>Explanations of vote: Mrs Castellina; Lord O'Hagan; Mr Chambeiron; Miss Roberts; Mr Glinne; Lady Elles; Mr K. Schön; Mr Galland; Mr Coppieters; Mr Pannella</i>		<i>Mr Glinne</i>	346
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	341	<i>Mr Chambeiron</i>	346
15. <i>Crisis in the iron-and-steel industry — Motions for resolutions by Mr Michel and others (Doc. 1-402/80/rev.) and by Mrs Salisch and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group (Doc. 1-414/80/rev.):</i>		<i>Adoption of the resolution in Doc. 1-407/80/rev.</i>	346
<i>Mr K. Schön</i>	344	<i>Adoption of the resolution in Doc. 1-419/80</i>	346
<i>Mrs Salisch</i>	345		
<i>Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission</i>	345	17. <i>Adams case — Motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the Socialist Group (Doc. 1-410/80):</i>	
<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Chambeiron; Mrs Kellet-Bowman</i>	345	<i>Mr Glinne</i>	346
<i>Adoption of the resolution in Doc. 1-402/80/rev.</i>	345	<i>Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission</i>	346
<i>Adoption of the resolution in Doc. 1-414/80/rev.</i>	346	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	347
16. <i>Sentencing to death of Kim Dae Jung — Motions for resolutions by the Socialist Group (Doc. 1-407/80/rev.) and by Mr Fanti and others on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group (Doc. 1-419/80):</i>		18. <i>Petition No 1/79 — Report, without debate, by Mr D'Angelosante on behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions (Doc. 1-286/80):</i>	
		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	347
		19. <i>Dates of the next part-session</i>	347
		20. <i>Approval of the minutes</i>	347
		21. <i>Adjournment of the session</i>	347

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

Vice-President

*(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)***President.** — The sitting is open.1. *Approval of the minutes***President.** — The minutes of proceedings of yesterday's sitting have been distributed.

Are there any comments?

The minutes are adopted.

2. *Documents received***President.** — I have received various documents, which you will find listed in the minutes.3. *Membership of committees***President.** — I have received:

— a request from the Liberal and Democratic Group for the appointment of Mr Beyer de Ryke as member of the delegation to the Joint Parliamentary Committee of the EEC-Greece Association;

— a request from the European Democratic Group for the appointment of Mr J. M. Taylor to the Committee on Budgetary Control, to replace Mr Patterson.

Are there any objections?

The appointments are ratified.

4. *Consultative Assembly ACP-EEC***President.** — The non-attached Members of Parliament have informed me that they have nominated Mr Romualdi as representative to the EEC-ACP Consultative Assembly.

Are there any objections?

The nomination is ratified.

5. *Urgent procedure*

President. — The next item is a decision on the adoption of urgent procedure for five motions for resolutions.

We begin with two motions on the crisis in the iron-and-steel industry:

- the motion for a resolution by Mr Michel and others (Doc. 1-402/80/rev.); and
- the motion for a resolution by Mrs Salisch and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group (Doc. 1-414/80/rev.).

Since these two motions relate to the same subject, I propose that the two requests for urgent procedure be put to a single vote.

I put the request to the vote.

Urgent procedure is adopted.

This item will be entered on the agenda for this sitting.

*
* *

We proceed to two motions for resolutions on the sentencing to death of Mr Kim:

- the motion for a resolution by the Socialist Group (1-407/80/rev.); and
- the motion for a resolution by Mr Fanti and others on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group (Doc. 1-419/80).

Since these two motions for a resolution relate to the same subject, I propose that the two requests be put to a single vote.

I call Mr Forth on a point of order.

Mr Forth. — Mr President, on behalf of my Group I would like to request a roll-call vote on the adoption of urgent procedure in respect of the matter you have just mentioned.

President. — A request for a roll-call vote made on behalf of a Group must be complied with. The roll-call will be taken by means of the electronic system.

I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (F) Mr President, if ever there was a case for adopting urgent procedure — which happens very frequently in this House — it is this one. A man has been sentenced to death, and there is an imminent risk of this execution.

This Parliament would be unworthy of the name if, after all the matters on which it has voted for the adoption of urgent procedure, especially just two minutes ago ...

President. — Mr Pannella, are you for or against the adoption of urgent procedure?

Mr Pannella. — Mr President, that is what I am trying to explain.

President. — Yes, but according to the Rules of Procedure no more than one speaker in favour and one speaker against may be heard. I therefore ask you to state whether you are in favour or against.

Mr Pannella. — (F) Mr President, you may ask me to say whether I am in favour or against in the three minutes which I have available.

I can well understand that the Conservatives may be frustrated by the fact that certain Members will shortly enter the Chamber who would otherwise have been absent for the roll-call, but these parliamentary games do not justify their impatience and intolerance!

All I want is quite simply to state that by reason of the imminent risk of execution Parliament cannot refuse to adopt urgent procedure for this debate.

President. — I call Mr Fergusson on a point of order.

Mr Fergusson. — Mr President, with the very greatest respect to you, is it not right that once the vote is open people cannot speak, as Mr Pannella has just done? The vote was open. I had actually voted before you called him. The lights were on. Surely this is wrong.

President. — Mr Fergusson, I am very sorry to have to contradict you, but I had not yet declared the vote open.

I call Mr Sarre.

Mr Sarre. — (F) Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group, I should like to speak in support of the adoption of urgent procedure for this motion for a resolution.

Sarre

Having regard to the extremely serious threat to Mr Kim, I should like the House to demonstrate a little more dignity in the face of the dramatic events which may take place shortly. Since the opening of this part-session, the political trial in Seoul has ended and Mr Kim Dae Jung, leader of the democratic opposition, imprisoned in South Korea, has been condemned to death. Following a disgraceful trial whose outcome was obvious from the start, Mr Kim Dae Jung has been condemned to death for his opinions on the basis of unfounded accusations.

This founder member of the Democratic Party and former candidate for the presidency of the republic is an embarrassment to the dictatorial régime of General Chon. Enjoying great popularity among his people, Mr Kim has always based his actions on the rule of law, whereas his opponents have not failed to persecute him by every means. Forced into exile in 1973, he was arrested in Tokyo shortly thereafter by the secret services and has been incarcerated in his country more or less continuously for eight years.

The sentencing to death of Mr Kim Dae Jung has aroused great feeling throughout the world and from the most diverse quarters. This appalling political trial, at which 23 other accused persons were given prison sentences, some of them very heavy, represents a challenge by the new régime in Seoul. It is a violent assault on the liberty of conscience and therefore on a fundamental human right.

Our first duty today, ladies and gentlemen, is to launch an urgent appeal to save the life of Kim Dae Jung and to call for his release and that of those accused with him. By so doing, this House will be standing by its commitment to human and civil rights. For this reason, I invite you to vote in favour of adopting urgent procedure for this motion for a resolution in order to call upon European public opinion to support the campaign throughout the world. Let us stop this crime and save Mr Kim!

President. — I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (D) Mr President, I shall be brief. I should like to thank the President of the House for sending a telegram the day before yesterday expressing a view which I am sure the whole House will now adopt. I am in favour of urgent procedure.

President. — I call Lady Elles.

Lady Elles. — My Group will have a free vote on this: I myself will abstain. I believe, however, that the Parliament should have the right to debate this item, and I strongly protest at the comments made by Mr Pannella, which were totally without foundation. It is

our Group who asked for a roll-call vote precisely on this motion in order to see how many of those who make protests on paper fail to turn up here and show, by their presence and their vote, what their views are.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Martin.

Mr Martin. — (F) Mr President, I speak here on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group. The need for urgent debate is clear. When a man's life is at stake, it is regrettable that people in this House should find it necessary to behave in a theatrical manner.

A democrat awaits death in prison in Seoul. Yesterday, for humanitarian reasons, our colleague Mrs De March proposed the sending of a unanimous telegram by the Bureau of Parliament to save Mr Kim. I wish to place on record that apart from the Communist Group all the other groups yesterday refused to send such a telegram. I repeat: all the other groups. We shall vote in favour of urgent procedure because we must save Mr Kim and stop the crime . . .

(Loud interruptions from Mr Pannella and Mr Glinne)

President. — Mr Martin, I cannot allow what you have just said to pass without correction. As Mr Klepsch stated a moment ago, the day before yesterday Mrs Veil, as President of Parliament, on behalf of Parliament and hence on behalf of the Bureau, sent a telegram asking that Mr Kim should not be executed.

This being so, it is quite irrelevant to mention what may have been said in the Bureau. It was the President of Parliament who took the initiative in sending this message, and today the whole House will be called upon to express its views.

(Applause. Cries of 'Apologize!' from the right)

(The vote was taken)

I call Mr Donnez.

Mr Donnez. — (F) As my button appears not to be working, I wish to state that I am in favour of urgent procedure.

President. — I note what you have said.

Urgent procedure is adopted.¹

This item is entered on the agenda of this sitting.

¹ For details of the vote by roll-call, see the Minutes.

President. — We proceed to the motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the Socialist Group (Doc. 1-410/80) on the Adams case. I call Mr Van Minnen.

Mr Van Minnen. — Mr President, I hope we do not need a roll-call vote on this request for urgent procedure. The text of this motion for a resolution is in effect, Mr President, the same as that adopted by Parliament on 23 May. The urgency of this matter is undeniable in the light of Parliament's vote for the Donnez report, particularly for that amendment calling upon the European Commission to ask the competent bodies of the Swiss Confederation to re-examine and to reopen the Adams case. May I remind the House that this decision was taken unanimously. In view of the discussions in the Chamber and the obvious conclusions of the Donnez report, one might have expected an appropriate response from the Commission. On the contrary, nothing positive has been done in that direction. The Commission's excuse is that they did not feel that any representations to the Swiss authorities would be productive. In particular, the Commission emphasizes that they do not consider it proper to make representations on the question of reopening the case, given the firm rule, followed by all the Community institutions, not to trespass on the processes of the judicial authorities in non-member countries. But whatever the Commission may argue, Parliament must insist that the Commission carries out the decision of this House without any further delay. We do not need, Mr President, a long debate today on the merits of the Adams case. We had that months ago. What we want today is a simple demand that the Commission act now on Parliament's unanimous decision.

President. — I call Mr Fischbach.

Mr Fischbach. — (F) Mr President, I do not intend to go into the details of the question, but I should nevertheless like to point out that this Adams case was discussed at length during the consideration of the excellent report by Mr Donnez. On that occasion the authorities of the Swiss Confederation were asked to review this matter. Thus, in May of this year Parliament clearly gave its opinion.

Now we are being asked to return to this question and consider a text which, apart from a few details, is the same as that adopted in May.

Our Group considers that it does not help Parliament's reputation to return several times to the same question. We have clearly stated our opinion on the Adams case; we agreed with the conclusions of the rapporteur, Mr Donnez; and for this reason we shall vote against the adoption of urgent procedure for this motion.

President. — I put the request to the vote.

As the result of the vote by show of hands is doubtful, we shall now vote by sitting and standing.

As the result of the vote by sitting and standing is equally doubtful, the vote will be taken by roll-call, using the electronic system.

(The vote was then taken.¹ Mr Barbagli stated that he voted against)

I call Mr Donnez.

Mr Donnez. — (F) My button is still not working! Since it is a matter of one vote either way, may I say that I vote in favour.

President. — I call Mr Sherlock.

Mr Sherlock. — Mr President, my red light against did not come on. I voted against, which makes it dead even.

(Mr Spinelli and Mr Ceravolo stated that they voted in favour)

President. — Urgent procedure is adopted.

The motion for a resolution is entered on today's agenda.

6. Regulations on flax and hemp

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-389/80) by Mr Blaney, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the

proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-134/80) for

- I. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1308/70, on the common organization of the market in flax and hemp; and
- II. a regulation on the measures encouraging the use of flax fibres for the 1980-81 and 1981-82 marketing years.

I call Mr Provan.

Mr Provan, deputy rapporteur. — Mr President, Mr Blaney unfortunately cannot be with us this morning, and I have been asked to present this report formally to the House.

¹ For details of the vote by roll-call, see the Minutes.

Provan

The history of it is that Mr Blaney originally produced a report to the Committee on Agriculture, which was amended so considerably by amendments from Mr Ligios that these have become the report. I gather that we have some amendments forward from Mr Coppieters: I recommend Parliament to reject them, as they do not reflect the wishes of the Committee on Agriculture.

President. — I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (NL) Mr President, I am grateful to the rapporteur for describing the dispute between Mr Blaney and the majority of the committee so correctly. My amendment is in fact intended to reinstate not only Mr Blaney's view but also that of the Commission itself. This matter is of no little importance, because it concerns support measures for a sector of agriculture which is in danger of going to the wall and the promotion of the use of flax fibres, which have always been praised for their quality on all sides. The Commission had stated that for this purpose a reasonable amount would be allocated from the agricultural fund. Mr Blaney wanted to alter the text of the Commission's directive by means of an amendment so that 50 % of the finance would come from the producers themselves and 50 % from a contribution from the EAGGF. That is the amendment which I have the honour of proposing.

President. — I call Mr Sutra.

Mr Sutra. — (F) Mr President, just a few words in support of the report by Mr Blaney. Perhaps, as Mr Coppieters has said, it is not enough, but at least it goes in the right direction.

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — Mr President, I am very grateful to the committee and to the rapporteur for their excellent report and I am grateful that the main idea expressed by the Commission in this proposal has been supported by the Committee on Agriculture, its rapporteur and the other speakers this morning. It is important that we look for suitable substitutes for agricultural products at present in structural surplus wherever we can find them, and we should support such measures from the Community. The only disagreement which seems to exist between the rapporteur and the Commission's proposals therefore concerns, not the principle, but the ratio between EAGGF payments and payments taken from the grants already made to the producers (which are also actually from the EAGGF). The rapporteur proposes a different proportion — i.e., 100 % from

the grants. I can understand the reasons behind that proposal, but I must nevertheless, taking into account the serious budgetary situation of the Community as such and the agricultural policy in particular, stick to the formula which has been put forward. It is not really a matter of a very substantial disagreement, but rather of administering the limited money which is at our disposal. As you know, the budgetary proposals for 1981 actually go very close to the limit of the Community's own resources, and we must therefore show on all items, big as well as small, the greatest possible restraint.

With these few comments in regard to ways of financing the budget, I hope Parliament will be able to adopt this resolution.

President. — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting-time.

7. EEC emergency aid for Martinique and Guadeloupe

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

- the motion for a resolution by Mr Clément and others on EEC emergency aid for Martinique, devastated by Hurricane Allen (Doc. 1-362/80);
- the motion for a resolution by Mr Sablé and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and Mr d'Ormesson and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group), on Community aid to the departments of Martinique and Guadeloupe, devastated by Hurricane Allen (Doc. 1-337/80);
- the motion for a resolution by Mr Vergès and others on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on Community aid to the departments of Guadeloupe and Martinique, devastated by Hurricane Allen (Doc. 1-384/80).

I call Mr Clément.

Mr Clément. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the French overseas departments are disadvantaged not only economically but sometimes also climatically as is shown by these hurricanes, whose frequency aggravates their effects.

Having discussed the subject on several occasions, the House knows the effects which these disasters can have on the population, on their equipment and facilities and on the economic activity of the region. Today Guadeloupe and, even more, Martinique have once again been seriously hit, this time by Hurricane Allen. I should like to thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for having unanimously agreed to adopt urgent procedure

Clément

in order to provide the maximum assistance from the Community to these regions. May I also thank the Commission and particularly Mr Cheysson, whom I alerted on 8 August and whose diligence has permitted the rapid transfer of 700 000 EUA in emergency aid to the French Antilles. Obviously this aid, although welcome, is insignificant in relation to the extent of the damage caused to housing to equipment and facilities and, even more, to crops. In Martinique alone, the damage to crops and livestock amounts to FF 240 m, to which must be added the losses of fishermen and hotel-keepers.

Account must also be taken of the indirect effects of the hurricane, particularly on employments but also on transport, industry and tourism. All in all, excluding public facilities, Hurricane Allen has cost Martinique FF 540 m, or over 92 million EUA.

However, no price can be put on the distress caused to those men and women who for the second time in a year have lost their homes, their work and their incomes.

The support offered by the Community must be commensurate with that distress and with the courage which the stricken population of Guadeloupe and Martinique is showing in rebuilding its life. This is why I have requested quick action from the EAGGF, the Social Fund and the Regional Development Fund in order to make good the damage done to crops, housing and equipment. Only quick action of this kind can remedy the pessimism of the farmers of this region, some of whom, as a result of cumbersome national administrative procedures, are still waiting, one year after Hurricane David, to be paid the aid allocated to them. It is now necessary to devise and implement a regional development plan which will provide for the diversification of crops, in particular the revival of sugar-cane growing, and the development of industry by coordinating Community resources and national resources, it being always understood that Community aid does not supplant national aid. In this way the economy of these regions, starting from an unhappy combination of events, will be rebuilt, and a youthful population, whose wish it is to live in their own country and not be cut off from their roots, will be assured of local employment.

President. — I call Mr. Sablé.

Mr Sablé. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, less than one year after Hurricanes David and Frederick devastated the Antilles, a new and equally serious disaster struck on 3 August 1980. The unexpected magnitude of Hurricane Allen, much reported in the French and international press, has prolonged and aggravated the disastrous consequences of the previous hurricanes.

