

Annex

Official Journal of the European Communities

No 1-252

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1979-1980 Session
Report of Proceedings
on 10 March 1980
Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Monday, 10 March 1980	1
Resumption, p. 2 — Membership of Parliament, p. 2 — Petitions, p. 3 — Documents, p. 3 — Texts of treaties, p. 6 — Statement by the President, p. 7 — Urgent procedure, p. 7 — Order of business, p. 8 — Speaking time, p. 10 — Tabling of amendments, p. 11 — Procedure without report, p. 11 — Action taken on Parliament's opinions, p. 12 — Question Time, p. 17 — Urgent procedure, p. 31 — Fight against drug abuse, p. 31 — Agenda, p. 36 — Agenda for the sitting on 11 March 1980, p. 36 — Closure, p. 36 — Annex, p. 37.	

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.

Resolutions adopted at the sitting of 10 March 1980 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 85 of 8 April 1980.

SITTING OF MONDAY, 10 MARCH 1980

1. Resumption of the session	2	<i>lach; Mr Curry; Mr Gundelach; Mr van Aerssen; Mr Gundelach; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Gundelach</i>	20
2. Membership of Parliament	2	Question No 7 by Mr Maher: Common policy for afforestation within the Community: Mr Gundelach; Mr Maher; Mr Gundelach; Mr Hutton; Mr Gundelach; Mr Clinton; Mr Gundelach	21
3. Petitions	3	Question No 9 by Mr Berkhower: Coup in Surinam: Mr Cheysson; Mr Berkhower; Mr Cheysson; Mr Penders; Mr Cheysson	22
4. Documents received	3	Question No 11 by Mrs Clwyd: Trade links with Yugoslavia: Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission; Mrs Clwyd; Mr Natali; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Natali	23
5. Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council	6	Question No 14 by Mr van Aerssen: Application of directives in the Member States: Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission; Mr van Aerssen; Mr Jenkins; Mr Howell; Mr Jenkins; Mr Enright; Mr Jenkins; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Jenkins; Mr Johnson; Mr Jenkins	24
6. Statement by the President	7	Question No 15 by Mr Tyrrell: Romania: Mr Brunner; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Brunner; Mr Balfe; Mr Brunner; Mr Jakobsen; Mr Brunner	25
7. Urgent procedure	7	Question No 20 by Mr Balfe: Sugar beet production quotas: Mr Gundelach; Mr Balfe; Mr Gundelach; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Gundelach; Mr Lomas; Mr Gundelach; Miss Hooper; Mr Gundelach; Mr Moreland; Mr Gundelach	26
8. Order of business:		Question No 21 by Mr Cariglia: Impact of anti-pollution directives in the Member States: Mr Natali; Mr Cariglia; Mr Natali; Mr Howell; Mr Natali; Mr van Aerssen; Mr Natali	28
<i>Mr Seal, Mr Schwartzberg, Miss Quin, Mr Megahy, Mr Karl-Heinz Hoffmann, Mrs Bonino, Mr Fich, Mr Enright</i>	8	Question No 24 by Mr Seligman: The relationship between the Community and the European Space Agency: Mr Cheysson; Mr Seligman; Mr Cheysson	29
9. Speaking time	10	Question No 26 by Mr Battersby: Community's relations with China: Mr Brunner; Mr Battersby; Mr Brunner; Mr van Aerssen; Mr Brunner	29
10. Deadline for tabling amendments	11	Question No 27 by Mr Harris: Exports of butter to the Soviet Union: Mr Gundelach; Mr Harris; Mr Gundelach;	
11. Procedure without report	11		
12. Action taken by the Commission on the opinions and proposals of parliament:			
<i>Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission; Sir Henry Plumb, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture;</i>	12		
<i>Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Hord;</i>	14		
Point of order: <i>Mr Rogers</i>	15		
<i>Mr Maher; Mrs Castle; Mr Pranchère; Mr Aigner; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Gundelach</i>	15		
13. Question Time (Doc. 1-825/79);	17		
Questions to the Commission of the European Communities:			
Question No 8 by Mr Deleau: Iron and steel works at Bagnoli:			
<i>Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission; Mr Deleau; Mr Davignon</i>	18		
Question No 1 by Mr Ansquer: Supervision of Euro-credits:			
<i>Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission; Mr Ansquer; Mr Cheysson; Mr van Aerssen; Mr Cheysson</i>	18		
Question No 2 by Mr Provan: Scotch whisky imports:			
<i>Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission; Mr Provan; Mr Brunner; Mr John D. Taylor; Mr Brunner</i>	19		
Question No 6 by Sir John Stewart-Clark: Animal welfare:			
<i>Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission; Sir John Stewart-Clark; Mr Gunde-</i>			

<i>Mr Price; Mr Gundelach</i>	30	<i>Amendments to the second indent of paragraph 1:</i>	
<i>Point of order: Mr Scott-Hopkins</i>	31	<i>Mrs Squarcialupi</i>	33
14. <i>Urgent procedure</i>	31	<i>Amendment after the fifth indent of paragraph 1:</i>	
15. <i>Fight against drug abuse (vote):</i>		<i>Mrs Squarcialupi</i>	33
<i>Motion for a resolution by Mrs Squarcialupi (Doc. 1-752/79)</i>	31	<i>Amendments after paragraph 1:</i>	
<i>Amendment to the first indent of the preamble:</i>		<i>Mrs Squarcialupi</i>	34
<i>Mrs Squarcialupi, rapporteur</i>	31	<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Fernandez, Mr Capanna, Mrs Bonino, Mr Sherlock, Mrs Groes, Mr Patterson, Mrs Dekker</i>	34
<i>Amendment to the second indent of the preamble:</i>		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	36
<i>Mrs Squarcialupi</i>	31	16. <i>Agenda</i>	36
<i>Points of order: Mr Ripa di Meana; Mr Klepsch</i>	32	17. <i>Agenda for the sitting on 11 March 1980</i>	36
<i>Amendments after the second indent of the preamble:</i>		18. <i>Closure of the session</i>	36
<i>Mrs Squarcialupi</i>	32	<i>Annex</i>	37
<i>Amendment to the first indent of paragraph 1:</i>			
<i>Mrs Squarcialupi</i>	33		

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

President

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

President. — The sitting is open.

1. *Resumption of the session*

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament which was adjourned on 15 February 1980.

2. *Membership of Parliament*

President. — By letter of 4 March 1980 Mr Spautz has informed me of his resignation as Member of Par-

liament following his appointment as a member of the Luxembourg Government. Pursuant to Rule 4 (3) of the Rules of Procedure we establish that there is a vacancy.

By letter of 5 March 1980 the President of the Luxembourg Chamber of Deputies has informed me of the appointment of Mrs Lentz-Cornette as Member of the European Parliament to replace Mr Spautz, the first substitute on the list of the Christian Social Party having declined to take his seat.

By letter of 6 March 1980 Mr Mauroy has informed me of his resignation as Member of Parliament. Pursuant to Rule 4 (3) of the Rules of Procedure we establish that there is a vacancy.

By telex of 7 March 1980 the competent French authorities have informed me of the appointment of Mr Jalton as Member of Parliament to replace Mr Mauroy.

I welcome these colleagues who, pursuant to Rule 3 (3) of the Rules of Procedure, will provisionally take their seats in Parliament and on its committees with the same rights as other Members.

President3. *Petitions*

President. — I have received the following petitions:

- from Mr Ezio Perillo on the Regional Law No 62 of November 1977 on vocational training,
- from Mr Jeronimo Abad Carretero on the situation of Spanish teachers, victims of the Franco regime,
- from the Association for the Preservation of the Ijsselmeer (Lake Ijssel) on the preservation of the environment of the Ijsselmeer,
- from 180 students from 48 countries on peace and security for all,
- from Mr Fritz Becker on behalf of 'Europe 2000 — The League for Free Nations' on détente and disarmament,
- from Mr Antonio Ferraiuolo on irrigation waters from the Pisciró and Bagni mountain streams,
- from Mr Karl Schwabe on the free transfer of social security benefits,
- from Mr W.J.A. Visser on the Belgian language problem,
- from the 1980 district youth conference of the German postal union, North Baden — Palatinate regional administration, on 1 September as anti-war day.

These petitions have been given numbers 49 to 57/79 and entered in the register provided for in Rule 48 (2) of the Rules of Procedure. Pursuant to paragraph 3 of that same Rule, they have been referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

At its meeting of 18 December 1979 the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions examined petition No 16/79, established that it did not come within the terms of reference of the Communities and therefore decided to file it without further action.

4. *Documents received*

President. — Since the adjournment of the session I have received the following documents:

- (a) from the Council, requests for an opinion on the following Commission proposals:

- for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States concerning electrical equipment for use in potentially explosive atmospheres in mines susceptible to fire-damp (Doc. 1-805/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs as the committee responsible and to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection for an opinion;

— for:

- I. a directive on the fixing of maximum levels for pesticide residues in and on cereals intended for human consumption

- II. a directive on the fixing of maximum levels for pesticide residues in and on foodstuffs of animal origin

(Doc. 1-806/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Agriculture for an opinion;

- on the fixing of prices for certain agricultural products and on certain related measures (Doc. 1-807/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and the Committee on Development and Cooperation for opinions;

— for:

- I. a regulation on monetary compensatory amounts

- II. a regulation on the value of the unit of account and the conversion rates to be applied for the purposes of the common agricultural policy

(Doc. 1-817/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets for an opinion;

- for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to methods of testing the biodegradability of non-ionic surfactants and amending Directive 73/404/EEC (Doc. 1-823/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs;

- for a regulation approving the Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and the European Economic Community concerning fishing off the coast of Guinea-Bissau and two exchanges of letters relating thereto (Doc. 1-830/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Development and Cooperation and to the Committee on Agriculture as the committees responsible and to the Committee on Budgets for an opinion;

- for a regulation laying down for 1980 certain measures for the conservation and management of fishery resources applicable to vessels flying the flag of Norway (Doc. 1-832/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture;

- for a regulation amending Regulation No. 136/66/EEC on the establishment of a common organization of the market in oils and fats and supple-

President

menting Regulation (EEC) No. 1360/78 on producer groups and associations thereof (Doc. 1-837/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture;

(b) from the committees, the following reports:

- by Mr Luster, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-629/79) for a directive on health and veterinary inspection problems upon importation of bovine animals and swine and fresh meat from non-member countries (Doc. 1-811/79);
- by Mr Seligman, on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 12/79) for a decision adopting a research and development programme for the European Atomic Energy Community on the plutonium cycle and its safety (1980 to 1984) (Doc. 1-813/79);
- by Mr Nyborg, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-572/79) for a directive amending Directive 77/62/EEC coordinating procedures for the award of public supply contracts (Doc. 1-814/79);
- by Mr Hänsch, on behalf on the Political Affairs Committee, on the respect for human rights in Czechoslovakia (Doc. 1-815/79);
- by Mr Linde, on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research, on a communication from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 217/79) on new lines of action by the European Community in the field of energy saving (Doc. 1-816/79);
- by Mr von Wogau, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on a proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-533/79) for a directive amending Directive 72/276/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to certain methods for the quantitative analysis of binary textile fibre mixtures (Doc. 1-818/79);
- by Mr Mihr, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-534/79) for a directive amending Directive 79/113/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the determination of the noise emission of construction plant and equipment (Doc. 1-819/79);
- by Mr van Miert, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on the violation of human rights and fundamental liberties in Chile (Doc. 1-821/79);
- by Mr Seal, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the communication from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-757/79) on the negotiations between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Cyprus for the conclusion of a Transitional Protocol to the Association Agreement (Doc. 1-822/79);
- by Mrs Barbarella, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 47/79) on policy with regard to agricultural structures (Doc. 1-824/79);
- by Mr Buchou, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-691/79) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 337/79 on the common organization of the market in wine (Doc. 1-826/79);
- by Mr Sutra, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-259/79) for:
 - I. a regulation on liqueur wines produced in the Community
 - II. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No. 338/79 as regards quality liqueur wines produced in specified regions (Doc. 1-827/79);
- by Mr Kirk, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for:
 - I. a regulation concerning, for certain fish stocks occurring in the Community fishing zone, the fixing for 1980 of the total allowable catches and the means of making the catches together with the share available to the Community (Doc. 1-729/79)
 - II. a regulation laying down the arrangements for recording and forwarding information concerning catches effected during fishing activity by vessels of Member States (Doc. 1-828/79);
- by Mr Provan, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for:
 - I. a regulation approving the fishing agreements concluded in the form of an exchange of letters between the European Economic Community and Canada
 - II. a regulation allocating certain catch quotas between Member States for vessels fishing in Canadian waters (Doc. 1-783/79) (Doc. 1-829/79);
- by Mr Woltjer, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-830/79) for a regulation approving the Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and the European Economic Community concerning fishing off the coast of Guinea-Bissau and two exchanges of letters relating thereto (Doc. 1-831/79);
- by Mrs Majj-Weggen, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer

President

Protection, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-273/79) for a directive amending for the seventh time the directive of 23 October 1962 on the approximation of the rules of the Member States concerning the colouring matters authorized for use in foodstuffs intended for human consumption (Doc. 1-834/79);

- by Mr Enright, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-830/79) for a regulation approving the Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and the European Economic Community concerning fishing off the coast of Guinea-Bissau and two exchanges of letters relating thereto (Doc. 1-835/79);

(c) the following oral question with debate:

- by Mr Lange, Mr Delors and Mr Glinne, on behalf of the Socialist Group, to the Commission on enterprises and governments in international economic activity (Doc. 1-808/79);

(d) the following oral question without debate:

- by Mr de Pasquale, Mr Papapietro, Mr Cardia, Mrs Barbarella, Mr d'Angelosante and Mr Cerauolo to the Commission on the problems of the wine market (Doc. 1-809/79);

- (e) the following oral questions (Doc. 1-825/79) pursuant to Rule 47A of the Rules of Procedure for Question Time on 10 and 12 March 1980 by Mr Ansquer, Mr Provan, Mr Remilly, Mr Gillot, Mr Poncelet, Sir John Stewart-Clark, Mr Maher, Mr Deleau, Mr Berkhower, Mr Collins, Mrs Clwyd, Mr Spinelli, Mr Leonard, Mr van Aerssen, Mr Tyrrell, Mr Seal, Mr Ruffolo, Mr Didò, Mr Pintat, Mr Balfe, Mr Cariglia, Mrs Le Roux, Mr Sieglerschmidt, Mr Seligman, Mr Normanton, Mr Battersby, Mr Harris, Mrs Chouraqui, Mr Welsh, Mr Hopper, Mr Davern, Mr de la Malene, Mr Caillavet, Mr Curry, Mr Lalor, Mr O'Donnell, Lord O'Hagan, Mr de Ferranti, Mr Rossi, Mr Beumer, Mr Kirk, Mr Møller, Mr Prag, Mr Ippolito, Miss Brookes, Mr Moorhouse, Mrs Pruvot, Mrs Squarcialupi, Mrs Ewing, Mr Kavanagh, Mr Debré, Mr O'Leary, Mrs Dienesch, Mr Poncelet, Mr Ansquer, Mrs Chouraqui, Mrs Ewing, Lady Elles, Mr Megahy, Mr Ruffolo, Mr Didò, Mr Hutton, Sir Peter Vanneck, Mr Fergusson, Mr Seligman, Mr Schwarzenberg, Mr Seefeld, Mr von der Vring, Mr Caillavet, Mr Provan, Mrs Squarcialupi, Mr van Miert, Miss Brookes, Mr C. Jackson, Mr Lomas, Mr Harris, Mr Sieglerschmidt, Mr Provan and Mrs Lizin

(f) the following motions for resolutions, tabled pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure:

- by Mr Petronio on the creation of a European Stock Exchange (Doc. 1-796/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs as the committee responsible and to the Political Affairs Committee for an opinion;

- by Mr Petronio, Mr Almirante, Mr Romualdi and Mr Buttafuoco on the Milan-Adriatic waterway (Doc. 1-797/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Transport as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets for an opinion;

- by Mr Petronio, Mr Almirante, Mr Romualdi and Mr Buttafuoco on urgent measures to save Venice (Doc. 1-798/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets for an opinion;

- by Mr Petronio, Mr Almirante, Mr Romualdi and Mr Buttafuoco on the system of export refunds applied to Italian rice (Doc. 1-799/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the Committee responsible and to the Committee on Development and Cooperation for an opinion;

- by Mr Pisani, Mr Jaquet, Mrs Charzat, Mrs Cresson, Mr Delors, Mr Estier, Mr Faure, Mrs Fullet, Mrs Gaspard, Mr Josselin, Mr Loo, Mr Martinet, Mr Mauroy, Mr Moreau, Mr Motchane, Mr Oehler, Mr Percheron, Mrs Roudy, Mr Sarre, Mr Schwarzenberg, Mr Sutra and Mrs Vayssade, laying down the objectives, the administrative and financial rules and adoption procedures for a new European Agricultural policy, submitted to the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 1-800/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets, the Committee on External Economic Relations, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and the Committee on Development and Cooperation for opinions;

- by Mr Beumer and Mr Penders on trade boycotts (Doc. 1-801/79)

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee;

- by Mr Moreland, Mr Prout and Mr Sherlock on the export to Sweden of products containing cadmium (Doc. 1-802/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs;

- by Mr van Minnen, Mrs Buchan, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, Mr Peters, Mr Arndt, Mr Albers, Mr Jaquet, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, Mr Vernimmen, Mrs Viehoff, Mr Colla, Mr Glinne, Mr Balfe, Mr Estier, Mrs Lizin, Mr Schwarzenberg, Mr Sarre, Mrs Roudy, Mr Wettig, Mr Enright and Mr Caborn on conscientious objectors (Doc. 1-803/79)

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee;

President

- by Mr Gillot on a draft directive on the exercise of the profession of architect (Doc. 1-810/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Legal Affairs as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport for an opinion;

- by Mr Leonardi and Mr Bonaccini on the competitiveness of the Community economy (Doc. 1-820/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs;

(g) the following motions for resolutions:

- by the Liberal and Democratic Group on the budgetization of the European Development Fund (Doc. 1-812/79);

- by the Bureau, Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group), Mr Scott-Hopkins on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Fanti on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group, Mr Bangemann on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group and Mr de la Malene on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, on the composition of parliamentary committees (Doc. 1-839/79).