We must pay tribute to the speed with which, in both Paris and Brussels, support was given to the departments of Martinique and Guadeloupe and to the neighbouring islands in that region, whether or not associated with the Community. On 10 September, the Commission decided to grant France an emergency aid of 700 000 EUA and, in response to the appeal from the Caribbean states hit by the hurricane, it granted 300 000 EUA to Jamaica, St Lucia, St Vincent and the Grenadine Islands and to Dominique, 50 000 EUA to Barbados and 400 000 EUA to the Republic of Haïti, which is not a signatory to the Lomé Convention. As in the case of Hurricane David, I was on the spot and the spectacle of the power of Nature was even more staggering: Rain and wind at speeds of up to 230 km per hour in one night wiped out all the export and garden crops which were just beginning to recover.

A team of French and other European experts visited the area to assess the demoralizing effects of this double catastrophe. Disturbed by so much misfortune, I made enquiries with the national meteorological archives service on the frequency of these climatic phenomena. Ladies and gentlemen, the information which I received will reassure those who may be concerned or sceptical. Between 1635 and 1978, Martinique was affected by hurricanes on the average once every twelve years, and we have to go back to 1776 to find a case similar to that now before us. In that year, the official report records two hurricanes, on 13 August and 7 September, which laid waste the plantations, causing 800 deaths and the loss of over 100 ships. Forgive me, President, for giving this information, but some of my colleagues were afraid that hurricanes might be an annual occurrence in our regions. The fact is, however, that according to our information they happen only once every 10 years. Not until the year 1963, followed by Hurricane David in 1979, do we find the regular pattern of these disturbances reappearing.

I will not go into the detail of the damage caused to the various spheres of economic and social life. Full information has already been published. What I would like to point out is that during the debate on 28 September 1979, which ended with the unanimous adoption of the motions we had tabled, Mr Cheysson affirmed the need to use jointly all the Community's resources — EAGGF, ERDF, Social Fund, EIB — and to use them, not as a replacement for, but in addition to, national aid. That is the doctrine which we have always supported, both in the French National Assembly and in the European Parliament, particularly since the Hansen decision, which put an end to the uncertainty over the legal situation of the overseas departments, which are in fact among the less-favoured marginal areas of the Community.

The enormous damage suffered is all the more serious in that these are small, overpopulated islands which can only maintain their standard of living by relying

Sablé

on national and European solidarity, on growing productivity, the diversification of crops and professional skills, which, thanks to social legislation and the spread of education, have reached a fairly high level of development.

The problems with which we have to deal are not only physical and human but also administrative and financial. The level of indebtedness means that planters can no longer contract new loans, and the revival of agriculture will, according to the experts, require a sum of around 150 million francs. What is needed now is a new strategy of development to fight these disasters which from time to time set back social and economic progress, a strategy which takes account of the climate and the environment but also of the need to modernize economic structures. Aid from the Social Fund would go directly to those concerned and would permit retraining and the creation of many jobs. The General Council of Martinique has mobilized considerable resources precisely to enable the Social Fund to intervene, including a 20-million-Franc programme for measures extending over three years.

If, ladies and gentlemen, it is true that every cloud has a silver lining, we now have an excellent opportunity of demonstrating this during the cooperation which will certainly be introduced under the 8th national plan between the government in Paris and the Commission in Brussels. It will be important in this period to demonstrate that the overseas departments, within the framework of their constitutional system, by choosing suitable development models set out on the best road to economic modernization.

President. — I call Mr Vergès.

Mr Vergès. — (F) Mr President, I will be fairly brief after what the two previous speakers have said about Martinique. I should simply like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that not only did we see last year with Hurricanes David and Frederick that hurricanes have devastating effects on the fragile economies of our countries, our islands — which still retain their colonial structures — but what is serious is that one year later these islands should be hit by a second and more devastating hurricane. This period of one year was not enough for the farmers to reorganize their crops, for unemployed farm-workers to have any chance of finding new jobs, or for the fishermen to resume fishing. No sooner were the conditions created for the economy to start up again than we had this even more destructive hurricane. As we were saying the day before yesterday, the most catastrophic periods in the history of our islands have been those marked by destructive hurricanes in two successive years. That is my first point.

My second point is that last year Parliament unanimously voted aid for the island of Réunion and the

Antilles, which had been hit by hurricanes, and the Commission sent missions to these disaster areas, and thus we had not only emergency aid appropriations but also decisions on long-term aid from the EAGGF, the ERDF and the Social Fund; but the lesson to be drawn from the experience of Réunion and the Antilles is that the transfer of appropriations takes a long time and such aid is distributed by systems over which there is no control. Consequently, both in the Antilles and in Réunion there have been protests from agricultural workers and farmers at the slowness of aid and inadequacies in its distribution. We think that there is a lesson to be learnt here. We must know what happens to emergency aid sent to such places. We take a vote here and congratulate ourselves on an act of solidarity, and then a few months later we learn that the local organizations, municipalities, trade-union or professional organizations are protesting because they have not seen the aid or, if they have, that it is insufficient. It is on this point, I believe, that we should draw conclusions and by our vote show not only our solidarity and our feeling that the matter is urgent but also our desire for checks to be made to see that all the resources allocated for these countries are actually distributed.

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

Mr d'Ormesson. — (F) Mr President, the European People's Party believes that there are times when the Community's goodwill and financial assistance take on the significance of an essential contribution to the survival of one of its members. How can we fail to appreciate the distress of the people of the French Antilles, where two successive hurricanes in 1979 virtually ruined the islands' agriculture just before harvest-time, as Mr Sablé reminded us so well a moment ago?

Hurricane Allen has completed that ruin: practically 100 % of all banana plantations have been destroyed in Martinique and 45 % in Guadeloupe, while sugarcane and pineapple plantations, plantations of flowers or market-gardening products or avocados have suffered very serious damage, depriving planters of their harvest. This loss has been aggravated by the need to rebuild their stocks ravaged by the last hurricane, and the cost of this alone amounts to half that of another harvest. This situation threatens considerable unemployment and ruin for the planters.

In these circumstances, the Community would gain moral credit by taking financial measures through the various funds at its disposal to revive agriculture in the Antilles and to give a brave but stricken population the means to earn a living and the feeling of fraternal support from the Community.

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

Mr Sutra. — (*F*) Mr President, very briefly — since all the arguments have already been heard — I wish to express my Group's support for this motion for a resolution.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (*I*) Mr President, as a number of speakers have pointed out, the Commission has always come to the aid of populations affected by natural disasters. As regards the French departments of Martinique and Guadeloupe, devastated by Hurricanes David and Frederick, the Commission in 1979, subject to the opinion of the European Parliament and decision by the Council, granted the following aid: 1 million units of account as emergency aid; 12 million units of account by way of participation under the EAGGF at the rate of 50 % for the reconstruction of the banana-growing industry. Following the recent Hurricane Allen, the Commission at its meeting of 10 September decided — as has been stated — to grant France an emergency aid of 700 000 units of account under Chapter 59 of the budget, for the purpose of repairing the damage suffered in the departments of Martinique and Guadeloupe. This aid is intended for housing and to compensate losses of the inhabitants' private property. In a message from the Secretary of State for the Overseas Departments, the French Government referred to the Commission's diligence in taking that decision, and a similar view has been expressed in this House by Mr Clément.

But, Mr President, the frequency of the damage to these plantations leads us to the conclusion that the most effective form of aid for these populations would be to enable them to diversify their crops. In June, the Commission therefore submitted a proposal to the Council which will be considered for a second time at a forthcoming Council meeting. The proposal concerns irrigation, rationalization of structures and diversification of agricultural products and provides for a Community aid of 96 million units of account for the French overseas departments as a whole.

The French Government has also recently applied to the Commission for funds for the development of agriculture in the department of Martinique. This project, like the previous one, responds to the need frequently expressed by the populations of these regions for secure sources of income based on activities independent of climatic factors. The Commission will consider this question at the earliest opportunity and hopes that the Council will be able to adopt its more general proposals concerning diversification as soon as possible.

President. — The debate is closed.

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

8. Fisheries policy

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

- the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Glinne and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the crisis in the European fishing industry (Doc. 1-382/80/rev.);
- the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Calvez and others on the common fisheries policy (Doc. 1-403/80).

I call Mr Josselin.

Mr Josselin. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, once again it is in a three-quarters-empty Chamber that the European Parliament comes to discuss the question of fisheries. We have never been able to debate the fisheries question except at the end of a part-session, as if we were absolutely determined to renew the tradition of Friday as fish-day; but the tradition has been abandoned, as have the fishermen.

Nevertheless, there is a crisis in Europe's fishing industry, and the long struggle of the French fishermen, witnessed by hundreds of thousands of European tourists and interrupted — no more — by the decision to return to work, taken on Wednesday in Boulogne, deserved better. The causes of the crisis are well-known: the increasing scarcity of fish due to the anarchic exploitation of certain species and reduced opportunities for catches in the waters of third countries following the setting up of 200-mile exclusive economic zones. These, now structural, factors are aggravated by the considerable increase in shipbuilding costs and particularly by frequent and heavy increases in fuel costs, which have totally overwhelmed the economic basis of the fishing industry. Between 1973 and 1979, the price of 'fishing' diesel rose by 600 %. In the same period, the average selling price of fish rose by only 88 %. Finally, we know that an organization of the markets — both national and European — would play into the hands of powerful groups, many of them multinational, which are engaging in shameless speculation, at the expense of fishermen and consumers, in the marketing and processing of fish products.

In these circumstances, it seems to me absolutely necessary for this House to ask the Council to look into this question on 29 September and to honour its undertaking to reach an agreement before the end of this year, as required by the Treaty, of which Parliament is the guardian. I do not deny the difficulty of reaching such an agreement where national interests

Josselin

are at stake and the present economic difficulties regrettably tend to favour national selfishness. But as far as the French Socialists are concerned, the Community agreement should at least insist upon respect for the principle of equal access to resources and decide upon a non-discriminatory system for catch quotas while, of course, taking account of the legitimate interests of coastal regions and also of historical rights acquired by certain fleets.

The agreement should also permit the development of a structural policy for the adaptation of fishing-fleets to the new international situation, mobilizing the EAGGF, the ERDF and the Social Fund perhaps, so as to permit not only the implementation of a coherent system for the control and supervision of fishing-grounds but also a reform of the common organization of the market in order to provide effective protection for the Community market against third countries and speculators.

Lastly, and most importantly, the agreement should record the intention of the Member States to improve and harmonize the working conditions and safety measures for Community fishermen as well as their social benefits in accordance with Article 117 of the Treaty of Rome. Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, one of the main objects of the motion which the Socialists now ask you to adopt is to point out the responsibility of the governments for this matter. Because fishermen account for only a small proportion of the population, the governments, overlooking the fact that the loss of one fisherman's job entails the loss of six jobs upstream and downstream of the fishing industry, have all too often neglected the fishing industry in both economic and social terms. In this connection, the acceptance by the French Government of the supposedly irretrievable decline of its fishing industry and the use of the fishing industry as a bargaining counter in international negotiations, its tendency to set fishermen at loggerheads with other categories of citizens and its willingness in this field also to accept social decay in refusing to intervene in negotiations between shipowners and fishermen are, unfortunately, typical. Also typical is the way in which it has tried to make Europe responsible for the crisis in the French fishing industry. This Parliament cannot allow Europe to be held up as responsible in the place of the governments.

By adopting this resolution condemning the serious failure by the Council of Ministers to adopt a common fisheries policy, by obliging the Council to accept its responsibilities, Parliament will be recording its intention not only to defend the jobs of a particularly deserving section of workers, not only to ensure that the fishing industry contributes to Europe's self-sufficiency in food, to the fight against hunger in the world — which we have been taking about this week — it will also be manifesting its intention to defend the future of the Community institutions. The physical, biological and economic factors of fishing make it a

sector which calls for Community solutions. But we must refuse to tolerate the use of Europe's fishing industry by certain people to remove blame from themselves or by others to justify their anti-European attitudes. By voting for this motion for a resolution, you will be affirming that Europe should be neither the good conscience of some nor the scapegoat of others.

President. — I call Mr Calvez.

Mr Calvez. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on 29 September a fisheries Council will be held in Brussels. As several governments have already contacted Mr Gundelach with requests for a more rapid implementation of the common fisheries policy and a review of the organization of the markets for fish products, no one can be unaware of the economic and social importance of the fishing industry. In this matter it is not for us to push the blame for the crisis in the European fishing industry onto the governments, any more than it is for us to denounce the failures of the Council of Ministers to act, because the fishing industry is no exception to the long list of sectors supported by public and Community resources. I think that this has to be recognized objectively.

But there is an ingrained habit of relying on the Member States to produce remedies for all ailments. Is it not reasonable that aid to shipowners should be made subject to improving the viability of their companies? The fishing industry of today should also adapt its management methods to the requirements of today, to the development of fishing techniques and to the difficulties on the fish market.

It is true that there are problems. Some fishermen are in serious straits, and all possible energy and goodwill must be mobilized to work out satisfactory solutions rationally. We cannot allow the deadline of 30 December 1980 to be extended. The Council has given undertakings and must stand by them. We ask the Council to do all it can to reach agreements between the Member States and so to prevent another crisis from following on the one which we are now experiencing in other sectors of the Community. A lot of people are looking to the European Parliament to see whether it is capable of bringing into being, in conjunction with the Commission and Council of Ministers, a European fisheries policy. We should not underestimate the importance of the squalls that we ahead, because the question is tricky and complex, but the reputation of the European institutions will reflect the results achieved.

President. — I call Mr Battersby to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Battersby. — Mr President, the European Democratic Group welcomes the fact that urgency has once again been recognized in connection with the common fishing policy, because the situation is desperately urgent. I don't think we realize how urgent it is. Time is not on our side, and the policy has to be established by 31 December. That is only 102 days away, and that includes week-ends, holidays, everything — 102 days!

The fishermen are finding it harder and harder to make a living, and it now takes 30 % more oil to catch a ton of fish than it did ten years ago. In the same period oil costs have escalated, and the price that the fisherman is getting for his fish has not kept pace with this escalation in fuel costs. Fish has to compete in the open market with other protein foodstuffs which have a much lower energy input. Competition from countries with lower oil prices has also distorted the market. The cost of new vessels, due to increased labour costs, more sophisticated electronic gear, larger engines and the burden of loan-servicing with high interest-rates, is causing prospective owners to hold back. This is creating a serious problem in the small specialist shipyards. Some Community ports, including my own port of Hull, have suffered disproportionately over the last few years, owing not only to the lack of decision over the common fishing policy, but also to the Icelandic closure, high fuel costs, loss of fishing opportunities and reduced stocks. These casualties — these ports, these communities — must be catered for in the new policy.

We cannot go on without a common fishing policy. The Commission has now produced for our opinion two of the three conceptual documents basic to the policy, documents on structure and resources, but these two elements cannot be effective without a marketing policy. The purpose of the fishing industry is to provide food for our people at reasonable prices while giving a reasonable return to the fisherman and the processor and to conserve the resource for all time. What I am asking the Commission is: where is the basic conceptual document on marketing? When shall we see this proposal? The fishermen harvest every day, not once a year. They are very vulnerable to overnight changes in exchange-rates and fuel prices, to dumping and uncontrolled imports. The existing withdrawal-price system is not suited to the present Community situation. It has not been for many years. Seventy thousand tons of fish will be landed by the largest Community producers' organization between now and the end of the year with no guaranteed price. Reference prices do not reflect reality. They are too low. They should be raised now without waiting till the end of the year. Export refunds need urgent review. The new marketing system must be flexible, realistic and sophisticated, but it must not create a withdrawal-price system in which good fish is caught deliberately for intervention, with resultant overfishing and stock destruction.

We must have the marketing proposals, and we must have them immediately. We have only 102 days, and in this period we call on the Commission and the Council to spare no effort in reaching agreement and producing the basic conceptual regulations before 31 December. The industry has waited too long. It has been waiting now for five years, and it has suffered long enough. There are 78 000 fishermen in northern waters and half-a-million or more Europeans involved in the fishing and associated industries. The Parliament, the people of Europe and the fishermen are looking to the Council and the Commission to do their duty and to do it quickly.

(Applause from the right)

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

Mr Papapietro. — *(I)* Mr President, we consider this initiative to be useful and timely, having regard to the struggle of the fishermen in France and Italy and to the worsening fisheries situation in the Mediterranean and the North Sea.

As Mr Battersby, the chairman of the sub-committee, has just stated, the fisheries sub-committee is considering this problem and will be presenting documents specifically on the Mediterranean and on fishing in my country, which has been dramatically affected by the economic crisis, by rising fuel costs, by the progressive depletion of fish stocks, by the effect on the market of speculation by middlemen, by the structural weakness of the processing industry, and is further aggravated by relations with third countries and by the continuous and serious lack of an agreement in the Mediterranean, one result of which is that 22 Sicilian fishermen are still in Libyan jails.

We have frequently and dramatically raised this problem in this House. The inadequacy of my government's policy is not much offset by intervention in the form of fuel subsidies or in marketing questions for the regions concerned. There is inadequacy even in the availability of information and statistics, affecting not only my country but also other fishing countries. There is no exact information on the number of those employed, nor is there any precise idea not of the quantity but of the species of fish caught. Insufficient value is attached to scientific research and to international cooperation agreements — as far as my Mediterranean country is concerned — on conservation, repopulation and the processing industry, quite apart from the happiness and even the physical liberty of those employed in this industry.

There is an urgent need for a general change in the Community's fisheries policy to take account of the industry's general requirements and of the diversity and interrelation of the fishing economies of the

Papapietro

various Community regions. Fishing in the North Sea is different from fishing in the Mediterranean. We therefore agree with the flexible approach adopted by the sub-committee under the eminent chairmanship of Mr Battersby when looking at these questions. We further consider that there is an urgent need to impress upon the Commission — along the lines of the resolutions and speeches this morning — the urgent need for a profound change in policy in this sector.