5. *Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council*

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

- agreement between the European Economic Community and the Federal Republic of Brazil on trade in textile products;
- agreement between the European Economic Community and the Eastern Republic of Uruguay on trade in textile products;
- agreement between the European Economic Community and Haiti on trade in textile products;
- agreement in the form of an exchange of letters relating to Article 9 of Protocol No. 1 to the agreement between the European Economic Community and the State of Israel and concerning the importation into the Community of preserved fruit salads originating in Israel (1980);
- agreement in the form of an exchange of letters between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Tunisia fixing the additional amount to be deducted from the levy on imports into the Community of untreated olive oil, originating in Tunisia, for the period from 1 November 1979 to 31 October 1980;
- agreement in the form of an exchange of letters between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Tunisia concerning the import into the Community of preserved fruit salads originating in Tunisia;
- agreement in the form of an exchange of letters between the European Economic Community and the Kingdom of Morocco fixing the additional amount to be deducted from the levy on imports into the Community of untreated olive oil originating in Morocco, for the period from 1 November 1979 to 31 October 1980;
- agreement in the form of an exchange of letters between the European Economic Community and the Kingdom of Morocco concerning the import into the Community of preserved fruit salads originating in Morocco;
- agreement in the form of an exchange of letters between the European Economic Community and the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria concerning the import into the Community of preserved fruit salads originating in Algeria;
- agreement in the form of an exchange of letters between the European Economic Community and the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria fixing the additional amount to be deducted from the levy on imports into the Community of untreated olive oil originating in Algeria, for the period from 1 November 1979 to 31 October 1980;
- agreement in the form of an exchange of letters between the European Economic Community and the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria on the importation into the Community of tomato concentrates originating in Algeria;
- supplementary protocol to the agreement between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Portugal;
- exchange of letters relating to Article 8 of the supplementary protocol;
- exchange of letters concerning products falling under the Treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community;
- act of notification of the approval by the Community of the agreement between the European Economic Community and the Federal Republic of Brazil on trade in textile products;
- act of notification of the approval by the Community of the agreement between the European Economic Community and the Eastern Republic of Uruguay on trade in textile products;
- internal agreement of 1979 on the financing and administration of Community aid;
- internal agreement on the measures and procedures required for implementation of the second ACP-EEC Convention of Lomé;
- agreement between the European Economic Community and Hong Kong on trade in textile products;

President

- transitional protocol to the agreement establishing an association between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Cyprus.

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

6. Statement by the President

President. — The chairman of the Political Affairs Committee has informed me that his committee has decided not to draw up a report on:

- the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Dekker and others on human rights in the Soviet Union and the 1980 Olympic Games in Moscow (Doc. 1-431/79) which had been referred to it on 26 October 1979
- the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Seal and Mr Lomas on the boycott of the Olympic Games (Doc. 1-787/79) which had been referred to it on 15 February 1980

in view of the fact that Parliament has, at its sitting of 15 February 1980, adopted the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Blumenfeld and others on the Moscow Olympic Games (Doc. 1-779/79/rev.).

The chairman of the Committee on Transport has also informed me that his committee has decided not to draw up a report on:

- the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Cottrell and others on a fixed link between Northern Ireland and Scotland (Doc. 1-687/79) which had been referred to it on 18 January 1980 adding that the committee would be grateful if I would invite the Commission to study the possibility of establishing a permanent link between Northern Ireland and Scotland as indicated in paragraph 3 of the motion for a resolution.

7. Urgent procedure

President. — The Council had requested urgent procedure, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, for two proposals for regulations on monetary compensatory amounts and on the value of the unit of account and the conversion rates to be applied for the purposes of the common agricultural policy.

After the report by the Committee on Agriculture on these subjects was placed on the draft agenda for the part-session from 24/26 March 1980, the Council has withdrawn its request for urgent procedure.

I have also received the following requests for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure:

- motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Hoff, Mrs van den Heuvel, Mrs Martin, Mrs Squarcialupi, Mrs Roudy, Miss Roberts, Mrs Lizin, Mrs Chouraqui, Mr Glinne, Mrs Maij-Weggen, Mr Spinelli, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, Mr Johnson, Mrs Bonino, Mrs Desmond, Mr Pelikan, Mr Pürsten, Mrs von Alemann, Mrs Dekker, Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, Mrs Vayssade, Mr Beumer, Mrs Walz, Mrs Groes, Mr Arndt, Mr Notenboom, Mrs Krouwel-Vlam, Mrs Rabbethge, Mrs Weber, Mr Linde, Mrs Barbarella, Mr Maher, Mr Purvis, Mr Seefeld, Mrs Lenz, Mrs Herklotz, Mr Radoux, Mr Balfe, Mr Josselin, Mr von der Vring, Mr Rogers, Mr Alber, Mr Orlandi, Mr Penders, Mr Schwencke, Mr Peters, Mr Hänsch, Mr Schön, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, Mr Puletti, Mr Wawrzik, Mr Schieler, Mr Dankert, Mrs Salisch, Mr Muntingh, Mrs Viehoff, Mr Sutra, Mr Schinzel, Mr Hoffmann, Mr Sieglerschmidt, Mr Cohen, Mr Nordlohne and Miss Quin

on membership of the future Commission of the European Communities (Doc. 1-804/79);

- motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Lizin, Mrs Roudy, Mrs Vayssade, Mrs Hoff, Mrs Martin, Mrs Gaiotti de Biase, Miss Roberts, Mrs Groes, Mrs Squarcialupi, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Percheron, Mrs Charzat, Mrs Viehoff, Mr Muntingh, Mr Griffiths, Mr Gallagher, Mr Gendebien, Mrs Ewing, Mrs Boot, Mr Blaney, Mr Tolman and Mrs Baduel Glorioso, on participation in the special United Nations Conference on the status of women (Doc. 1-833/79);
- motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Marchais, Mrs Hoffmann, Mr Vergès, Mr Wurtz, Mrs de March, Mr Ansart, Mr Gremetz, Mr Piquet and Mr Chambeiron, on the creation of an *ad hoc* committee on violations of human rights in the European Community (Doc. 1-838/79).

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

These requests for urgent debate will be put to the vote at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

8. Order of business

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

At its meeting of 14 February 1980 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has been distributed to you (PE 63-411/rev.).

As the Committee on Agriculture has not adopted the report on catch quotas allocated to vessels flying the

President

flag of a Member State and fishing in the regulated zone defined by the NAFO Convention, which had been down for debate on Friday, this item (No 16) has been withdrawn from the agenda.

At the request of the enlarged Bureau I propose the following amendments:

Monday 10 March 1980: the votes will be taken at the end of the agenda, i.e. after Question Time.