We shall vote for the resolution.

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

Mr Remilly. — (*F*) Mr President, in the little time available to me I should like to state the position on the fisheries question of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, which has grasped the magnitude of the problem and the risks entailed in letting Europe slide into maritime lethargy.

The trouble was already latent. What brought it out was, of course, the rise in oil prices, which should have been speedily mitigated by a reduction in the price of fuel used in fishing. We were repeatedly told that it was not possible to grant subsidies to French fuel, the price of which was aligned on that of fuel in other countries. That, however, is incorrect. It is true that the fuel used for fishing is exempt from duty, but it still costs about 1.14 francs in France, whereas in Italy it only costs 0.70 francs; and at the same time Westminster is granting about 140 million francs to its fishermen to offset recent increases. When one realizes that it takes one litre of diesel to catch one kilogram of fish, it would seem elementary to provide special short-term measures to reduce the price of fuel used in fishing. The Commission should act at this level by making proposals, just as it proposed that Germany, Belgium and the Netherlands should subsidize fuel used for agriculture under grass. Why should this be possible for one agricultural sector but not for another? Such support would be particularly justified as French fisheries produce more than 750 000 tonnes of fish and employ over 30 000 people, with whom must also be considered the many related activities: transport, canning, shipbuilding, etc. Moreover, if the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea has decided to extend the economic zone to 200 miles, rules must be laid down for exploiting resources within that zone in order to preserve the rights established by fishermen over several decades.

We are confident that the Council will respect its undertaking, given on 30 May 1980, to reach an agreement before 30 December of this year. This agreement should lay down a fairer and more realistic quota policy, taking account of the situation of stocks and allowing all fishermen to participate fairly in their reconstitution. Further, we must stop favouring cheap

imports and grant higher guaranteed prices to our producers. There is an urgent need to restore to fishermen the social and economic standing which they have lost. These, together with the development of aid for modernizing fleets and the promotion of agriculture, are the requirements for the success of tomorrow's fishing industry in Europe.

President. — I call Miss Quin.

Miss Quin. — I welcome the chance for a debate on this subject at this point so that our views can be made known before the Council meeting the week after next. Once again I am rather sorry that the debate has to be on a Friday; there can be something of a clublike atmosphere here with those of us interested in fishing matters discussing these issues on a Friday, but the clublike atmosphere should not blind us to the extreme gravity of the situation.

I would like to mention very briefly a few aspects which I hope will be taken into account by the Council and by the Commission. First, quotas: I do not feel, on grounds of fairness, that the Commission's proposals on quota allocations really do justice to the UK's claims. More account of the United Kingdom resource contribution to EEC waters needs to be taken and also of the loss of catch opportunities in third countries. Because of this, and with two-thirds of the EEC catch outside the Mediterranean in the UK waters, I feel that an allocation of between 40 % and 45 % is not unreasonable.

Secondly, I would like to mention the problem of regional preferences. I feel, as does the Commission, that areas which are particularly dependent on fishing should have their interests taken into account, but I am still perturbed that one of the areas mentioned, that of north Britain, has not been clearly defined. I know that fishermen in my own area of England, north-east England, are still very concerned about this. Their case for inclusion in such an area is, I feel sure, that there are many fishing communities between Berwick and Flamborough Head that would face a very bleak future if they were not given some sort of special provision.

The North-East, too, has such a high level of unemployment in general — in the last few months second only to Northern Ireland in the United Kingdom — that this too needs to be taken fully into account. Despite my pleas to the Commission and my having made various requests and various approaches, no clarification of this area has yet been made — perhaps some answer will be forthcoming this morning.

Thirdly, the aspect of policing is an important one. Many of us who represent fishing areas know that fishermen can be suspicious that others are overfishing. For this reason there needs to be some transna-

Quin

tional element in any policing arrangement in order to try and create a climate of confidence.

Fourthly, I hope that proposals that come forward on restructuring will not only include the question of capital projects but will also have a human element and include social payments for those who have suffered, or will suffer, hardship because of reduced opportunities.

Fifthly, I should like very briefly to mention the way these fishing negotiations are conducted. In July, in this Assembly, there was an astonishing degree of unity among parliamentarians who spoke on the Gautier report in their criticism of the way Commission proposals had been presented to us, often far too late for us to make any useful contribution. Often documents were given to us which confused rather than clarified. This was stressed again and again. I think the way the Council operates, too, gives us some cause for suspicion, because many of us are concerned that fishing may be a trade-off issue, bargained against completely dissimilar issues.

Finally, I would say that the issue must be decided on its merits. Otherwise a fair solution will elude us and the fishing communities of Europe will blame us bitterly for a long time to come.

President. — I call Mr Kirk.

Mr Kirk. — *(DK)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I do not think everyone here in the House really appreciates what it is that we are debating now and have debated so many times in the past year. When I listen to the discussion, when we start to go into slightly more detail, I get the impression that many people think that the crisis in the fishing industry can be resolved merely by having a common fisheries policy, that these three words alone are enough to overcome the crisis in the industry. This is certainly not the crucial factor. The crucial question is how the common fisheries policy is to be built up and on what principles it is going to be based. It seems to me that in some of the Member States one often finds an attitude which is not really directed towards setting up a common policy for the benefit of the Community, but toward creating a so-called common policy around the issue of how much control can be gained over common resources at national level. But this is not the kind of common fisheries policy which I think Parliament ought to be discussing.

I would also like to say that what we have seen and heard in recent months both in France and in the United Kingdom is clearly an indication of the serious problems which have arisen in the fishing industry since the extension of the economic zones and the onset of the energy crisis. But I am not sure, judging by the proposals which we have seen so far from the

Commission and which the Commission's Directorate-General for Fisheries has drawn up, that the situation has in fact been correctly assessed. I am not sure that there has been the re-assessment made necessary by the economic zones, the energy crisis and the problems which these have caused for the fishing industry, while we continue to operate in practice on much the same principles as in 1976 and 1977. I should therefore like to take the opportunity today of urging the Commission and Mr Gundelach to try to analyse the situation in greater depth and then to see in what areas the Community can intervene to ward off these after-effects; also to ensure that this is done at Community level and that the common fisheries policy does not become a policy whose sole aim is to distribute our common resources in relation to the interests of national governments.

Furthermore, it is quite clear to me that at the moment there is a great risk of further forms of protectionism appearing in the fishing industry. We have seen the French Government, during the fisheries crisis in France, produce a solution to the problems of the French, based on the view that a further, stricter system of health control would solve the problems of the French fisherman and the French fishing industry. I do not think this is the path we should take. If we choose this path, it can only be with the aim of seeking to interfere with free internal trade in fishery products. I would warn strongly against this. The same applies to the various forms of national support measures which exist in some Member States. It is very dangerous for these to be allowed to flourish too widely, and certainly it then becomes even harder to achieve a common fisheries policy capable of providing all the fishermen in the Community with the same conditions of competition. It is my hope that the common fisheries policy will be able to live up to this aim, but I am also convinced that there should be a change of course.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR DE FERRANTI

Vice-President

President. — I call Mrs Le Roux.

Mrs Le Roux. — *(F)* Mr President, it was with calmness, determination and responsibility that fishermen from all the coastal areas of France a few weeks ago started an action whose proportions must have been obvious to all. The reasons for this action are simple. Fishermen no longer wish to live on an inhuman salary in inhuman working conditions. They do not want their families to bear the brunt of the austerity

Le Roux

imposed by the capitalists. They do not want the fishing industry, which provides a living for more than a million French people, simply to disappear from our country's economy. The French workers have understood this and lent active support, giving moral and material assistance to the fishermen and their families.

Our analysis of the causes of the crisis and the reasons for the difficulties is not that of Mr Glinne and Mr Josselin and their friends in the Socialist Group, nor is it that of Mr Calvez and those who here support the French Government. It is obvious, and it is one of the proposals which we are defending, that fish-stocks must be organized, rationally and reasonably in order to safeguard the future. But to say, as the Socialist Group does, that the increasing rarity of fish resources and the reduced catch possibilities are the causes of the crisis, at a time when fish are being destroyed in massive quantities and millions of people are dying of hunger, is to overlook the fundamental reasons for the phenomenon, and I cannot believe that, in a political group which includes among its members several distinguished economists, this omission is accidental.

The cause of the fishing crisis is the policy pursued by the governments of the Community — ours in particular, which has deliberately favoured the big ship-owners, the fish-processing companies and in particular the leaders in the agri-foodstuffs industry. Everything has been done to promote the emergence of a few fishing and processing companies, with the result that there has been an acceleration in concentration of shipping companies and, in the long term, a decline in fishing. Processing factories have been built in Africa to take advantage of cheap labour, so putting the canning industry in our own country out of business. The quest for maximum productivity and the elimination of jobs have adversely affected the living and working conditions of the fishermen.

We are told that there is no common fisheries policy and that one will have to be worked out. There *is* a fisheries policy, and we will fight it. The interventions of the EAGGF, like the short-term measures, have been systematic, selective and specific. The last decisive act was the proposal from the Commission, which we alone in this House rejected firmly, for the restructuring of non-industrial fishing, which will destroy the jobs of hundreds, perhaps thousands of fishermen and penalize French non-industrial fishing. The reality of the harmful policy pursued by the Community, i.e., by the governments of the Member States, is recognized by the great majority of French fishermen, who regard the Common Market as harmful to their interests and dangerous. The result of this damaging policy can be seen in the figures. In France, the trade in fish shows a deficit of 3 100 million francs, as against a turnover of 3 100 million francs. Every year since 1971, the deficit has increased by 7.8%. What then, faced with this crisis, are we proposing? — Certainly not that the problems of the fishing industry, and in particular the French fishing industry, should be settled by the

Community. We have enough sorry evidence, from steel-making to ship-repairing, of the harmful effects of European integration.

However, the Community can and must use its powers under the Treaty of Rome to protect resources by prohibiting the catching of immature fish and reserving fish for human consumption; to guarantee fair access to fishing zones for the ships of the Member States and to allocate fishing quotas in accordance with the mutual interests and economic traditions of the populations concerned; to combat the practice of third countries' flying flags of convenience of Member States of the Community; to guarantee fishermen a decent standard of living by guaranteeing minimum prices corresponding to the realities of the cost of living; and by the application of Article 117, which provides for social security systems to be harmonized on the basis of the highest standards. Lastly, and, we think, the essential element which would show that the Members of this Assembly and the Community are prepared to express their concern for the future of the fishing industry in actions and not just words, we must stop the enlargement of the Common Market to include Spain and Portugal.

These are the considerations which have led us to amend the text tabled by the Socialist Group, because the proposals and statements contained in that text, as also in that of Mr Calvez and his friends, are not, in our view, such as to satisfy the claims of the fishermen and provide real lasting solutions to the serious crisis affecting that industry.

President. — The agenda stipulates that we start voting at 10.30. However, I personally feel that you would probably prefer to finish the debate and begin the voting when the debate is over.

I call Mrs Castle on a point of order.

Mrs Castle. — Mr President, further to what you have just said.

This habit of deciding a voting-time in the morning and then quite arbitrarily altering it during the course of a debate really makes life impossible for Members who may have other work to do. There are no division bells in this place; no means of knowing what is happening in this Chamber without having a noisy instrument on in one's room all the time.

Can I ask that you stand by the decision taken and that we vote at 10.30?

President. — I therefore put the matter to the vote.

(Parliament voted to interrupt the debate and proceed to the voting)

President

I call Mr Kirk on a point of order.

Mr Kirk. — (DK) Mr President, I think it is unreasonable of Mrs Castle to insist on interrupting the debate in this way. I must respect the President's decision; but it is not good enough for those people who are interested in the debate, and who also feel that they have work to do, if others have no respect for a debate which is in progress in Parliament.

President. — With respect, that is hardly a point of order. It is for the President to decide, and I try and follow the wishes of the House.

9. Votes

President. — The next item is the vote on motions for a resolution on which the debate has been closed.

I call Mrs Castle on a point of order.

Mrs Castle. — Mr President, I have just been to the distribution office to collect the amendments. I have found two in English. Am I to take it that they are the only amendments that are going to be put today? This really is a very odd way to run a parliament.

President. — I take note of what you have said. We begin with the motion for a resolution contained in the *Travaglini report (Doc. 1-347/80): Regional development programmes*.

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 3)

On paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 2, tabled by Mr Harris, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, seeking to delete the word 'structural'.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Travaglini, rapporteur. — (I) I am in favour, since it improves the wording.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 2, paragraph 4 as amended and paragraphs 5 to 11)

President. — On paragraph 12, I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Travaglini, seeking to replace the figure 1980 by the figure 1981.

(Parliament adopted in succession Amendment No 1, paragraph 12, thus amended, and paragraphs 13 to 17)

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole, incorporating the amendments which have been adopted.

The resolution is adopted.¹

I call Mrs Kellet-Bowman on a point of order.

Mrs Kellet-Bowman. — Would Mrs Castle care to withdraw her quite unfounded comments, because the procedure has been perfectly correct?

President. — I call Mrs Castle.

Mrs Castle. — Mr President, I asked a question, as I have a right to do, whether the two amendments were all that there were. Nobody seemed to know.

Mrs Kellet-Bowman. — We did!

*

* *

President. — We now proceed to the *Sassano report (Doc. 1-214/80): Alternative energy sources*.

(Parliament adopted the preamble)

On paragraph 1, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Seligman and deleting the phrase: 'including the liquefaction and gasification of solid fuels'.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Sassano, rapporteur. — (I) I am in agreement.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1 and paragraphs 1 thus amended)

President. — After paragraph 1, I have Amendment No 2, tabled by Mr Seligman and adding the following new paragraph:

- 1 a. Stresses the need to devote substantially increased financial resources to liquefaction and gasification of solid fuels, in view of the urgent need to find substitutes for liquid and gaseous fuels and in order to keep pace with the much larger expenditure on these processes by the Community's competitors in the world.

What is the rapporteur's position?

¹ OJ C 265 of 13. 10. 1980.

Mr Sassano, rapporteur. — (I) I am in agreement.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 2 and then paragraphs 2 to 6)

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole, incorporating the amendments which have been adopted.

The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *von Wogau report (Doc. 1-340/80): Fuel consumption and engine-power of motor-vehicles.*

The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *von Wogau report (Doc. 1-343/80): Safety-belts and interior fittings of motor-vehicles.*

The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the *Turner report (Doc. 1-237/80): Insurance contracts.*

We shall first vote on the amendments to the proposal for a directive.

On Article 1 of the proposal for a directive, I have two amendments tabled by Lady Elles and Mr Tyrrell on behalf of the European Democratic Group:

— Amendment No 12, seeking to reword the article as follows:

The object of this directive is to coordinate the fundamental laws, regulations and administrative provisions

governing those classes of insurance contracts designated for coordination in the services directive as adopted by the Council of Ministers.

— Amendment No 15, seeking to add the following sentence at the end of the article:

The scope of this directive is limited to risks situated within Member States.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — The committee would most certainly have supported Amendment No 12, because they presuppose this.

They did consider Amendment No 15 and were in sympathy with the idea, but were persuaded by the Commission that it was unnecessary to insert it. So I think it is a question of being safe rather than sorry when one votes for No 15.

(Parliament adopted Amendments Nos 12 and 15 in succession)

President. — On Article 2, I have three amendments:

— Amendment No 5, tabled by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and seeking to reword paragraph 2 as follows:

2. Pending the issue of such a document, the policy-holder shall receive, without delay, a document which attests to the existence of an insurance contract and contains at least the information referred to in paragraph 1 together with a statement of the risks not covered by the contract, the risks covered and the amount insured. If the insurer fails to include this information, the policy-holder shall be entitled to terminate the contract.

— Amendment No 6, tabled by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and seeking to delete paragraph 7;

— Amendment No 13, tabled by Lady Elles and Mr Tyrrell and seeking to reword paragraph 6 as follows:

The contract and the documents referred to in paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 shall be drafted in a language to be agreed between the parties.

What is the rapporteur's position?

¹ OJ C 265 of 13. 10. 1980.

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — Mr President, the committee did consider the point in Amendment No 5 very carefully and decided against it. They also considered the point in Amendment No 13 and postponed the decision to the other directive we are concerned with. But I must point out that the amendment does not make any provision for translation if the language is different from that of the policy-holder. The committee would therefore be against it.

As far as Amendment No 6 is concerned, the committee expressly decided that a one-year period was needed.

(Parliament rejected the three amendments in turn)

President. — On Article 3 (2) (a), I have Amendment No 23 tabled by Mr Megahy and others on behalf of the Socialist Group and seeking to delete, in the amended text proposed by Parliament, the words 'or the policy-holder' and 'or termination'.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — We are against this. It deprives the policy-holder of a right.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 23)

President. — On Article 3 (2) (b) (i), I have two amendments:

— Amendment No 24, tabled by Mr Megahy and others on behalf of the Socialist Group and seeking to delete, in the amended text proposed by Parliament, and the words 'or termination' in each case;

— Amendment No 10, tabled by Mr Kirk and Mr Tyrrell and seeking to amend the paragraph as follows:

— The other party shall be entitled to a period of fifteen days from the date on which he receives the proposal for an amendment in which to accept or reject it. If the other party rejects the proposal or fails to reply within the above time-limit, the party proposing amendment or termination may terminate the contract within a period of eight days by giving fifteen days' notice. Where the policy is not taken out in the course of commercial activity the periods referred to above shall be extended to one month, three weeks and one month.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — Amendment No 24 prevents termination of an agreement and thus would lead to unacceptable terms being put forward, so the committee is against that. I believe the committee

would have supported Amendment No 10, because they discussed it at length but could not come to any satisfactory conclusion. It is a good one, I think.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 24 and adopted Amendment No 10)

President. — On Article 3 (3), first sentence, Article 3 (4) (b) and Article 3 (5), I have Amendments Nos 25, 26 and 27, tabled by Mr Megahy and others on behalf of the Socialist Group and seeking to reinstate the Commission's text in each case.

On Article 3 (3) (c), I have Amendment No 16, by Lady Elles and Mr Tyrrell, seeking to add the following sentence:

The provisions of this subparagraph shall not apply where the parties to this contract expressly exclude them.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — Amendment No 25 is inconsistent with Article 3 (1), which has not been amended. No 26 cuts out damages for fraud, so the committee is against it. Amendment No 27 is also inconsistent with Article 3 (1). Amendment No 16 does not accord with the committee's acceptance of the applicability of the proportional principle, so the committee is against it.

(Parliament rejected all four amendments in turn)

President. — On Article 4 (2), Article 4 (4), Article 4 (6) (b) and Article 4 (7), I have Amendments Nos 28, 29, 30 and 31 respectively, tabled by Mr Megahy and others on behalf of the Socialist Group and seeking to reinstate the Commission's text in each case.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — Amendment No 28 proposes unacceptable terms on the contract. The committee is against Amendment No 29 because it is inconsistent with Article 3 (3) (c). It is against Amendment No 30 because it would cut out payment of damages for fraud, and Amendment No 31 is inconsistent with Articles 4 (5) and 4 (6).

(Parliament rejected all four amendments in turn)

President. — On Article 6, I have Amendment No 11, by Lady Elles and Mr Tyrrell, seeking to reinstate the Commission's text.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — There is no doubt that the amendment made in committee went wrong and does

Turner

not reflect what the committee intended. There is no alternative but to go back to the original, which is what this amendment proposes.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 11)

President. — On Article 8, I have Amendment No 17, by Lady Elles and Mr Tyrrell, seeking to add the following sentence at the end of paragraph 2:

Should the costs exceed the insured sum, they shall only be defrayed by the insurer in cases where the policy-holder has acted on the express instructions of the insurer.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — I considered this problem and came to no clear solution. I think the committee would have considered this sensible, but I must give it a free vote.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 17)

President. — On Article 9 (4), I have Amendment No 9, tabled by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

4. If the insurer proves that the policy-holder's failure to fulfil one of the obligations laid down in paragraphs 1 and 2 was intended to cause him loss or to deceive him, he shall be released from all liability to make payment in respect of the claim and in respect of the part of the claim to which the policy-holder's failure to fulfil these obligations applies.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — We are against the amendment, because it gives rights to a fraudulent party.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 9)

President. — On Article 10 (3), I have Amendment No 7, tabled by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and seeking to add the following new subparagraph between subparagraphs (c) and (d):

Should the insured risk cease to apply, the policy-holder shall be entitled to terminate the contract and shall not be required to pay the premium; if the premium has already been paid, the policy-holder shall be entitled to repayment of the appropriate sum.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — They have covered it already in Article 10 (2) (a).

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 7)

President. — On Article 12, I have Amendment No 8, tabled by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and seeking to add the following sentence at the end of this paragraph:

... The Member States may also make provision in their national legislation for more favourable terms for the policy-holder, insured person or injured third party.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — The committee was definitely against this amendment, because it proposes that the directive should be a minimum directive, whereas it is a harmonizing directive.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 8)

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

(Parliament adopted the preamble)

On paragraph 1, I have Amendment No 14, tabled by Lady Elles and Mr Tyrrell on behalf of the European Democratic Group and seeking to add the following text at the end of this paragraph:

but considers that the proposal for a directive should not be enacted until after the enactment of the second Council directive on the coordination of laws, regulations and administrative provisions relating to direct insurance other than life insurance (hereinafter the services directive), and that its subsequent enactment should seek only to harmonize insurance contract law in the European Community to the extent that is strictly necessary in the light of the eventual shape of the second Council directive.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — This would certainly be accepted, as it is in line with the first amendment adopted this morning.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 14 and paragraph 1 as amended)

President. — On paragraph 2, I have Amendment No 18, tabled by Mr Megahy and others on behalf of the Socialist Group and seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

2. Is of the opinion that approximation of legislation going beyond the provision of this draft directive is necessary to ensure equivalent safeguards for all policy-holders.

President

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — This particular amendment was rejected by the committee.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 18 and adopted paragraph 2)

President. — On paragraph 3, I have two amendments:

— Amendment No 19, tabled, by Mr Megahy and others on behalf of the Socialist Group and seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

3. Regrets that the introduction of a period for reconsideration of the contract, the prohibition of abusive clauses, the express mention of exclusions and of completion dates together with the conditions for terminating the contract are not adequately covered by unambiguous provisions in this draft directive;

— Amendment No 1, tabled by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

3. Considers that in general terms the directive does not provide for an appropriate balance between the rights and obligations of the insurer and those of the insured person.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — Amendment No 19 was withdrawn by Mr Sieglerschmidt in committee and Amendment No 1 criticizes the directive, saying that it is unbalanced, which the committee does not think it is.

(Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 19 and 1 and adopted paragraph 3)

President. — After paragraph 3, I have three amendments tabled by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection:

— Amendment No 2, seeking to add the following new paragraph:

- 3(a) Therefore considers that this directive should be regarded as laying down minimum requirements which permit the Member States to provide where necessary for greater protection of the policy-holder;

— Amendment No 3, seeking to add the following new paragraph:

- 3(b) Request the Commission to supplement the directive through:

- (a) harmonization of the wording of insurance contracts so that their meaning is immediately clear to the consumer and he is able to compare the terms offered,
- (b) regulations on unfair terms,
- (c) provisions allowing time for consideration;

— Amendment No 4, seeking to add the following new paragraph:

- 3(c) Requests the Commission to modify the directive so as to ensure a better balance between the rights and obligations of the contracting parties in the event of termination of the contract.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — The committee is against Amendment No 2, because it seeks to make it a minimum directive. It is against Amendments Nos 3 and 4, because they are inconsistent with what has been voted so far.

(Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 2, 3 and 4 in succession and adopted paragraph 4)

President. — On paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 20, tabled by Mr Megahy and others on behalf of the Socialist Group and seeking to reword this paragraph to read as follows:

5. Stresses that there should be an equitable balance between the interests of the insurer and insured in the case of voluntary insurance contracts concluded to cover major industrial and commercial risks on the one hand and standard insurance contracts of the type concluded by private policy-holders with a limited knowledge of their legal position on the other.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — This amendment was rejected in committee.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 20 and adopted paragraph 5)

President. — On paragraph 6, I have Amendment No 21, tabled by Mr Megahy and others on behalf of the Socialist Group and seeking to delete this paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — This amendment is inconsistent with the vote already taken on the draft.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 21 and adopted paragraphs 7 and 8)

President. — On paragraph 9, I have Amendment No 22, tabled by Mr Megahy and others on behalf of the Socialist Group and seeking to delete this paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Turner, rapporteur. — We are against this amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 22 and adopted paragraphs 9 to 11)

President. — I can now give the floor for explanations of vote. I call Mrs Seibel-Emmerling.

Mrs Seibel-Emmerling. — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am giving an explanation of vote on behalf of the Socialist Group. Our group will vote against this report for several reasons. The debate yesterday evening — which unfortunately took place before an empty house — made it clear to everyone that this report does not take sufficient account of the rights of the consumer. This proposal from the Commission, and what is now going to happen because of the vote in this House, will deprive the consumer in certain Member States of rights which he had fought for; it will set back the entire development of consumers' rights in the field of insurance. You, ladies and gentlemen, have for the most part refused to recognize this directive as one which lays down a minimum. There could have been an opportunity to advance the cause of consumer protection in the Member States. We are therefore unable to vote in favour of this.

Furthermore, we in the Socialist Group must protest in no uncertain terms at the accusation made by the rapporteur and unfortunately not only not refuted, but almost given some degree of credence by being repeated by the President of the House, that when seeking to amend paragraph 9 the Socialist Group was trying to secure rights for fraudulent parties. What was the point at issue? The point at issue was that insurance companies cannot avoid the obligations otherwise imposed on them by the contract of insurance by refusing to provide any insurance at all if one section of the contract proves invalid because of false information having been supplied. Therefore, the Socialist Group — like the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection — sought to introduce a clause through its amendment which merely stated that only that section of the contract of insurance obtained by deception need not be fulfilled, while other clauses unaffected by this would continue to form a contract of insurance.

The committee — and I can also speak here on behalf of the committee, whose opinion I drafted — looked at this very carefully; and I must say how surprised I

am that some of its members, who in committee voted in favour of all the amendments which they are now rejecting, have now changed their minds — in my opinion, against their better judgment.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Janssen van Raay.

Mr Janssen van Raay. — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as spokesman for the Christian-Democratic Group I repeat this morning, before a somewhat fuller house than yesterday, that in our honest opinion the Turner report is quite rightly a broad compromise between the interests of the insurers and those of the insured. I also wish to defend those members of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection who apparently changed their minds as a result of the debate yesterday evening. They are perfectly entitled to do so. Yesterday, some particularly good arguments were put forward, to which I myself contributed, to demonstrate that we do indeed have a clear understanding of the background to these proposals, but that our advice is, firstly on legal grounds and secondly because of the balance which rightly exists in this resolution: vote in favour. And if people change their minds because of a debate, they have every right to do so. That is exactly what a debate is for.

The Legal Affairs Committee put forward arguments which, I am very pleased to say, were sufficiently convincing for our own colleagues in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. Let me say, finally, that I should be very sorry, not least on behalf of the consumers, if this directive were to be rejected. The adoption of the directive, which regulates the competition between insurance companies in all the countries of the European Community, is in itself the best means of protecting the consumer. The consumer is protected by the increased harmonization of competition.

He has a choice: if one company does not suit him, he can go to another, and so the legislation is harmonized. We shall therefore definitely vote in favour of this directive.

President. — I call Mrs Scrivener.

Mrs Scrivener. — *(F)* Mr President, to my great regret I think I shall recommend a vote against this report, because, as a result of the votes that have taken place, the text before us is no longer coherent. In such an important matter which affects the interests of insurers — obviously — as well as those of consumers, it is necessary to review this question in order to produce a better-prepared draft more acceptable to both sides.

President. — I call Lady Elles.

Lady Elles. — Mr President, on behalf of my group, I wish to say that we shall certainly support this motion for a resolution and Mr Turner's report, and would like to thank Mr Turner for the work he has done on this draft directive.

However, I am surprised that the consumer group in the Legal Affairs Committee should now say that they have not had a chance, because, as I read the draft directive, all the improvements in the original Commission proposal have been quite rightly in favour of consumers. So I am very surprised at the comment made by the mover of some of the amendments. Secondly, I would like to point out that only two of her colleagues, out of 113 members of the Socialist Group, were present to lend this poor young lady their support. Many will know that there were many members of the European People's Party and my own group here until 10.55, when the House rose. I would like to have it put on the record that we were supporting both the subject matter and the report itself.

I am grateful that the House has decided that this draft directive should only be considered in the light of a previous draft directive before the Council concerning the provision of services, because this particular draft directive is really an expansion of Article 5 of the original draft directive. We hope that the Commission and the Council will get on with their task of adopting the first draft directive, on the provision of services, and then turn their minds to this. I agree that it will need some considerable tidying up, but as it stands I think it is a vast improvement on the original draft that came before the Legal Affairs Committee. I would therefore advise my group to vote in favour of it on the basis of this present text.

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

The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* *

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Key report (Doc. 1-334/80): Use of certain appropriations available in the budget.*

The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the *Ryan report (Doc. 1-334/80): Discharge to the European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training.*

(Parliament adopted the decision proposed in the report)

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the *Blaney report (Doc. 1-389/80): Flax and hemp.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble)

On the sole paragraph, I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Coppieters, seeking to replace the single paragraph by the following text:

1. Requests the Commission to amend its proposals in such a manner that 50 % of the financing for the proposed information campaigns will take the form of direct aid from the EAGGF;
2. Approves the Commission's proposal subject to this amendment being made.

What is the rapporteur's position?

Mr Provan, deputy rapporteur. — Mr President, as I said this morning, when I introduced the report on behalf of Mr Blaney, the Committee on Agriculture is against this amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and adopted the original paragraph)

President. — I put the resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* *

President. — We shall now consider the three motions for resolutions on Community aid to the departments of Guadeloupe and Martinique devastated by Hurricane Allen.

I put to the vote the *Clément et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-362/80): Emergency aid for Martinique.*

The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* *

¹ OJ C 265 of 13. 10. 1980.

President. — I put to the vote the *Sablé et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-377/80): Community aid to Martinique and Guadeloupe.*

The resolution is adopted.¹

*

* *

President. — I put to the vote the *Vergès et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-384/80): Community aid to Guadeloupe and Martinique.*

The resolution is adopted.¹

I call Mr Collins on a point of order.

Mr Collins. — Mr President, you will not, I think, have failed to observe a certain confusion, unusual even for a Friday, in the way in which people have been recording their votes over the last half-hour. There seems to be some doubt about whether they are for or against. I really do think it would help a great deal if, as well as reading out the author of the report, you would give the House the title of the report, because not everybody remembers the rapporteur's name. I think people would find this very helpful and would then know which way to vote, because it would be much clearer.

President. — Your point of order has been noted.

10. Fisheries policy (contd)

President. — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on two motions for resolutions on fishing (Doc. 1-382/80/rev./corr. and Doc. 1-403/80).

I call Mr Harris.

Mr Harris. — Mr President, I would like to congratulate Mr Josselin on the responsible way in which he moved this resolution. I am sorry that once again I have to quarrel with Mrs Le Roux, but it is on one point only. She said in her speech that the fishermen of France had acted with a sense of responsibility. I am afraid that they did not. They caused tremendous inconvenience and hardship to holiday-makers, both French and English, and other nationalities as well, and I think that should be said.

I would, however, like to assure her that I spent my holiday in Brittany this year. I went through a lot of

fishing-ports in Brittany, and I can well understand the plight of the fishermen there. I look at the table in the Commission's document charting the way in which the French fishing-fleet has declined drastically over the years. So this is not just a problem facing one country. It is facing several countries — my country, the United Kingdom, has also had a decline in its fishing-fleet. It is sometimes represented as a battle between nations in the Community. It is not just that. In my part of the world, down in Cornwall in the South-West of England, the main controversy is over the appearance of large fishing-boats from Scotland and the east coast of the United Kingdom fishing for mackerel.

What I want to say to the Commissioner today is that the Commission and the Council must not forget the interests of the small inshore fisherman, whether in Brittany, Cornwall or other regions of the Community. I believe it is absolutely essential to have special safeguards for those inshore fishermen. As I said earlier, it is sometimes a question of the size of vessels coming in to fishing-grounds and scooping up fish. It is vital that we have adequate protection for local inshore fishing-fleets. For my part, I think there does need to be a limit on the size of vessels and some control on how close they can come to the shore. That is my plea to the Council and to the Commission, because I feel that ultimately the future of a restructured Community fishing industry will depend basically on the smaller boats, the inshore and the middle-water boats. I am afraid that the big boats no longer have anywhere to go since Iceland extended its limits.

I want to see a common fisheries policy which is fair to the fishermen of all nations, and I give you my word that it will have my support if it meets the criterion of fairness and also ensures an adequate conservation of stocks.

(Applause)

President. — I call Miss Brookes.

Miss Brookes. — Mr President, Wales is very much part of the European Community, but does not, perhaps, have the largest fishing industry. That does not mean, however, that the fishermen of Wales are less concerned than those in other areas in the United Kingdom and the Community about the present situation regarding the common fishing policy.

The Welsh fishing industry is concerned about the trespass into the small Celtic Sea of the very large beam trawlers that follow the sole exclusively, a fish which is extremely profitable on the Continent of Europe. This beam trawling is overfishing the Celtic Sea. In addition, this particular form of trawling destroys the seabed and in time will make the more traditional forms of trawling impossible.

¹ OJC 265 of 13. 10. 1980.

Brookes

The total allowable catch is fair, but the proportion of the TAC granted to the United Kingdom fishermen should be between 40 % and 45 %. The UK proposals for historical fishing-rights are that the limit for each nation should be taken from the fishing patterns of the past twenty years. Overfishing during the last few years should not be rewarded by taking too short a period as the historical basis.

A recent industry in North Wales is that of processing and freezing the fish as the catches are landed on the quayside, and this creates much employment. If the Welsh fishing industry has the opportunity and is allowed to grow, then new jobs will be automatically created. Fishing is one of the industries in Wales that provide employment for the major part of the year, and the fishermen and trawlermen are eager for a common fishing policy and are quite prepared to face fair competition. They do ask, however, that European odds shall not be stacked against them.

Welsh fishermen are among thousands of other Community fishermen eager to have their industry assured. Mr President, Mr Gundelach, I ask this Parliament, on behalf of North Wales and Welsh fishermen, for a 35-mile preferential zone in the small Celtic Sea and for the efficient policing of those waters to ensure that the Celtic Sea will not be overfished.