Tuesday 11 March 1980: the opening of the annual session will be followed by the vote on a motion for a resolution on the composition of the committees of Parliament.

Friday 14 March 1980: the report by Mr Seal, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the negotiations between the EEC and the Republic of Cyprus for the conclusion of a transitional protocol to the association agreement (Doc. 1-822/79) will be entered on the agenda immediately after his report without debate on trade relations with Cyprus.

Furthermore, it has been agreed to propose that a motion for a resolution by the Committee on Budgets on the budgetary timetable for the adoption of the 1980 budget should be entered on the agenda at the beginning of Friday's sitting.

I call Mr Seal.

Mr Seal. — Madam President, at a previous plenary session I put down a motion for a resolution with request for urgent debate on the British Government's immigration proposals. The request for urgent debate was rejected and the motion for a resolution was referred to the Legal Affairs Committee. I understand from our representatives on the Legal Affairs Committee that this motion has been discussed and that the Committee agreed that it would be debated this week at this plenary session. As I do not see the motion for a resolution on the agenda, Madam President, perhaps you could tell me what has happened to the decision of the Legal Affairs Committee.

President. — Mr Seal, I have had no notification of the fact that a report was to be drawn up on this subject. In any case the enlarged Bureau has decided on the draft agenda to which clearly nothing further can be added.

I call Mr Schwartzberg.

Mr Schwartzberg. — (F) Madam President, as you know, the agenda for tomorrow, Tuesday, includes the debate on my report on restrictions of competition in the air transport sector, which was adopted by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs

last January. I have, however, been informed of a request by Mr Seefeld, Chairman of the Committee on Transport, that consideration of my report be postponed, because the Committee on Transport is currently looking into roughly the same problem and has begun a series of public hearings on this subject which will not be completed until a few months time.

For my part, therefore, I agree to Mr Seefeld's request, because I feel it would be better to deal with these two reports, which cover the same subject, together in a few weeks or months time. I therefore suggest my report be postponed to a later part-session.

President. — I have had a request for this, but unfortunately too late to be able to take any action on it. I propose therefore that the draft agenda which has been placed before you should be amended accordingly.

I call Miss Quin.

Miss Quin. — Madam President, according to the agenda I am due, on Friday, to present a report on fishing in the Baltic. This report should have been taken at our last part-session. I feel it is quite wrong that reports which are carried over from a previous part-session should be put on Friday's agenda of the subsequent session as there is a great danger that the matter might not be dealt with at all, particularly if it is displaced by urgent debates during the week. I should like you to have a look at the possibility of taking my report in the early part of the week, preferably today or tomorrow.

President. — It is true that this report has been put down for Friday, but I should hope that on this occasion we will be able to get through our entire agenda.

I call Mr Megahy.

Mr Megahy. — Madam President, further to the point made by my colleague Mr Seal, in connection with the view of the Legal Affairs Committee on the resolution submitted by Mr Seal and other Members concerning the British Government's immigration policies, I am completely dissatisfied with the answer which you gave. First of all, this request of the Legal Affairs Committee does not seem to have been given proper consideration by the Bureau. Secondly, may I point out that your explanation that this matter should be discussed in April is completely contrary to the view of the Legal Affairs Committee, because their argument for submitting this to this part-session was the fact that by the end of March the last possible date for challenging these immigration proposals would have gone and therefore there would be no reason whatsoever for debating this matter in the April part-session.

Megahy

sion. I would like to see the Bureau reconsider this question in view of the urgent representations by the Legal Affairs Committee that it should be discussed before the end of March.

(Applause from certain quarters on the left)

President. — When the Bureau met this morning it could have discussed this matter, but the fact is that we had no clearly formulated request before us.

I call Mr Hoffmann.

Mr Karl-Heinz Hoffmann. — *(D)* Madam President, the Group of the European People's Party had instructed me to move that the Schwartzenberg report be taken off the agenda. Now that Mr Schwartzenberg, the rapporteur, has himself proposed that the debate on restrictions of competition in the air transport sector be postponed, my Group supports his proposal.

President. — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — *(I)* Madam President, I would like to ask you to tell me something, or explain it. I see at the top of the agenda that speaking time is to be allocated in accordance with Rule 28. Whilst repeating — or rather taking as said and done — everything that we have already said on the systematic use of Rule 28, I wanted to ask you for some information. The total time allotted to the Group for Technical Coordination for all the items on Friday's agenda is five minutes. My question is this: if other motions for a resolution are added to the agenda under Rule 14 — the urgent debate procedure — will that time still be five minutes?

President. — Yes, Mrs Bonino. Even if we add other motions for resolutions to our programme, the speaking time available remains a constant quantity. This is why there is always the danger that certain reports may not be debated.

I call Mr Fich.

Mr Fich. — *(Dk)* Madam President, this is about the point raised by Miss Quin on the report on salmon fishing in the Swedish fishing area. I must say, I was not at all satisfied with your answer. This matter has been on the agenda for one Friday and now we have it down for Friday again. Of course, as you say, we hope we shall get through the agenda, but there is no guarantee that we shall, and now people are talking of other matters which they want to be dealt with urgently. Therefore, it was proposed that this item

should be moved to Tuesday or Wednesday to prevent it being postponed once again to next month.

President. — If this question could not be debated on Friday morning, it would indeed be very disturbing, because, in fact, it has been put down for the very beginning of the sitting!

The enlarged Bureau has tried to arrange the draft agenda in the most orderly fashion possible by putting related subjects into groups. This is why the matter in which you are so interested has been put down for Friday morning.

I call Mr Enright.

Mr Enright. — On the same point, Madam President, what really concerns me very much indeed is that whereas one of our constitutional functions as a Parliament is to adopt reports — and these reports are vital to the Commission — we are getting ourselves into the situation where we are influencing world opinion during the beginning of the week and then neglecting the actual powers that we have and the requirements that are made of us by the Commission. Could we therefore have an assurance that in future reports which are required by the Commission will be given priority early in the week? As it is, we are very often not giving these reports full attention and full consideration and they are being hastily put through on a Friday.

(Applause from certain quarters of the European Democratic Group)

President. — The enlarged Bureau discussed the draft agenda at great length. It is natural that each committee considers that its report should be given priority. On the other hand the political groups are anxious that Tuesday and Wednesday should be devoted to debates on subjects of major importance. We have to draw up an agenda that will take account of all these points of view. I would add that Friday is just a working day like any other.

The order of business is therefore as follows:

This afternoon until 8.00 p.m.:

— Procedure without report

President

- Commission statement on action taken on the opinions and proposals of Parliament — Question Time (questions to the Commission: 1 ½ hours) — Fight against drug abuse (vote) — Regulations on the Common Customs Tariff (vote) — Directive on the modernization of farms (vote)

Tuesday, 11 March 1980

9.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m. and 3.00 p.m. to 7.00 p.m.:

- Opening of annual session
- Motion for a resolution on the composition of committees
- Cronin report on the ERDF
- Joint debate on the Damseaux and Spinelli reports and an oral question to the Commission on competition policy
- D'Angelosante report on a directive on transferable securities

3.00 p.m.: Voting time

Wednesday, 12 March 1980

9.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m. and 3.00 p.m. to 7.00 p.m.:

- Motion for a resolution on a uniform European passport
- Motion for a resolution on the budgetization of the EDF
- Barbarella report on agricultural structures policy

3.00 p.m.: Voting time

5.30 p.m. to 7.00 p.m.: Question Time (questions to the Council and to the Foreign Ministers)

Thursday, 13 March 1980

10.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m., 3.00 p.m. to 8.00 p.m. and 9.00 p.m. to midnight:

- Possibly, continuation of Tuesday's and Wednesday's agendas
- Joint debate on the Buchou report and three oral questions to the Commission on the problems of the wine market
- Buchou report on basic products
- Ligios report on fruit and vegetables
- Provan report on sheepmeat
- Sutra report on liqueur wines
- Filippi report on SMUs in Portugal
- Seeler report on relations between the EEC and the ASEAN
- Sablé report on milk fats

- Gillot report on the law of the Sea

3.00 p.m.: Voting time

Friday, 14 March 1980

9.00 a.m.:

- Procedure without report
- Possibly, continuation of Thursday's agenda

10.30 a.m.: Voting time

- Motion for a resolution on the budgetary timetable for 1980
- Seal report on trade with Cyprus (without debate)
- Seal report on negotiations between the EEC and Cyprus
- Joint debate on the Helms, Quin, Nielsen, Enright, Woltjer, Provan and Kirk reports on fisheries

End of sitting: Voting time

Are there any objections?

This order of business is therefore agreed.

9. *Speaking time*

President. — I propose, pursuant to Rules 28 and 36A of the Rules of Procedure, that speaking time be allocated as follows:

— Overall speaking time for the items on Tuesday's agenda	
Rapporteurs	60 minutes
	(10 minutes each)
Commission	60 minutes
Members: 300 minutes allocated as follows:	
Socialist Group	74 minutes
Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic 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
	Total: 7 hours

— Overall speaking time for the items on Wednesday's agenda

Rapporteurs	30 minutes
	(10 minutes each)
Commission and Council	30 minutes
	in all
Members: 240 minutes allocated as follows:	
Socialist Group	58 minutes

President

Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group)	55 minutes
European Democratic Group	35 minutes
Communist and Allies Group	25 minutes
Liberal and Democratic Group	24 minutes
Group of European Progressive Democrats	15 minutes
Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members	10 minutes
Non-attached Members	18 minutes
Total:	5 hours

— *Overall speaking time for the items on Thursday's agenda*

Rapporteurs	120 minutes (10 minutes each)
Commission	120 minutes
Members: 360 minutes allocated as follows:	
Socialist Group	90 minutes
Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group)	85 minutes
European Democratic Group	53 minutes
Communist and Allies Group	38 minutes
Liberal and Democratic Group	35 minutes
Group of European Progressive Democrats	22 minutes
Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members	13 minutes
Non-attached Members	24 minutes
Total:	10 hours

— *Overall speaking time for the items on Friday's agenda*

Rapporteurs	50 minutes (5 minutes each)
Commission	40 minutes
Members: 90 minutes allocated as follows:	
Socialist Group	20 minutes
Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group)	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
Total:	3 hours

Rapporteurs for any items added to the agenda will each be entitled to 10 minutes speaking time.

Are there any comments?

That is agreed.

10. *Deadline for tabling amendments*

President. — For items other than those held over

from the previous part-session I propose that the deadline for tabling amendments be fixed as follows:

- 6 p.m. this evening for the items on the agenda for 11 and 12 March 1980
- 7 p.m. this evening for the motion for a resolution on the membership of committees
- 6 p.m. on Tuesday, 11 March for the items on the agenda of 13 March 1980
- 6 p.m. on Wednesday, 12 March for the items on the agenda of 14 March 1980.

Are there any comments?

That is agreed.

11. *Procedure without report*

President. — Pursuant to Rule 27A of the Rules of Procedure, the following Commission proposals have been placed on the agenda for this sitting for consideration without report:

- for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1119/78 laying down special measures for peas and field beans used in the feeding of animals (Doc. 1-693/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible, and to the Committee on Budgets for an opinion;

- for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No. 2925/78 with regard to the period of suspension of application of the prices condition to which import into the Community of certain types of citrus fruit originating in Spain is subject (Doc. 1-697/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on External Economic Relations as the committee responsible, and to the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Budgets for opinions;

- for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No. 1081/77 on the temporary suspension of aids for the purchase of dairy cows and of heifers intended for milk production (Doc. 1-712/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture;

— for:

- I. a draft directive on statistical returns in respect of carriage of goods by inland waterways as part of regional statistics
- II. a draft directive on statistical returns in respect of carriage of goods by rail as part of regional statistics (Doc. 1-743/79)

President

which has been referred to the Committee on Transport as the committee responsible, and to the Committee on Budgets for an opinion.

Unless any Member has asked leave in writing to speak on these proposals or amendments are tabled to them before the opening of the sitting on Friday, 14 March 1980, I shall declare the proposals to be approved.

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

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

I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — Madam President, on 15 February 1980 the Parliament adopted a resolution dealing with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and also Soviet Russia's failure to respect human rights. The Commission shares the fundamental principles and views expressed in this resolution by the European Parliament and considers it timely, politically wise and worthy of Europe.

That resolution included certain specific paragraphs concerning our exports to Soviet Russia, with refunds or aid in other ways, of certain agricultural products which are in surplus in the Community. The resolution in fact calls upon the Commission to place an embargo on the export of these items to Soviet Russia.