President. — I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DK) Mr President, I also regret that debates on fisheries — which may not account for a high percentage of the Community's domestic product, but nevertheless provide social security for a considerable number of people, whether they fish at sea or work in the fish-processing industry — should take place under the pressure of time which inevitably occurs on Fridays. I hope that a future debate, which will have to be held when the Commission's proposals for updating the existing proposals are referred to Parliament — I shall return to this in due course — and prior to the Council taking its decision before the end of the year, will take place on the broadest possible basis and at a time when Parliament's full attention can be devoted to it, because we are, after all, dealing with a problem of considerable social and economic importance.

Let me add that here we are on the point of creating a new European policy. It is some years since the Community and its institutions succeeded in achieving this. Creating a common fisheries policy will be a major step forward, reaching out beyond the fishing industry to promote cooperation in Europe, and it therefore demands a full contribution from all the Community institutions: the Council, the Commission and also the Parliament. When the specific details which are yet to emerge become available, this contri-

bution must not merely take the form of a debate in general terms, but must also be concerned with specific topics and specific disputes which have to be solved in connection with the establishment of this common policy, and I acknowledge that some of the Members who have spoken in today's debate have touched on this point.

The motion for a resolution which has been tabled here emphasizes strongly to the Council that the political decision of principle, taken as part of a major agreement at the end of May this year, that a common fisheries policy should be implemented by the end of the year should be put into effect. I consider this emphasis on the part of Parliament extremely valuable from the political point of view, and express the Commission's full support for the motion now before the House. The Commission considers it absolutely essential, both for the economic and social reasons which I have mentioned and for political reasons such as the need to supplement and complete our set of common policies with a common fisheries policy, that the decision of principle should now be put into effect, as was envisaged in the overall political agreement reached at the end of May, in which considerable sacrifices were made by various countries in order to solve the problems of other countries.

The Commission, for its part, will do all in its power, both politically and materially, in the next three months, as in the previous year, to ensure that this date is adhered to. If, by misfortune, this does not happen, not only will the fishing industry be confronted with even greater difficulties than those it faces at the moment, but the Community will undoubtedly be plunged into a new crisis of proportions which I do not think the small Assembly here today fully appreciates. It cannot be stressed enough that there is this political aspect besides the economic and social aspect.

I shall not go into the details of this fisheries policy in my remarks today, because in the next two months I anticipate a wider-ranging discussion of the main elements of the policy in Parliament; but I should like to discuss the timetable, at it were, necessary for reaching this goal, as I believe it should look, and in this connexion it will also be possible for me to indicate which elements I believe must form part of a common fisheries policy to enable it to meet the needs of the fishing industry as part of our overall economy. Of course I agree with Mr Kirk that this cannot be achieved merely by saying that we now have a common fisheries policy: the content of this fisheries policy is certainly the most important thing when we are discussing how to overcome the crisis which European fisheries are undoubtedly facing.

This crisis may be more serious today in some countries than in others, but it is spreading. I will not go any further into the reasons for it: they are clearly described — as clearly as is possible in brief terms —

Gundelach

in the motion for a resolution before the House; but we must not forget that it is part of the general economic crisis, which has brought with it a reduction in the demand for fishery products. It is due to high energy prices and the high level of costs. It is even due to the taking of catches. It is the legacy we have received in recent years from a reduction in our fishing facilities in the waters of third countries, not so much in terms of quantity as in terms of value, but that is still bad enough. All these factors are known and documented, and there is no reason for me to go into them any further here, but one must keep them in mind as a diagnosis when seeking to work out a fisheries policy capable of meeting the challenge presented by this situation.

First and foremost, what are known as conservation and control measures must be implemented, and the Commission has submitted all the proposals necessary in this respect, to which Parliament has long since given its approval and on which it has delivered its views. We are seeking the adoption of these proposals at the forthcoming Council meeting on 29 September, and considerable progress has been made. Problems concerning, for example, the 'pout-box', which for a long time appeared insoluble, now seem capable of being solved in a reasonable way. A final solution has still to be found to other problems such as the size of nets, but I hope we have come so far that a solution may be achieved with the necessary political will in the Council.

When I refer to these as technical arrangements, this is the term which is used to designate the document, but it does in fact conceal a range of measures such as conservation, monitoring the catches which are being taken, ensuring that controls are uniform in the individual Member States and so on, a series of basic conditions — the constitution, one might say — for the way in which fishing is to be practised, rules on stationary catches, and a great deal more. This also includes the question of the size of vessels to be used in certain waters, a subject which is gaining in importance, because if a certain coastal population is to be maintained which is 100 % dependent on fishing, we must ensure that in some areas there is no use of a type of equipment which makes any other method of fishing completely impossible. It has always formed part of the Commission's philosophy, if I may put it that way, that this problem must also be solved.

This is a network of problems which covers a wide field, but it is now nearing a solution. I hope the political will exists — one can certainly never do more than hope where the Council is concerned — I hope it can be brought to a conclusion, but this depends on the final outcome in September, as the decision on the 'pout-box' must be put into effect by 1 October at the latest.

On the same occasion, the Commission wants the Council to discuss the ideas we have had. We have

already informed the Council, as I have said here in Parliament on previous occasions, that the organization of the market — the regulations by which we guarantee certain prices on the domestic market and protect our industry against excessive competition from outside — which was set up in the early 1970s, must in our opinion be replaced by a new policy better suited to the conditions of today, which are the result of the various factors to which I have already drawn attention, especially the change in our fishing facilities in the waters of third countries and the introduction of the 200-mile limit. It is the Commission's intention to discuss the main lines of such a new market policy at the meeting on 29 September, with a view to submitting more detailed proposals at the next Council meeting, after consultation with Parliament, producers' organizations and others. Thus the ground has been prepared for the decision to be taken at the next meeting.

The Council has before it the Commission's proposals on quotas for 1980, but most of 1980 is now over. It serves no purpose to go on and on discussing these proposals, which in the view of some lay too much weight on compensation from third countries and preferential treatment for one country or another, while those countries which receive compensation from third countries and preferential treatment do not think enough weight is laid on this. This debate, based on the figures for 1980, was interesting up to a point, but is now of no further interest, because 1980 is nearly over and no quota proposals can be implemented for 1980.

The Commission's view is that this exercise has served its purpose. It has produced a rational debate in which a wide range of views has been expressed by the various Member States, and we can learn from this. Now it is a question of establishing, on the basis of advice from biologists and from the advisory committee which represents the industry, and taking into account the various social and economic interests which are concerned in this 'exercise', a proposal for 1981 which will form the real basis of the discussion on quotas in the Council, and which we hope will also become the real basis for a debate on the same subject in Parliament in the autumn.

A question is raised in the motion for a resolution which I think is justified namely, whether a sufficient number of Council meetings have been arranged during the autumn to deal with the various 'exercises' which I have mentioned. These, of course, include the structural proposal which is already before Parliament and the Council, a proposal for aid in adapting the fleets in the Member States to the new conditions in which fisheries have to operate now and in future years, together with the establishment of experimental fisheries and the building up of other forms of fishing, fish-farms and a great deal more. Have enough Council meetings been arranged to deal with this very extensive body of work and to enable decisions to be

Gundelach

taken before the end of the year? I have to say that this is not the case: my advice to the Presidency is that further Council meetings must be arranged, especially in November, so that we can be sure there are enough Council meetings to take the necessary decisions and avoid the disastrous situation of holding a marathon meeting at the end of December, under conditions of great urgency, and taking decisions which will have an effect for many years to come — all this under a pressure of time which is hardly appropriate for decisions of the kind involved. I must make it clear to Parliament that while our thoughts are turned towards 1981, we are in fact taking fundamental decisions on how fisheries are to be operated in the Community for many years to come, and such decisions cannot be taken at one brief meeting at the end of the year, but must be built up methodically, as I have tried to indicate when describing the programme of work which I have put forward here and which the Commission believes is the one to be followed, as I also hope it will be. Parliament's programme of work will be adjusted, so that we can all pull together and achieve the result which, I repeat, is vital not only for the fishing industry but also for the unity of the Community — namely, the adoption of a common fisheries policy before the end of the current year. In my opinion, any other course of action is impossible.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed.

We shall now consider the motions for resolutions.

We begin with the Glinne *et al.* motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-382/80/rev.).

I have Amendment No 1, by Mrs Le Roux and others, seeking to replace the motion for a resolution by the following text:

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the gravity of the crisis in the fishing industry in the Member States of the Community,
- whereas, despite France's economic tradition and role as a coastal State, the fishing industry is constantly declining,
- having regard to the responsibility of the governments and the Community with regard to the successive setbacks suffered by the fishing industry and the increasing role assumed by imports from third countries, which are creating a trade deficit of almost the same proportions as the industry's turnover,
- having regard to the negative nature of the guidelines laid down by the Commission and the Council, whose declared aim is to reduce appreciably the number of vessels,
- whereas pursuit of an integration policy that would merely aggravate the difficulties in the fishing industry and related sectors would have disastrous consequences,

- whereas the proposed enlargement represents a threat to the very survival of the industry,
 - whereas the demands of the French fishermen for immediate implementation of national protective measures are fully justified,
 - whereas supplementary measures are required at Community level to supersede the guidelines previously laid down,
1. Calls for free access by the fishing vessels of the Member States to all Community waters;
 2. Calls for a review of the quotas allocated on the basis of criteria that take account of the mutual interests and economic traditions of the peoples whose livelihood depends on fishing and in the light of the stocks available;
 3. Calls for an end to all negotiations on the enlargement of the Community to include Spain, whose fishing potential represents 50 % of production and which accounts for ¾ of all fishermen in the Community;
 4. Calls for an increase in guaranteed production prices that takes account of operating costs and affords fishermen a decent standard of living;
 5. Calls for strict compliance with the Community preference rules to prevent the market from being flooded by imports from third countries;
 6. Calls for the effective application to fishermen of Article 117 of the Treaty, which provides for harmonization of social systems at the highest level;
 7. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Commission and Council.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1)

President. — I can now give the floor for explanations of vote.

I call Mr Welsh.

Mr Welsh. — Mr President, the crisis in the fishing industry is an extremely serious one that must occupy our minds a great deal in this House, and therefore I shall vote for both these resolutions.

I would, however, like to point out that, were it not for the rather petulant intervention by Mrs Castle earlier this morning, these votes could have taken place in a much fuller House. More of us would have had the opportunity to hear the Commissioner's reply, and I think it is a pity that the real interests of British, French and other Community fishermen have been treated this way on what was a very minor procedural point.

President. — I call Mr Enright.

Mr Enright. — I shall be voting for this motion and have stayed to vote for it, but I would like to point

Enright

out, in reply to Mr Welsh, that it is absurd nonsense to say that you will vote at 10.30 and then not vote at 10.30. Either we have procedures cut and dried in this House or we all pack up and go home.

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

The resolution is adopted.¹

I put to the vote the Calvez *et al.* motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-403/80).

The resolution is adopted.¹

11. *Persecution of Bahais in Iran*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution by Mr Lalor and Mr Israël on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, Mr Glinne and Mrs van den Heuvel on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group), Mr Scott-Hopkins and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group, and Mr BANGEMANN and Mr BERKHOUWER on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the persecution of members of the Bahai community in Iran (Doc. 1-397/80/rev.).

I call Mr Israël.

Mr Israël. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Bahai religion is separate and distinct from the three great monotheistic movements which preceded it. However, it shares a common origin with those religions in that it accepts much of their teaching. In Iran, where this religion was born, there has been a revolution which has totally disrupted human relations. The Bahai are a religious minority of 300 000 people living within the empire of the Ayatollah Khomeini. Iran's recently adopted constitution, like all constitutions, provides in theory for the protection of religious minorities.

Unfortunately, the Bahai religion is not one of the minority religions protected by the Constitution. The reason for this omission is that in Iran followers of the Bahai faith are generally former Moslems. The fierce persecution to which they are subject is aggravated by the fact that members of the Bahai sect appear to be considered as unfaithful to Islam according to the ideas of the Ayatollah Khomeiny.

In these circumstances, the followers of the Bahai faith are totally isolated and deprived of legal protection inside and outside their own country. There is no Bahai Vatican, there is not a sufficiently strong world community to protest against the fate handed out to

the Bahais in Iran. It is therefore quite natural that the Bahais should turn to us as the Parliament of Europe and that they should look to our Assembly for the support which they lack everywhere else in the world. Mr President, this Parliament would greatly add to its dignity by adopting this resolution which is moreover tabled by the five major groups in this Assembly.

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

Mr Habsburg. — (*D*) Mr President, the Group of the European People's Party has also been greatly dismayed to witness in recent months an example of religious persecution which is particularly abhorrent because the people concerned are completely defenceless. I therefore believe, as my colleague Mr Israël has said, that we must make our voice heard, although I am not generally a supporter of resolutions which have no direct bearing on European matters.

I have one further point. It has been stated here that Islam is responsible for the persecution of the Bahais. I would stress that someone like the Ayatollah Khomeiny is nothing more than a traitor to Islam. The Ulemas in Morocco have already made that quite clear. Islam is a deeply tolerant faith. What Khomeiny is doing is as much a travesty as were the policies of Stalin, Amin or Macías. I therefore believe it is our duty to protest most seriously, in the interests of Islam, in the interests of the peoples of Iran and also to uphold the honour of Europe.

(*Applause*)

President. — I call Mr Purvis to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

Mr Purvis. — Mr President, having been led privately to concern for the Bahais of Iran by representatives of that faith in my part of Mid-Scotland and Fife, I found subsequently that there was widespread concern amongst my colleagues in this group, and on reaching Strasbourg this week I found myself part of a Europe-wide concern. The Bahais of Europe have put their faith in the European Parliament. They fully believe that it is through us that the protection of their co-religionists in Iran can best be safeguarded. So our constituents have placed their faith in us and we must justify that trust by wholeheartedly supporting this resolution. And I would like to see it supported right round the Chamber.

Certainly, we must also condemn the fact that European missionaries and religious figures in Iran have been imprisoned without trial and have been expelled

¹ OJ C 265 of 13. 10. 1980.

Purvis

unreasonably from the country. Certainly we must express our concern for other religious minorities in Iran — the Christians and the Jews, whose security is at risk, who have been harrassed and in some cases executed. But the Bahais are altogether the most extreme case. There are over 300 000 in Iran. Their faith is tolerant of other religions. Their faith does not permit involvement in politics, but enjoins loyalty and obedience to the government of their country. And yet the Prime Minister of Iran has vowed to rid the country of the Bahais. Why? They surely pose no threat to the stability of either his government or his country. Their sacred places have been destroyed. They have been harrassed from their homes and villages. They have been dispossessed of their property. They have been removed from government jobs. They are being pressed to recant their faith. They have been arrested and imprisoned, and some have been executed after secret, so-called trials. Their leaders are even now held incommunicado in prison, and one can but fear for their lives. They are not even recognized as a religious minority, as other religious minorities are. In fact, the Iranian government claims they don't exist! The registration of their births, marriages and deaths is not permitted and so they do not exist.

For these reasons, my colleagues in the European Democratic Group join wholeheartedly with colleagues throughout the European Parliament and all our constituents, Bahai and non-Bahai, throughout Europe, in an appeal directed to the Iranian Government to observe the basic human rights of their Bahai countrymen, and we ask the Council of Ministers and the Member States to use all the pressure that they can muster with the Iranian Government to ensure that these tolerant and peaceful people are protected in their homeland.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Hahn.

Mr Hahn. — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is particularly gratifying that all the groups in this House should stand up for the Bahai religion and plead for tolerance to be shown towards it in Iran. We can only say that it is particularly abhorrent that persecution on religious grounds can still occur in the 20th century. What is happening in Iran at the moment can only be compared with what happened to the Jews under Hitler's so-called Third Reich. The tactics are almost exactly the same as they were then in Germany: the leaders of Bahais are being murdered, they are being killed and executed, temples are being destroyed, these people are being stripped of all rights and their children expelled from schools. Ladies and gentlemen, when such action claims to be taken in the name of a religion, it can only bring that religion itself into disrepute.

I agree with my colleague Mr Habsburg that this is not the nature of Islam. Precisely because we say 'yes' to religion we must protest at its exploitation for such repressive and destructive measures against a large minority within a people and within a State such as Iran. The whole House should speak out against this.

President. — I call Mr Provan.

Mr Provan. — What we are discussing this morning is really a cover-up of what is taking place in Iran today, and if it had not been the case that had been brought forward so eloquently by the Bahais in Europe, this might not well have been discussed this morning. It is a cover-up because we have fanatical factions roaming the streets and the countryside of Iran, secret courts, imprisonments, murder, all of which is going ahead in the name of religion, but it is not religion at all. It is religious persecution, because the Iranian authorities are looking for a scapegoat. They are trying to deceive their people: one deception is the use of a previous British Ambassador's signature on a document, and yet he ceased to be Ambassador four years ago.

Religious persecution, Mr President, of the Bahais — yes, and of Christians also. The Christians basically in Iran are ethnic groups, and therefore it is persecution of ethnic minorities within Iran as well as religious persecution. But it is the religious persecution that we abhor most, because these religious bodies thought that with the arrival of Ayatollah Khomeiny they were going to get some help. They were deceived, and Christianity itself is only receiving lip service as a recognized religion.

What is the history of this? In the first months since the revolution, we have had an Anglican priest murdered. In the second month, we have had a hospital taken over, and unfortunately the health standards are very much lower because of it. We have had other hospitals seized, and the Anglicans are not allowed to do their business. I support very strongly indeed the third paragraph of the motion, which refers to other religious minorities, because Bishop Dequani Tafti's son has been murdered and now we also find his secretary, Jean Waddell, who is a constituent of mine in East Scotland, in prison. We do not know where she is, we do not know what her fate is; she has already faced attempted murder when she was molested and imprisoned, and we know not what is going to happen. We are not allowed any access whatsoever to her to find out, and this cannot be applauded by anybody who thinks properly and sanely in the Western world.