While understanding full well the feelings and the motives underlying what has here been expressed by the European Parliament, it is, however, my duty to tell this House that it is not within the powers of the Commission to impose upon exports of agricultural items — or, for that matter, of any other items — any embargo or take any other step which in fact amounts to an embargo.

This does not mean that the Commission does not have, as part of its responsibility for managing our agricultural export policy, certain powers to see to it that this policy is sensibly administered from the political as well as from the economic — that is, the budgetary — point of view. It follows from this that the Commission

also has a responsibility to initiate policies within the Community when political requirements make it necessary. The Commission did so when on 5 January this year, following the brutal Soviet Russian attack on Afghanistan, the United States of America, while not imposing an embargo — that I must underline — cancelled additional contracts for sales of cereals to the Soviet Union and certain other contracts for sales of other agricultural commodities — often with an element of support. The Commission immediately took the necessary steps to ensure that European exporters did not in any way take over from the United States in these important exports of cereals to Soviet Russian markets or, indeed, of any other commodity of which exports were either being stopped or subjected to a control by the United States *vis-à-vis* Soviet Russia. Here we are in particular speaking about products based on cereals, such as meat, poultry, etc.

In order to avoid any overspill, any confusion, any speculation which could lead to economic losses for the Community, we further undertook to subject to strict controls other agricultural items which were not subject to any US embargo or control *vis-à-vis* Soviet Russian markets, such as, in particular, dairy products. We did this using our powers under the Treaty to avoid any unnecessary budgetary losses due to price speculation.

We then went to the Council of Foreign Ministers to get a clear political situation with regard to European policy on agricultural exports in this present very grave situation. On 15 January, the Council of Ministers decided — thereby covering politically the actions which the Commission had taken on its own initiative — that the Community should not provide any substitute for American exports to Russian markets and that in regard to other agricultural items we should not go beyond the bounds of normal trade. That, of course, applies in particular, but not solely, to dairy products. The Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs took this decision as the Council, not within the framework of political cooperation, and at the January part-session it was communicated to the House by the President of the Council and by Mr Haferkamp speaking on behalf of the Commission.

This line was not contested by the European Parliament at the time. Subsequently, the matter was discussed once again at the February session of the Council of Ministers, and the Council unanimously confirmed the position it had taken at its January session, which was not to provide any substitute for American exports to Russian markets, in particular in the field of grain and products based on grain, and not to bypass the strict limits of normal trade in other commodities sold to Soviet Russia.

Since 5 January, the Commission has introduced strict measures in all the commodity areas to which I have referred, the details of which I am sure you know, in

* See Annex.

Gundelach

order to enable us, on a day-to-day basis, to ensure that these commitments are strictly adhered to. It has been done and it functions. I must make it clear that in that period the Commission has in fact not allowed any sales of butter, whether by prefixation or bulk sales or sales in small packages, to Soviet Russia.

I must also make it clear that this conservative application of the Council decision has given rise to some concern in the Council and also among many Members of this House, who have raised questions on this subject for the Question Time which is to follow shortly. I must make it clear, as I started off by saying, that the Commission has no power to introduce any embargo, either directly or indirectly. It is taking the initiative to have established by the Council a clear and powerful policy which has the enormous advantage of presenting a European reaction in a united form. This being the case, and it being the responsibility of the Commission to execute the Council decision submitted in January to this House, we cannot in the long run operate it as an embargo. We have to operate it on its own terms, but in so doing we have to take into account the responsibility of the Commission to see to it that we use our budgetary means in the most economic manner. We have the responsibility to administer these resolutions and the existing directives in such a manner that we do not incur unnecessary losses to the Community, and this is all the more important since it is difficult — and that I understand — for the taxpayers of Europe to understand, in the present economic and political circumstances, that Community money is being used for the disposal of surpluses, in particular to countries with whom we are not exactly on friendly terms at this time.

I must again re-emphasize that in carrying out this extremely prudent policy, both from a political and from an economic point of view, we are not in a position to impose an embargo or anything which is tantamount to an embargo.

I must ask the House to bear with me for one minute. The issue primarily concerns dairy products. We are not replacing American exports to Soviet Russia. The United States has not introduced an embargo. The problem of our surpluses, in particular of dairy products, is to a large extent an internal Community problem. When all is said and done, what is difficult for the taxpayers to understand is that, as things go in this year of inflation, we have to pay for another 100 000 tonnes of butter to be disposed of on internal or external markets which are already over-saturated.

With all due respect and with all the understanding I have for this question of exporting butter to Russia, the root of the matter, therefore, is the fundamental problem of a vast overproduction of milk products, especially butter, and as long as we do not have the will and the courage to get to the root of that problem,

we shall be confronted with delicate issues such as the one we are confronted with now. As long as we have these surpluses, they have to be disposed of. We are not wasting the taxpayers' money by exporting them, because if we don't export them and as long as we have that overproduction they will continue to pile up in our public stocks and it costs enormous amounts of money to keep them — more than it costs to export them.

The costs are there in any event. We are not paying export refunds in order to give aid to anybody. We have never exported to Soviet Russia for the benefit of the Russians, only for the benefit of the European farmers, because the European farmers have a price which is higher than the world market price. Since their price is higher than the world market price and since we are thereby generating surpluses, we have to get rid of these surpluses, and the only way we can get rid of them, apart from a vast programme of internal disposal, is by exports, which cost money, though less money than if we keep this butter or milk powder in stock. We cannot avoid the expense to the taxpayer as long as overproduction takes place.

In conclusion, Madam President, I therefore appeal to the House to collaborate with the Commission in dealing with the problem which is at the root of the difficulty — the over-production of milk products. In the meantime, the Commission will, within the limits of the Treaties and the directives, assume its responsibility for administering our export programme with all due respect for political sensitivities, which are sometimes twofold, and the necessity of husbanding our budgetary resources to the utmost. I am not in a position to institute an embargo, as I have already stated, but that is not to say that the Commission is not of the opinion that we are confronted with a problem; but we are confronted with a problem which has a broader application. Do not forget either that we are importers of butter, and we would not wish to push New Zealand, which depends on its exports of butter to Europe, into even greater dependence upon the Russian market. This has to be borne in mind as well: New Zealand has to sell butter to Soviet Russia today.