Therefore, Mr President, I ask this Parliament to support most strongly an amendment which has been put forward — Amendment No 1, which requests the Commission and Council of the European Communities to impose an embargo on all sales of surplus prod-

Provan

ucts to Iran where subsidies are involved, so that human rights can be restored to Iranian citizens.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) Mr President, the Commission shares the deep concern expressed in the two motions for resolutions over the fate of the Bahai Community and will do everything in its power to comply with the vote of the European Parliament.

President. — I call Mr Romualdi.

Mr Romualdi. — (I) Mr President, I should just like to say that the Italian non-attached Members share the indignation and protest expressed by all the groups in this Parliament at the action being taken against the right to life and religious liberty of the Bahai in Iran. We shall therefore vote in favour of this resolution in the name of freedom for all faiths and for the defence of the lives of all those who profess their religious belief.

President. — I call Mrs Dekker.

Mrs Dekker. — (NL) Mr President, I also want briefly to express my full support for the resolutions on the persecution of the Bahai community in Iran, and I am pleased that they are finding such clear and broad support in this Parliament. I agree that the Bahais' case has been well stated in the European Parliament, and I therefore hope that our clear condemnation of this situation will also apply to other groups now being persecuted because of their religion, particularly in Iran. I am thinking of the Jews and of the Christians, but this should apply in general to groups which are persecuted because of their religion, race or sex, or on the basis of any other distinction.

President. — The debate is closed.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 4)

After paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Hord and others, seeking to insert a new paragraph:

- 4 a. Requests the Commission and Council of the European Communities to impose an embargo on all sales of surplus agricultural products to Iran where subsidies by European taxpayers are involved until full human rights are restored to Iranian citizens.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1 and paragraph 5)

I can now give the floor for explanations of vote.

I call Mr Papapietro.

Mr Papapietro. — (I) Mr President, just a very brief statement. We should have supported this motion for a resolution if there had not been a purely technical error. The motion tabled is different from that which was discussed.

However, we support the principle of the motion for a resolution and will vote for it, expressing our total solidarity with the followers of the Bahai religion who are being so ruthlessly persecuted.

President. — I call Mr Prag.

Mr Prag. — Mr President, I just want to explain why I voted against the amendment.

Very simply, it was because I think that when we pass a resolution of this kind, it must be in order to achieve an effect. I am afraid that, given the present state of mind of the Iranian Government, we are not likely to do a great deal of good with paragraph 4 a.

Unofficially, there are some 450 000 Bahais in Iran, rather than the official figure of 300 000. I think they are all in danger. We can, perhaps, prevent a quite appalling pogrom, which is what they are threatened with. If children dare to be born, they are illegitimate. If people dare to marry — because their marriage cannot be recognized — they are accused of prostitution.

If we are to prevent a quite appalling massacre, we should have kept our resolution a little more moderate than it now becomes with Amendment No 1. That is why I voted against the amendment. But I do hope that the power of this Parliament, through its unanimous resolution, will be recognized by the Iranian Government and that we shall see some moderation of their appalling treatment of the Bahai faith.

President. — I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman.

Mrs Kellett-Bowman. — I voted for the amendment for the perfectly simple reason that all too often this Parliament seeks to take action with words only. This would be a practical way in which we could help to bring home to the Iranian Government our very strong feelings in support of the Bahai community.

President. — I call Mr Harris.

Mr Harris. — As co-author of the amendment, I would like to support the last speaker in this, although I do respect the views of my colleague, Mr Prag. I can see that it is a finely balanced argument. Very often we in this place need to focus on matters which are within our own competence. This is a matter within the competence of this Parliament, or at least the shared competence of this Parliament. I think the amendment highlights the relevance of this Parliament to this particular issue. I feel that we must take a stand on this, particularly as we understand that considerable amounts of subsidized food are being supplied to Iran, and that we really should speak out as a parliament on this issue. I do not think we can just shirk it.

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

The resolution is adopted.¹

12. Events in Bolivia

President. — The next item is a joint debate on

- the motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch and Mr Blumenfeld on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group), Mr Fergusson on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, and Mr Berkhouwer on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on the events in Bolivia (Doc. 1-381/80/rev.); and
- the motion for a resolution by Mr Fanti and others, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on relations between the EEC and the new régime in Bolivia (Doc. 1-385/80).

I call Mr Papapietro.

Mr Papapietro. — (*I*) Mr President, we shall vote in favour of the motion tabled by the other groups (Doc. 1-381/80/rev.). We should have preferred also to vote for our own motion (Doc. 1-385/80), because it contains an extra element — namely, the implied recognition of the lawful government elected by universal suffrage, which does not feature in the other motion. The other motion, however, is satisfactory in all other respects. We shall therefore vote for the other motion and ask that ours be dealt with pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure.

President. — I call Mr Fergusson.

Mr Fergusson. — Mr President, I very much welcome what we have just heard from the other side of the House. For the second time in a week we have the whole House, everybody and every group in the House, prepared to back a parliamentary resolution. It comes almost without any kind of opposition evident at all. The House is at one in condemning what has happened in Bolivia, just as it was at one, or to all intents and purposes at one, in expressing its fears and congratulations in respect of Poland.

On behalf of my group, I wish to support this motion, because we want to lend our voices to those which have already been raised throughout the world to condemn the *coup* in Bolivia. This *coup* is particularly repugnant because it took place immediately after a free and fair election. The weight of military repression was brought to bear on the Bolivian people because they had taken advantage of their opportunity to express their views, and the colonels there, as we know, have now set their face against what they quite cynically describe as any further electoral adventures. We can only regret this. Obviously we all have different views about democracy and about military dictatorships, but we all regret it whenever a military dictatorship supersedes a civil administration. However, we may perhaps make some instructive comparisons between this *coup* and another, which we discussed earlier this week, in Turkey, where the political parties had reached a stalemate and the military, on taking power, immediately swore, with a very good record of the same thing behind them, from the outset to provide a speedy return to democracy. One might also contrast what has happened in Bolivia with the other Andean Pact countries, notably Peru, whose new and freely-elected government took office in July this year.

I would draw the attention of the House particularly to the second indent of paragraph 4, because the justification here for this very short debate and a rather long resolution is that for once there is action which the Community has taken and can take to counter what has happened. Therefore, Mr President, I support this motion and express the hope that this resolution, and the action taken by the Commission and the Heads of Government of the Nine, will now bring about a speedy end to this very dark period of Bolivian history.

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

¹ OJ C 265 of 13. 10. 1980.

Mr Bersani. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the debate on Bolivia and the motion for a resolution tabled — on which the Group of the European People's Party collaborated and which it fully supports — are a real token of our keen interest in fundamental questions of human rights and democracy in the world in general and in Latin America in particular.

Hardly a session goes by without this House having to consider situations such as this in Latin America, a continent with which for various reasons we have close links.

This underlines once again the need for more organic Community measures in Latin America as this House has tirelessly stressed for many years. The reactionary turn of events in Bolivia is all the more important for those of us who recall the solemn meeting in this Chamber with the Christian Democratic President of the Republic of Venezuela, Mr Herrera Campins Latin America's authoritative spokesman for freedom and development within democracy who had some years before heard the prophetic voice of Simon Bolivar exhorting the people of that part of the world to cooperation and unity in democracy.

The events in Bolivia — the latest in a long line of brutal interventions by the armed forces against a clear and firm expression of the popular will — therefore go against not only the inalienable principles of human and civil rights but also against the true destiny of Bolivia and the Latin American continent.

The Community with the full backing of this House is at the moment carrying out a specific initiative for a first cooperation agreement with the five countries of the Andean Pact including Bolivia. The agreement will not be blocked. We must reaffirm that it should go forward speedily and smoothly in accordance — I believe — with the wishes of all the groups in this Parliament.

From this point of view also, the coup d'état in Bolivia goes against the true interests of the Bolivian people and of the Bolivian State as well as those of international cooperation in the wider sense.

Our position must therefore, as the motion for a resolution states, be firm, resolute and exemplary in its condemnation of the coup d'état, expressing solidarity with the representatives and downtrodden forces of democracy, blocking any diplomatic or economic initiative for cooperation, denouncing immediately acts of persecution, applying international political pressure so that the situation may return to democratic normality as soon as possible — I repeat as soon as possible.

Mr Natali, a rapid and generous action in favour of the Andean Pact can at this moment and in this context have a precise significance. The forces of democracy must show their ability to respond in

concrete meaningful terms to the common duty to achieve an ever stronger, fairer and more democratic cooperation at international level.

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

Mr Arndt. — (D) Mr President, I must apologize on behalf of my colleagues Mr Glinne and Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, who were also down to speak in support of this motion for a resolution, for in a situation like this it is necessary for every group to voice its opinion. In my view, the sittings we have had this week here in Strasbourg have been notable ones for the European Parliament, because they have shown that in basic questions of human rights — whether it was the motion for a resolution on Poland, on Turkey or, as is now the case, on Bolivia — the vast majority of Parliament realizes that when something of this kind happens in the world, Parliament must stand up and make its democratic convictions clear, and also make it clear that human rights may not be violated anywhere in the world without the European Parliament and all its groups stating quite clearly where they stand. It is of course quite understandable if one group or another has to withdraw from its original demands, and I hope that what has been seen here in the past week will continue to happen in the future.

Let me make three brief comments on the situation in Bolivia from the Socialist Group's point of view.

Firstly, our view is that we should have spoken out more clearly than is the case in this joint motion for a resolution on behalf of the legitimate government of Bolivia, which was prevented from governing by the military *coup*. We in particular, who were also directly elected, should regard it as important that when a majority is achieved anywhere in the world through free and direct elections, that majority then has the opportunity of governing, even if it happens not to share the views of our own political group.

Secondly, it should be clearly understood that the military coup in Bolivia must also be seen in connection with the conflict over the distribution of wealth within the country. That is, the people who have seized power there share the opinion of many other forces in the world when it comes to denying the people, the broad masses of the population, their share of what is produced. The military *coup* in Bolivia is a clear-cut example of how the landowners in that country are ready to do anything — even to see democracy go by the board — when it comes to defending their possessions. And perhaps we should reflect more often in this House on the fact — as we saw in the motion for a resolution on Poland — that time after time it is the workers in these countries who stand up for freedom, democracy and human rights.

Arndt

Thirdly, South America is in our view a part of the world in which things like this happen to such an extent that more light needs to be shed on the real facts behind them. The primary fact is — and I am glad that this has just been stated by the spokesman for the Christian-Democratic Group — that dire poverty exists throughout these countries. Therefore it is one of the European Community's greatest tasks to ensure, by supporting the democratically governed countries, that at least an attempt is made there — with our support — to overcome this dire poverty, because if we succeed in relieving the hardship there to some extent, we shall also remove the danger of such military *coups*.

That is what I have to say on behalf of the Socialist Group; but let me now add something on a personal note. We are often willing to adopt such resolutions; that is very right and proper; but what is more important is that afterwards, in the months which follow, we ensure that we stand by the principles of this resolution and do not one day, because of pressure or for other political reasons, slowly but surely begin to accept the situation, simply because that is the way things have turned out. It is not merely a question of adopting such resolutions but also of then taking the necessary action, thereby making it clear that this is not simply lip-service, but that the European Community stands ready to act throughout the world on behalf of those who are fighting for freedom, democracy and justice.

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

Mr Israël. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, technical difficulties are the reason for the absence of the Group of European Progressive Democrats from the motion for a resolution before you.

Like Mr Arndt I think that this sitting will have been particularly important for human rights by reason of the light we have been able to shed on countries where human rights are not respected.

But our analysis is incomplete in one respect in that it does not take into account Bolivia. What is happening in Bolivia? What is happening is a phenomenon which I would term ordinary fascism. We find in that country the movement which was born in Italy in 1923 which as we all know spread through Europe and today lives on dramatically in Latin America.

We must be particularly vigilant in considering this problem. Ordinary fascism can return exactly in the form in which we have known it: military coups d'état, arbitrary arrests, plain clothes policemen knocking on doors in the middle of the night with people completely helpless to stop them. We therefore firmly support this resolution on Bolivia and we welcome the wide approval that it attracts in this House.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (*I*) Mr President, the Commission wishes to state that it fully endorses the condemnation of the coup d'état by the military junta in Bolivia which, as was pointed out in the debate, is all the more reprehensible in that it took place immediately after free and fair democratic elections in that country.

The Commission had the opportunity to express its disapproval on the occasion of the visit to Peru by Mr Burke, a Member of the Commission, for a ceremony held on the transfer of power to the new Head of State of that Republic.

As regards relations with Bolivia, it should be pointed out that we have decided to suspend all aid planned for Bolivia under the 1980 programme for non-associated developing countries. We have also suspended programmes for commercial development, the granting of direct aid under the food aid programme and the commencement of negotiations for an agreement with Bolivia under the multifibre arrangement.

As you know, the Community had started negotiations for the conclusion of a framework cooperation agreement with the Andean Group. The first round of negotiations took place in June and the second round was planned to take place between 16 and 19 September. In view of political developments in Bolivia, the Commission has decided to suspend the negotiations pending clarification of Bolivia's position within the Andean Pact. The agreement was to be concluded between the Community, the Andean Pact and the individual Member States of the Andean Pact. Clearly, in the present state of affairs, the Community cannot accept the signature of the agreement by the Bolivian military junta.

However, in order not to penalize the other members of the Andean Pact, the Commission intends to continue contacts in connection with the negotiations at the level of technical talks. It will continue, Mr Arndt and Mr Bersani, to maintain close and cordial relations with the other democratically governed Andean countries.

President — The debate is closed.

I can now give the floor for explanations of vote.

I call Mr Castellina.

Mrs Castellina. — (*I*) Mr President, I only wish to say that I hope that the significance of this motion for a resolution is quite clear. We intend to regard Bolivia's democratically elected Head of State as Head of State in any event, despite his being precluded

Castellina

from performing his duties by reason of the coup d'état. This means that we shall not consider him merely as a political refugee but that this Parliament must undertake to maintain with Bolivia's elected representative such relations as are normally maintained with a person who has been democratically elected as Head of State. I think it would be desirable for this Parliament to take an initiative in this sense, possibly inviting the Bolivian President or Vice-President to speak in this Chamber in order to be able to express our total solidarity. I believe that this would be a worthwhile act which would surely give more concrete expression to our feelings of solidarity.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*I*) Mr President, I shall vote in favour of this motion for a resolution in the conviction that the only way of seriously expressing protest is not to cooperate and to cease cooperation with men of violence and aggressors exactly as the Commission has done in this case.

If you will allow me, Mr President, this demonstrates the truth of what we said on previous days and that it will not merely be a question of vague intentions because now we have confirmation. When Parliament and the Commission wish to strike at the authors of a coup d'état they know how to take practical action and not merely empty words. By contrast, it is clear that the majority of this Parliament has sided with the authors of the coup d'état in Ankara. I say this clearly and firmly and once more record my protest. All the same, Mr President, I shall vote in favour and I request, on behalf of my group, a vote by roll-call because it is not right that this Parliament should continue to operate in this way without sanction and without the knowledge of the electors. This will show clearly who votes, who is present and who tables motions for resolutions and then goes away.

President. — We can go straight to the voting and use the electronic system.

I call Mr Klepsch.

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) Mr President, I just want to take the opportunity of giving a brief explanation of vote.

Mr Pannella constantly complains that he feels offended by remarks made by some one or other in the course of the day; but his own comments, from beginning to end, were an affront to the majority of the House ...

(*Interruptions*)

I just wanted to make that clear — in fact, virtually to the whole House, because what he is insinuating is, as

he knows very well, completely untrue. Certainly, if a group requests a vote by roll-call, it must be held; but one only has to look at his group's benches to see that his request is only supported by the formalities of the Rules of Procedure and not by the presence of his group.

(*Interruptions*)

President. — I call Mr Fergusson on a point of order.

Mr Fergusson. — Mr President, for the second time today, after a vote has been called, people have been allowed to give an explanation of vote. With all respect to Mr Klepsch, whom I respect very much, either we have these rules or we do not have them. Everybody else seems to be allowed to disobey the rules. You can imagine how indignant we feel sitting here all morning, on Fridays, while Parliament goes on making a fool of itself because it does not obey its own rules.

President. — It is up to speakers, if they wish to catch the President's eye, to try and do so in good time. But Mr Klepsch was doing his best to speak, and I think it was very marginal. I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Mr President, Mr Klepsch said that he too would speak for an explanation of vote. I was unable to understand how he was going to vote, and his speech was therefore not an explanation of vote.

(*The vote took place*)

President. — The resolution is adopted.¹

13. *Protecting the site of Tyre*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution by Mr Beyer de Ryke and others, on protecting the site of Tyre (Doc. 1-388/80).

I call Mr Beyer de Ryke.

Mr Beyer de Ryke. — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, sometimes events confirm or ratify motions for urgent debate. And I would say that unfortunately events confirm the urgency which you, ladies and gentlemen, with the exception of one group, have yourselves requested. In fact, according to the despatches of France-Presse on the teletape machines yesterday, the site of Tyre has been bombed yet again.

¹ For details of the vote by roll-call, see the Minutes.

Beyer de Ryke

The urgency of the matter is therefore greater still because it is a question of protecting this site which forms part of mankind's history: 2 000 years of history, 2 000 years of humanity's recorded history. And bombed by whom? I was, ladies and gentlemen, expecting your intervention and I will not dodge the question. Bombed yesterday by the Christian militias but it would be unfair to take sides because these events need to be seen in their context. If you will allow me, I should like to start at the beginning. We should start, bearing in mind the wide and diverse responsibilities involved, with the Cairo Accord under which the Palestinians moved to Lebanon and took control of whole areas of that territory. And if you will permit me I would recall Raymond Eddé who told me of his meeting with the then President, Charles Lélou. He told me: 'I said to Charles: "Charles, you have been cuckolded".' It was perhaps over-theatrical but it was an expression which strangely presaged the wreck and subsequent submersion of Lebanon.

But Tyre, ladies and gentlemen, is the result of a whole situation. What do we find at Tyre? All around the ruins of Tyre and the port of Tyre we find the Palestinians. For two years. Tyre has been the most important port for Soviet arms imports. Looked at therefore from the Israeli point of view — and I would not myself deny certain Israeli claims with regard to South Lebanon — this is the background to their bombing Tyre. Finally to round it all off, there are the Christian militias which I mentioned to you and which are also a sign of Lebanon's internal fragmentation and breakdown. In the end Lebanon has come to resemble Poland in the 18th century, namely a country which no longer exists, a country presently under Syrian domination where the only institution with its head still above water is the presidency of the Republic. It is a country which has genuinely collapsed. Ladies and gentlemen, some members of the group facing me have accused me of being more interested in stones than men. Certain voices were raised the other day — I do not say it was you — to make that accusation against me, but I think it is unfounded. It is unfounded because if we endorse this great movement launched by UNESCO, this great movement of opinion — I will not here mention the names of all the signatories but you should know that Marguerite Yourcenar is among them — if we endorse this UNESCO movement it will not save a single life elsewhere in Lebanon but at least no one else will die in Tyre.

Here, in my view, we should emulate the Commission, and Mr Thorn who the other day launched an anguished appeal in favour of Lebanon, by encouraging any initiatives which might restore even a modest level of peace to this war-torn country. I can cite the precedents. I am thinking of Rome, Paris, and Lahore at the time of the Indo-Pakistani conflict. In these instances belligerents full of hate and hostility, put aside their differences understanding that often throughout

history it had been necessary to protect a common heritage, a heritage belonging to mankind's past. That is why I make this appeal to you. That is why here and now I endorse and ask everyone here to endorse this proposal from UNESCO.

Ladies and gentlemen, the history of mankind is full of love and hate and also regrettably indifference and I am not sure whether indifference is not the most serious of all. Let me therefore conclude by quoting Péguy: 'Do not kill, no do not kill the little life that is hope!' In the name of Tyre I thank you and let us all say together; cease fire!

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

Mr Habsburg. — (D) Mr President, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party I wish to endorse the comments just made by Mr Beyer de Ryke.

Further, I would like to emphasize the following point. For us, this question is principally one of human culture. I myself come from a country in which barely 15 % of the works of art of the past have survived since the beginning of this century. We know therefore how greatly later generations are deprived by such destruction. This is not a question of troubling ourselves over pieces of stone, but of preserving the cultural heritage for future generations. I therefore ask everyone to support this resolution, so that Tyre may also be kept intact for future generations.

President. — The debate is closed.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

14. *Termination of Mrs Macciocchi's appointment with the French University system*

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution by Mr Glinne and others, on the termination of Mrs Macciocchi's appointment with the French University (Doc. 1-395/80).

I call Mrs Roudy.

Mrs Roudy. — (F) Ladies and gentlemen, many of us European parliamentarians elected by universal suffrage who over the last year have grown accus-

¹ OJ C 265 of 13. 10. 1980.

Roudy

tomed to rubbing shoulders with one another and contrasting our diverse cultures within our various political groups, whose job here is the sometimes difficult but always rewarding one of expressing our political and cultural identities, think that Europe can only live and grow to maturity if it is also a Europe of culture, based on the traditions of the nine countries that make it up. We think that one of the best ways of contrasting national cultures is precisely to rub shoulders as we do here and as can be done in other places such as universities.

For this reason many of us have found it curious and, I must also say, shocking that an Italian professor elected to the European Assembly cannot, it appears, teach in a French university. The measure taken by my country's government against Maria Antonietta Macciocchi, whose employment as an associate teacher at Paris university VIII has been terminated on the ground that her duties are incompatible with her office as Italian Member of the European Assembly, is perfectly absurd.

This measure by the authorities is not only absurd and shocking for the manner in which it was taken, it is also crass, obscurantist and narrow-minded. It is more than curious, especially for us who work here and value cultural exchange.

It is also unjustifiable in that although Article 6 of the law of 7 July 1977 providing that no one shall at the same time hold office in the executive and the legislature, may be justified when applied to a parliamentarian who is a French citizen, it has no justification when applied to an Italian Member of this Parliament elected by the citizens of Italy and, I imagine, receiving a salary from Italy. One might even say that this amounts to interference by the French Government in the internal affairs of Italy.

The measure is also discriminatory and as such contrary to the Treaty of Rome and to the repeated declarations of the French Government in favour of the development of cultural cooperation in Europe. But on the evidence its intentions go no further than fine phrases.

That it is why it was urgent for this Parliament to take a decision on this affair because it is not yet too late, contrary to what was said in this House yesterday by one of our colleagues, Mr Simonet, it is not too late since Mrs Macciocchi confident of the influence of this Parliament's opinion has not yet appealed to the Council of State. I would add that in asking the French university authorities to reconsider their decision we are at the same time defending a principle which forms part of our identity: the principle of cultural exchange.

On behalf of the Socialist Group I therefore ask this Assembly to approve the resolution seeking the annul-

ment of this measure which, I repeat, is absurd, shocking, intolerable and unjustifiable.

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

Mr Galland. — (*F*) Mr President, I should like to address myself to Mrs Macciocchi seriously and say this.

The strength of your feeling today is quite understandable. First of all it is part of your normal character and it is reasonable also because your professional life and your intellectual commitment to Europe are affected. I for my part should like to take the heat out of this debate. I too, Mrs Macciocchi, am a radical Member of this Assembly, but of a rather different complexion from yourself, in that I am a supporter of Mr Giscard d'Estaing. However, contrary to what Mr Pannella might think, Mrs Macciocchi, radical parliamentarians in France today pride themselves on steering clear of the extremes of systematic demagoguery on the one hand — and in my opinion Mr Pannella would do well to emulate this French form of radicalism — and blind loyalty on the other hand. We are free parliamentarians and have no conception of what it is to be systematically aligned with government positions even if we have clearly chosen the side of the fence on which we sit. It is in this spirit, Mrs Macciocchi that I should like to speak, hoping that you will listen to me for your own sake. There are two points which have to be distinguished in this matter substance and form and I would remind you that we have not sought to avoid the debate. The whole Liberal Group voted for the adoption of the urgent procedure.

The substance is the legal question which Mrs Roudy mentioned. It is more complex than Mrs Roudy explained. Article 142 of our electoral code provides, as you know, that there shall be absolute incompatibility between public office and parliamentary office. There are only two exceptions to this rule, and, like all exceptions, they should be interpreted restrictively, namely, ministers of religion in Alsace-Lorraine — and you clearly do not fall in this category — and titular professors or directors of research who have fixed tenure and complete independence from the government. In such a case the holding of more than one office is possible, but you, as an associate teacher, do not qualify.

That is the law in France. It is quite clear. The legal problem which you seem to raise is as follows. As an Italian Member, your parliamentary salary is paid by the Italian Government. Therefore you are not receiving two French salaries and you say that you are not concerned by our electoral law of 7 July 1977 laying down provisions governing the election of the French representatives to our Assembly. Article 6 of that law

Galland

refers to Article 142 of the electoral code which is applicable to us.

For these reasons in particular, Mrs Macciocchi, you must refer this matter to the French Council of State. If you have not already done so, I am surprised and you should certainly do it. This brings me to make two remarks. First, it is essential for this House and it would be wise for you to wait for the French Council of State whose seriousness, jurisdiction and independence will not be questioned by anyone — to decide. It is for the Council of State and not for this House to say what the law is and pass judgment.

My own feeling, Mrs Macciocchi, is that you will not get round the incompatibility rule. Of course we have some work to do before we can achieve this impossible aim of a Europe of culture. But do you seriously believe that whereas our colleague Mr Delors, like you an associate teacher, had to stop teaching — and the Council of State has given a decision in his case — you will be able to continue? You cannot seriously pursue equality in employment and equivalence of qualifications in the Community and at the same time have situations where the nationals of a country are precluded from exercising an activity which foreigners in their country may exercise. Behind the law there are sometimes signs of common sense.

And then Mrs Macciocchi, there is the question of form. The timing of the notification of the decision is curious, coming one year after your joining this Assembly. I do not see how there can be any question of retrospective effect particularly with regard to the financial aspects. In my opinion, Mrs Macciocchi, the way in which your case has been dealt with is unacceptable. First of all, you could have been offered a choice between continuing with your teaching or with your office as Member of the European Parliament. Indeed, although ignorance of the law is no excuse, in your particular case you might at least have been reminded. And then you should have received a little more respect for your position. The way in which you were treated is exceptionally rude and whatever the merits of your case, intolerable. Please accept my apologies Mrs Macciocchi. I represent no one here, I am simply one Frenchman among many, but I offer you my apologies for the way in which you have been treated, about which I will say no more but which must deeply affect all those who every day fight for a good image of France in Europe. Your treatment, as you realize, illustrates the low esteem in which Members of the European Parliament are held in my country and in government circles in my country and that, I assure you, applies to us all.

I turn now, Mr President, to the vote. Our group will ask for a vote item by item. And I would ask our colleagues to be most attentive. We shall vote, Mrs Macciocchi, for paragraphs 1 and 2 of the motion for a resolution. We shall abstain on paragraph 3. It could have been better drafted and was perhaps unnecessary.

As regards paragraph 4, for the legal reasons which I have stated, the French Council of State has jurisdiction. This House cannot take its place. We shall vote against it. Depending on how this House votes, Mrs Macciocchi, on paragraph 4 — if paragraph 4 is adopted, we shall vote against the whole motion for a resolution. If paragraph 4 is rejected, we shall vote for the motion for a resolution. I would also suggest that you might have added that, in cases of incompatibility of this kind, the President of Parliament should also be informed. Ladies and gentlemen, I have attempted in this debate to be objective, dispassionate and European. I hope I have been successful.

President. — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in my view the case that we are discussing, which will in the end be referred to as the Macciocchi case, does not merely affect our colleague as an individual. I believe that it symbolizes a more widespread phenomenon. I am not a legal expert but I should like to say two things to Mr Galland who has apparently gone into this question in some detail.

The law is not neutral and often depends on interpretation. Certainly Mrs Macciocchi will appeal to the Council of State, but the Council of State has two years in which to reach a decision and in the meantime it seems our colleague must accept the situation as it stands.

I do not share the view that in this case we are dealing with a simple discourtesy in a matter of form. I do not believe that Mr Galland's legal interpretation of the electoral law and Article 6 of the law of 7 July 1977 is complete, because Mrs Macciocchi is in fact a titular professor although as a foreigner she can officially only occupy grade of associate. The exceptions which you mention, Mr Galland, in connection with the French electoral law do apply to her case. The reason for Mrs Macciocchi not being a titular professor in fact is not that she does not have the necessary qualifications but merely that she is a foreigner.

From this point of view therefore the situation is not free from doubt. Of course we have confidence in the Council of State, of course Mrs Macciocchi will appeal to the Council of State. But I think that account should be taken of the moral and symbolic significance that a measure such as that applied to our colleague can have. It means that a parliamentarian having Italian nationality elected under Italian law can no longer teach in a French or foreign university. This takes on the dimensions of a precedent which in my opinion should be rejected. It is true, Mr Galland, that our Parliament has no binding power but it does have a power to persuade and to deliver opinions. I therefore invite this House to vote for this motion for a resolution with the amendments tabled by Mr Habsburg for

Bonino

the reason that what is at stake is not the single, individual case of Mrs Macciocchi but a wider principle. There is the risk that no Member elected to the European Parliament may teach in France and this, in my opinion is intolerable if we intend to build a Europe of culture.

President. — I call Mr Habsburg.

Mr Habsburg. — (*D*) Mr President, I have tabled four amendments, which in my view correspond to the line taken by both Mr Galland and Mrs Bonino, for the simple reason that they display confidence in French justice. Hence our attempt to defuse the situation. On the other hand, however, it should be said quite clearly that the manner and form of the whole procedure is extremely regrettable and affects us directly as a Parliament. I can only regret, as someone who always regards himself as a francophile, that something has been done here on the part of France which is not in its true nature. I can only hope that as a result of the attitude taken by Parliament, France will once more act in accordance with its traditions.

President. — The debate is closed.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

On the preamble, I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Habsburg, seeking to replace the preamble with a new text to read as follows:

- amazed by the action taken by the French Government in regard to Mrs Maria Antonietta Macciocchi, whose appointment as associate professor with the University of Paris-VIII has been terminated on the grounds that the appointment was incompatible with her mandate as an Italian Member of the European Assembly.

The author accepts the amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1)

On paragraph 1, I have Amendment No 2, by Mr Habsburg, seeking to replace this paragraph with a new text to read as follows:

1. Notes that the Minister for the Universities informed Mrs Macciocchi of her dismissal, backdated to 30 September 1979, the day she became a Member of the European Parliament, in a letter merely invoking her office as Member.

The author accepts the amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 2)

On paragraph 2, I have Amendment No 3, by Mr Habsburg, seeking to replace the paragraph with a new text to read as follows:

2. Notes with regret that Mrs Macciocchi was never consulted or informed and that the decision concerning her was taken without her knowledge and without any regard for her status as a Member of the European Parliament, which entitled her to the same respect as is due to members of national parliaments.

The author accepts the amendment.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 3 and paragraph 3)

On paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 4, tabled by Mr Habsburg and seeking to replace the paragraph with a new text to read as follows:

4. Calls on the French Government to rescind this action in the spirit of cultural development and cooperation in Europe.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 4 and paragraph 5)

I can now give the floor for explanations of vote.

I call Mrs Castellina.

Mrs Castellina. — (*I*) I shall vote in favour of this motion for a resolution because from the legal standpoint it raises two contradictory points. If we consider the procedure adopted in relation to the injury to Mrs Macciocchi from the French point of view, we cannot escape the argument used to show that she is not a titular professor but merely an associate professor being an Italian citizen. If we look at the question from the point of view of her Italian citizenship, then the incompatibility rule cannot apply in that she was elected by Italy and not by France. The two viewpoints cannot be combined without creating a great legal muddle.

Leaving legal questions aside, I think that this Parliament should take a decision on a political question of principle which is this: are we interested — given that we are here talking about the need to build Europe — in having the maximum amount of political and cultural exchange? Do we want to have people sitting in this Parliament representing the Italian people and at the same time performing cultural duties in a university in a different Community country such as France? I think that if we believe in building Europe we must hope for more cases like that of Mrs Macciocchi, by which I mean that there should be more people performing these duties of spreading different experiences, cultures, traditions and trainings. It is therefore on this political principle which, in my opinion, we should express ourselves leaving aside legal questions. For this purpose I invite the Members of this House — who may have doubts over this intricate case but on which I think Mrs Macciocchi is quite right — to consider the sense and meaning of a vote by this Parliament which can only be this: do we want the maximum transfer of different ideas and traditions

Castellina

from one country to another? That is the sense which I give to my vote in favour of this motion.

President. — I call Lord O'Hagan.

Lord O'Hagan. — Mr President, I do not support this motion because I wish to attack the French Government, nor do I support it because I am wholly satisfied that we, in this Chamber, know the precise nature of the difficulties that have been encountered, although I listened with great attention, as I always do, to my friend, Yves Galland, and found his account extremely sympathetic.

I intervene because this is one of the few subjects on which Parliament has a right to express urgent concern. If we cannot defend the liberty of our Members to work in the time that is free to them so that they can better contribute as individuals and politicians to the building of the European Community, then it would be far better if we stopped now and replaced the individual choices in the ballot box by a series of numbers to be pressed by some distant and alien computer in Brussels. If we cannot defend the dignity of the Members of this Parliament, whatever their political view, whether we agree with it or not, to work for us and work in the Community under the law of the Community, then we must stop meeting altogether.

Finally, Mr President, it is a sad and macabre thought that after the ridiculous promiscuity of our concern for political causes all over the world, in the wasteland and desert of this empty Chamber, late on a Friday when the journalists have gone home; when the media have switched off; when the radio and the television plugs have been pulled out, we should have a calm, moderate, sensible debate about a matter of real urgency to us as Members and to the dignity of this Parliament.

(Applause)

The hours and the days of the journalists and the demands on the patience of members of the public who have come to watch have extended beyond the degree of endurance that can be imagined. We waste this Parliament's time in endless motions of urgency on subjects which are outside the concern of this Community and this continent. Late on a Friday, we are debating the fate of one of our Members.

Mr President, I appeal to you, let us have urgent debates about urgent matters. Is Mrs Macchiocchi too unimportant for our Members here to stay and listen? Yes, but is it too unimportant for Members to put their names to foolish resolutions and then go away? No, it is not! Mr President, I shall try and be moderate. I shall shut up. I have got to the end of my time. But let this serious, important, debate, about one of our own

Members, and the principle of our membership of this Parliament be a warning to the future of this Parliament of the dangers of abusing the urgency procedure as we do now.

President. — I call Mr Chambeiron.

Mr Chambeiron. — *(F)* Mr President, I agree with certain speakers who have spoken before me but I shall be a little less elegant and more firm in my language. The very least that one can say about this affair is that the measure to which the motion for a resolution relates is shockingly mean. But this does not surprise me, knowing the reputation in France of the Minister for the Universities, who, amongst other things, has elevated authoritarianism to an institution. We should have liked whenever similar cases arose in any of our countries not to find ourselves alone in condemning them. This affair is worrying in the sense that it creates a precedent which could be used to call into question the right of our universities to bring in people from outside in order to achieve their purpose of spreading knowledge.

Having had to consider comparable cases in my career as a senior French official, I wonder whether we have adopted the right approach to the case before us. In my view, it would have been wiser to consider it more seriously and I would say with less haste and more reflection because I would repeat, I am not sure that the procedure which we have followed is the best. I would refer to the exchange of views that we have just heard. The legal complexity of the question leads me to believe that it would have been wiser and more expedient, since the question concerns a Member of this House, to refer it either to the Bureau or to the committee responsible — but avoiding giving the problem a purely political significance of course — so that we might quickly receive a full report which would enable us to consider all the aspects of this complex affair and form our judgment. The majority of the House has chosen otherwise. That is its right but I am not entirely sure that it is the correct choice.

As far as our position is concerned, having said that we always have been and always shall be the first to condemn any arbitrary act and although we have voted for certain amendments which seem to us to reflect the reality of the situation, I wish to say that we cannot vote for this resolution for the simple reason that we cannot associate ourselves with certain of our colleagues who have such a selective attitude towards defending the rights of individuals or with certain others who when in France happily support the policy of the Minister for the Universities and who seek to distance themselves from him when they are in Strasbourg.

President. — I call Miss Roberts.

Miss Roberts. — Mr President, I shall support this motion for a resolution, and I offer my sympathy to Mrs Macciocchi in the situation in which she finds herself.

I am in a position, as perhaps no other Member of this Parliament is, to draw on my personal experience in this respect. When I was elected to this Parliament in June of last year, I, like Mrs Macciocchi, held a public appointment. I sat on a board which advised the British Government on pension matters. I was told at the time of my election that since this work had nothing whatever to do with the European Parliament, it would not be incompatible and I need not resign the appointment. — Very sensible advice, but unfortunately it was wrong in law. Under British law, the appointment was incompatible with membership of the European Parliament. I think this was a bad law; in point of fact, I believe that my experience in dealing with matters of employees' pensions would have been of value in the European Parliament and that much of what I have learned in the European Parliament would have been of value to me in my work on that pensions board: so both the board would have benefited and, I humbly believe, the European Parliament also, from the respective experience that I could draw upon in either place.

Unlike Mrs Macciocchi, I hope she will offer me some sympathy. I was more unfortunate than her, because the British law in this respect is a jolly sight sillier than the French law. Although there were some five or six weeks from the time of my election in June till the day on which we were to take our seats in this European Parliament and therefore I was not effectively a Member and was not, or would not have been, drawing any remuneration until some time in the middle of July, under British law I was not permitted to resign from this incompatible office. Instead, my election to the European Parliament was declared void, and I was disqualified. It was necessary for me, therefore, to contest a by-election in September, and I am happy to say that with a great deal of support from my colleagues in the European Democratic Group, who came along to help me magnificently, I won that by-election...

(Applause)

and was able to take my seat in this Parliament.

I think it was a thoroughly senseless piece of British law. I think the French law is senseless. I believe we should try to draw upon as wide a body of experience as we possibly can in this Parliament, and I hope that Parliament's efforts today will perhaps have some influence upon both the British and French Governments in this respect.

President. — I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — *(F)* Mr President, just a word to say that this morning, the working party responsible for considering the status of Members of the European Parliament met and that one of the questions which it is considering is that which we are discussing now. I hope that in a few weeks from now this working party will be able to submit proposals to the House for a general solution to these irksome problems.

President. — I call Lady Elles.

Lady Elles. — Mr President, first I supported the amendments of Mr Habsburg, except Amendment No 4, but I will vote for the resolution as a whole. I recognize the complexity of French internal law as described by Mr Galland, but the Treaty of Rome is not in question. There are derogations for nationals and for non-nationals. It is not a question of European law, but of internal law.

The reason why I am going to vote for this resolution but exclude amendment No 4 is that the treatment of an alien by an arbitrary action which has retroactive effect deprives a colleague of this Parliament, or any other individual who happens to be in Mrs Macciocchi's place, of her right to earn her living. It is not the French law that I am questioning, it is the way it was implemented, which I think is intolerable for any citizen wherever they may be. I can only congratulate Mrs Macciocchi that she has found so many friends here to support her in her action, and I feel very sorry for those aliens working throughout the Community who will not have the support of the European Parliament to safeguard their rights. It is for this reason that I disagree with Amendment No 4: the French Government should be called on not merely to rescind their decision, but to make adequate compensation to Mrs Macciocchi and to revise their internal law for future cases of this kind.

President. — I call Mr Schön.

Mr Konrad Schön. — *(D)* I believe that in this case we should vote in favour. By doing so, we shall finally be tackling a major problem, which is that the various national regulations and methods of applying the law must be done away with, so that European representatives are treated in the same way throughout Europe from the point of view of their status. I therefore believe that this problem should be seen in connection with the legal status of Members of the European Parliament. We cannot have several categories of Members! That is why I think we should tackle this subject.

President. — I call Mr Galland.

Mr Galland. — (*F*) Mr President, I should first of all like to say to Mr Chambeiron that the French Liberals do not need any lessons on liberty in judgment and action from the French Communist Party, which is the most Stalinist in Europe. As far as the substance of the debate is concerned, I should like to express to Mrs Macciocchi, my deep regret that the French Liberals will be voting against the motion for a resolution, because of Paragraph 4, which we believe to be wrong as a matter of law.

Mrs Macciocchi, I think that you have handled this badly. I will tell you why. You will have an impressive majority but you will lack the support of those who could have been useful had they voted with you, i. e. the French Members who support their government majority. Their favourable vote would certainly have influenced our government in your case more than any other. I am sorry for you, we have done everything we could and we pushed liberalism to the very extreme, but we shall vote against the motion for a resolution.

President. — I call Mr Coppieters.

Mr Coppieters. — (*NL*) Mr President, I shall vote in favour of this resolution, not as a mark of sympathy and not for the sake of academic freedom — *l'imagination au pouvoir*! — was the cry in Nanterre — but because the issue at stake here is the political freedom of the members of this Parliament. For me this resolution sounds a note of warning against the dangerous tendency of the French Government and of some politicians, which we have already witnessed on another score, to interfere in the affairs of the European Parliament and in our freedom of action. In this sense, this resolution is very important indeed.

President. — I call Mr Pannella.

Mr Pannella. — (*F*) Mr President, I shall vote in favour of the motion for a resolution for precisely the reasons which Mr Galland uses to justify his vote against. For myself, on the legal substance of the affair I put my trust in the jurist Maurice Duverger and in the many jurists who have expressed their views in the French press in full knowledge of the facts, speaking not out of empty liberalism but out of a completely different kind of liberalism. I shall vote for this motion because in a year or two the Council of State will give its judgment on the merits. We only hope that the French government will express its confidence in its Council of State by allowing Mrs Macciocchi to continue her duties. If subsequently the Council of State finds that we are wrong, then of course the French Government can only decide one way. That, Mr Galland, is reasonable, right and prudent. You talked about extreme liberalism and I think it is extreme in the way it habitually contradicts itself. In

that at least you have not disappointed us. I shall vote for the resolution.

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

The resolution is adopted.¹

15. *Crisis in the iron and steel industry*

President. — The next item is a joint debate on

— the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Michel and others on the urgent introduction of social aid measures for workers in the iron-and-steel industry (Doc. 1-402/80/rev.); and

— the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Salisch and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the crisis in the iron-and-steel industry (Doc. 1-414/80/rev.).

I call Mr Schön.

Mr Konrad Schön. — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the motion for a resolution tabled by the Group of the European People's Party is an important one, because it is high time we dealt with the social problems in the steel industry. We have supported these social measures right from the start, since the debate on the budget for 1980. We have always believed that the provisions of the Treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community are quite adequate to deal with urgent cases. The Commission should simply have been enabled to apply these provisions. There is no understanding in the outside world for the fact that the crisis is continually being debated, but that the crucial social issues are then blocked, simply because this debate is weighed down in part by demands which in our opinion should first be thoroughly examined. This is the only way to prevent a decline in the productivity of the steel industry, so far as it is still functioning at all, and to re-establish the competitiveness of the European steel industry in the world market.

Notwithstanding this concern, we have tabled a motion which, so far as its aims are concerned, we can associate entirely with that of the Socialist Group.

Quite briefly, the intention is in principle the same. We in the Group of the European People's Party therefore recommend that both resolutions be adopted.

President. — I call Mrs Salisch.

¹ OJ C 265 of 13. 10. 1980.

Mrs Salisch. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we considered the problems of the steel industry in the European Community during the last part-session before the summer recess, on the basis of the Peters report, and this is certainly not the time to go into every aspect of this debate. But I think all of us in the House agree that since then the trend in the steel sector has taken an alarming turn for the worse, particularly when we think of what has happened in the United Kingdom, France and Belgium. It is to be feared that because of this crisis quite arbitrary and uncoordinated measures will be taken, which will then have a long-term negative effect on the position of the European steel industry.

The reason why we have tabled a motion on these problems is that in our view it must always be ensured, in any measures which are taken, that Europe has sufficient steel-producing capacity in the medium and long term.

We agree in substance with the motion tabled by the Christian Democrats — that is, with the demand put forward by Mr Michel, and so I would join with the previous speaker in asking for both motions to be adopted. The task of the House must be to urge the Council and the Commission — particularly the Council — to take action here on the lines of the report which has been adopted. When taking immediate measures, it should not, in my view, be forgotten that supplementary measures also need to be taken. I am referring to the four main points, which include a certain amount of reorganization of shift-work and a reduction in working-hours. None of this should be forgotten, and it must form an integral part of the immediate measures. As the Council meeting is being held in October, we shall be doing the steel-workers of Europe a good turn if we now issue an urgent appeal to the Council to get to grips with this question and finally put these measures into effect.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) Mr President, the Commission shares the concern of the signatories to the motions before Parliament. The social aspects of the restructuring of the iron and steel industry are indeed in our view a fundamental aspect of the policy in this sector.

The Commission will once again do everything within its power to ensure that the Council of Ministers considers this question in October.

President. — The debate is closed. I can now give the floor for explanations of vote. I call Mr Chambeiron.

Mr Chambeiron. — (F) Mr President, the French Communists and Allies are against the European steel

plan and against the new measures being applied or prepared and which are likely to make it worse. We should like to make the following observations on the two texts that have been tabled.

In the first place, I should like to say that I see once again a growing tendency in this House to consider the most diverse kinds of questions. It does not moreover hesitate to interfere in the affairs of other countries while neglecting problems as important as those in the iron and steel industry. Indeed, it is quite impossible to discuss such an important question properly and calmly virtually at the last minute at almost 2 o'clock on a Friday afternoon.

I read the other day, Mr President, in the records of the British House of Lords that in the 19th century it was possible to pass a law important for the country by 5 votes to 2. We are picking up the worst British habits in this House. I repeat: it is unacceptable that such important questions should be treated in this way.

We ourselves tabled a resolution yesterday without a request for urgent procedure seeking an immediate stop to the European steel plan and to the current measures which are aggravating the situation. Yes, the urgent priority is to stop the break-up of industry and the dismantling of the steel-making industry.

No social measures can ever be sufficient to repair the damage that has been done unless they are measures taken with the unexpressed aim of facilitating programmes of redundancies and running down. But we will not resist such social measures. We would simply and clearly reaffirm that the first priority is to reject the European steel plan and condemn the new measures now being implemented.

President. — I call Mrs Kellet-Bowman.

Mrs Kellet-Bowman. — Whilst I did not agree with every aspect of the Peters report, I agreed with very much of it, and I feel very strongly that the social aspects of restructuring are vital to the wellbeing of the areas which are so heavily dependent on iron and steel. I therefore welcome Mr Natali's assurance that these social aspects will be kept very firmly before the Commission's eyes.

President. — The debate is closed.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution by Mr Michel and others (Doc. 1-402/80/rev.).

The resolution is adopted.¹

¹ OJ C 265 of 13. 10. 1980.

President

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution by Mrs Salisch and others (Doc. 1-414/80/rev.).

The resolution is adopted.¹

16. Sentencing to death of Kim Dae Jung

President. — The next item is a joint debate on

— the motion for a resolution by the Socialist Group on the sentencing to death of Mr Kim (Doc. 1-407/80/rev.); and

— the motion for a resolution by Mr Fanti and others, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, on the sentencing to death of Kim Dae Jung (Doc. 1-419/80).

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (F) Mr President, in relation to this text, whose eloquence is already quite sufficient, I wish only to underline the importance of intervention by the President of Parliament by télégram at the beginning of this week.

Various political groups have also taken the view that it was their duty to address themselves directly to the governments concerned. These interventions preceding and accompanying the tabling of the motions now before us will surely influence the decision which we hope the government concerned will take.

President. — I call Mr Chambeiron.

Mr Chambeiron. — (F) Mr President, my colleague Mr Martin, who was to speak has had to leave the Chamber like many others among our colleagues — to judge by the void in which we now continue this debate — and is now unable to do so.

In a previous discussion, he was the subject of accusations from some Members of this House, which do not appear to be entirely founded. I should like briefly and dispassionately, I assure you, to say what really happened.

After the telegram sent on Wednesday evening by the President of Parliament at the request of Mrs De March among others, Mrs De March yesterday morning proposed to the enlarged Bureau the sending of a new solemn telegram message in the name of the Bureau then meeting. Our colleague made that proposal in view of the imminent threat to the life of Mr Kim at a time when every hour counted, as we all realize. I can confirm that yesterday morning that proposal was not accepted by any Member of the

Bureau present with the exception however — let the truth be known — of Mr Pannella.

I wanted to say that on behalf of Mr Martin although that Mr President does not to me seem to be the most important thing. What is important is the life of a man. That is why we shall vote for the proposal before us.

President. — The debate is closed.

I put the motion for a resolution by the Socialist Group (Doc. 1-407/80/rev.) to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

I put the Fanti *et al.* motion for a resolution to the vote (Doc. 1-419/80).

The resolution is adopted.¹

*
* *

17. Adams case

President. — The next item is the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Glinne and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the Adams case (Doc. 1-410/80).

I call Mr Glinne.

Mr Glinne. — (F) Mr President, the text is quite clear. The purpose is to repeat a position previously taken by Parliament. That is what this matter requires.

President. — I call Mr Natali.

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) Mr President, I am very sorry to have to disappoint the generally legitimate expectation that at the end of the dinner comes the dessert, but the Commission cannot comply with the requests addressed to it in connection with the final item of this sitting.

The resolution contains a request to invite the Procurator-General of the Swiss Confederation to examine a decided case. During the previous debate on 23 May, my colleague Mr Giolitti stated that it was an invariable rule of the Community institutions — and hence

¹ OJ C 265 of 13. 10. 1980.

Natali

also of the Commission — not to interfere in the jurisdiction of the judicial authorities of third countries. This invariable rule is, I might add, also observed by the Commission in relation to the Member States. All the more reason therefore to apply the rule to relations with States which do not form part of the Community. This does not however alter the fact that the Commission has accepted responsibility for the situation of Mr Adams. As you know, it has already intervened in favour of Mr Adams in the form of financial contributions.

President. — The debate is closed.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

18. *Petition No 1/79*

President. — The next item is the report, without debate, by Mr D'Angelosante, on behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, on Petition No 1/79, on non-uniform interpretation by the Member States of EEC Regulation No 1408/71 (Doc. 1-286/80).

I note that no one wishes to speak.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.¹

19. *Dates of the next part-session.*

President. — There are no other items on the agenda. I thank the representatives of the Council and the Commission for their contributions to our work.

The enlarged Bureau proposes that our next sittings be held from 13 to 17 October in Strasbourg.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

20. *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 the sitting, which were written during the debates.

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

21. *Adjournment of the session*

President. — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 1.40 p.m.)

¹ OJ C 265 of 13. 10. 1980.



Price

	United Kingdom	Ireland	Belgium and Luxembourg	Denmark	Germany	France	Italy	Netherlands	Other countries
	UKL	IRL	BFR/LFR	DKR	DM	FF	LIT	HFL	BFR
Annual subscription 1980—1981	21.25	23.25	1 400,—	252,—	87,50	204,—	39 100	96,—	1 400,—
Single copies:									
up to 32 pages	0.60	0.70	40,—	7,20	2,50	5,80	1 120	2,80	40,—
up to 80 pages	1.20	1.40	80,—	14,40	5,—	11,60	2 240	5,60	80,—

more than 80 pages : price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprises :

- report of proceedings,
- annual indexes.

Sales

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February.

Orders may be placed with the Secretariat of the European Parliament or the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

Secretariat of the European Parliament

Centre européen

Plateau du Kirchberg

Boîte postale 1601 — Luxembourg

Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

Boîte postale 1003 — Luxembourg
and 5, rue du Commerce — Luxembourg

Postal cheque account : 19 190-81

Bank current account : B.I.L. 8-109/6003/300

Price: UKL 7.80 / IRL 9.10



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

ISSN 0378-5041

Boîte postale 1003 — Luxembourg

Catalogue number: AX-AA-80-008-EN-C