Madam President, having made this report and having in this way had to reserve the position of the Commission on the resolution to which I initially referred, I ask the House to collaborate with the Commission. I promise on behalf of the Commission to collaborate with the House in dealing with all the aspects of the issue of surplus products, be they dairy products or other products, when we come to deal with them on their own merits actually only two weeks from now.

(Applause)

President. — I call Sir Henry Plumb.

Gundelach

Sir Henry Plumb, Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. — Madam President, I would first of all like to thank the Commissioner for his statement, and I think we all understand the position that he and the Commission find themselves in at the moment. The Committee on Agriculture is obviously concerned at the mounting criticism of sales or possible sales of butter to Russia, but it would appear from the Commissioner's statement that some of the comments that have been made in recent weeks have been somewhat exaggerated. It is of no interest at all to the producers to accumulate heavy surpluses: producers wish to sell for the market, and the surpluses that obviously accrue at high cost in terms of storage and of sale are overcostly to the taxpayer, but selling the product more cheaply on the world market inevitably provokes criticism from the Community taxpayer.

I note that the Commissioner referred to the fact that he is following the guidelines of the Council. I note also that he indicated that the Commission, in their dealings with products going from the Community, have no intention of replacing American exports to Russia. I hope this House will accept the statement the Commissioner has now made, that the strict measures he referred to will be adhered to under commitment.

I note also that he referred to the fact that there have been no sales of butter from the Community since 5 January: this House will naturally watch with keen interest and keep a very critical eye on the future development of trade.

I think the point he made at the end of his statement is the one that we should consider as a priority. That is that we should concern ourselves and try to avoid excessive surpluses in order to save embarrassment for the producer, for the trader, for the consumer and in particular for the taxpayer. If we can achieve a proper supply-and-demand position in the Community, which makes a lot more sense in the interests of the whole, then we shall certainly save the embarrassment that we all find ourselves in when having to deal with these surpluses in the way they have been dealt with in the past. So I welcome the Commissioner's statement and I hope this House will support it.

(Applause)

President. — A total of fifteen minutes is now available to Members of Parliament to ask short questions.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Madam President, whilst thanking the Vice-President of the Commission for his statement, may I say that it causes me certain anxieties.

Of course, I understand that he cannot impose an embargo. Also I understand the necessity for dealing with the surplus production situation. The House, I think, during the budgetary debate demonstrated its willingness to tackle this problem, and I doubt not that we shall do the same thing in this House when we debate in ten day's time agricultural prices. But would he not agree that when he speaks of normal trade patterns this could mean, could it not, selling whatever butter he has at intervention prices to the Russians? I must repeat to him that I would find it extremely difficult to advise my group that any kind of subsidization requiring large sums of taxpayers' money would be acceptable. It would not. I do not believe that he himself wants this to happen. I think it would be the British and the European taxpayer's wish to pay for the storage or disposal costs at this moment when the Russians are in such flagrant violation of human rights — as they are — rather than to subsidize exports of butter to that country.

(Applause from the European Democratic Group)

I also believe that the Americans have in fact stopped the sale of fats to Russia. If that is so, we have no right in this House, neither has he any right, to substitute European butter for what has been stopped by the American Government. — Not an embargo, I agree, but stopped. And so I sincerely hope that he will assure us that in the carrying out of his mandate from the Council he will make quite certain that the price paid by — if it should be so — the Russians should be that of intervention.

President. — I call Mr Hord.

Mr Hord. — Madam President, I am sure that the electorate of Europe will be both horrified and angered at the way this directly elected Parliament's voice has been flouted by the Commission through its decision to ignore the resolution approved on 15 February. I would say to Mr Gundelach that he and his colleagues in the Commission have completely misread the situation that prevails. This is a political problem, not an economic one, and I would suggest that there are many people in Europe who would prefer to see the surplus commodities poured down the drain at their own cost rather than passed off to Russia because it is going to cost the Community some money.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

Unless the Commission understands the political realities, this House and all the institutions of the Community will be nothing in the eyes of the people who put us here. Finally I would like to ask Mr Gundelach how

Hord

much butter the Commission intends to sell to the USSR and at what price. Does he also realize that the butter that we sell or have been selling to Russia retails there for eight times as much, and all to fuel the Russian war machine? I think that this House and all the people of Europe will be very anxious to hear the reply to this question.

President. — I call Mr Rogers to speak on a point of order.

Mr Rogers. — Madam President, you announced that there were 15 minutes that were going to be available for short sharp questions on the content of the Commissioner's report. Already over half that time has been used up by two political statements rather than questions. When I went up to see the speakers' list I noticed that the next four speakers are also members of the Conservative Group. Now, Madam President, the Rules of Procedure generally lay down — and I am sure that this is what you yourself would want — that there should be a political balance in the supplementaries and the questions. Would you therefore, Madam President, look at the political balance of the input and also ensure that they are short sharp questions, or I think it would be very unfair on speakers who might want to comment at the same length as the two previous speakers. It is necessary to have a proper political balance in this debate.

(Applause)

President. — I was just about to give the floor to a Member from another political group.

I call Mr Maher.

Mr Maher. — Madam President, in order to try to get some balance into this situation, I think if we are considering the situation in Russia and the relationship between the European Community and the Russians at the moment, we have to look also at industrial exports to Russia. I wonder if the Commissioner for Agriculture could inform us about the position in relation to industrial exports? I would like to know, firstly, to what extent countries who are exporting industrial products are giving credits to the Russians in order that they will buy their industrial products rather than those of other countries?

Secondly, I would like to ask whether we are serious in suggesting that because we sell a product that is carrying some subsidy, it is different in terms of the help that it can give to the Russians from a product that is sold, for instance, without a subsidy. If it is a political

question and not an economic question, then surely it matters little whether we are prepared to give little support or whether we sell a product at the ruling price.

President. — I call Mrs Castle.

Mrs Castle. — Madam President, is the Commissioner aware that of course British consumers object to butter being exported to other countries, whatever they may be, at a fraction of the price that our own consumers have to pay? Is he aware that they object even more to having to pay as taxpayers for the creation of those surpluses in the first place, not least because the British taxpayer pays the lion's share? And can he tell the House whether the moralists among the British Conservatives opposite, or the moralists on the Committee on Agriculture, have given him any indication that they are willing to welcome with open arms his and the Commission's proposal for dealing with the imbalance in the markets in the common agricultural policy and getting rid of the surpluses which are the real cause of the trouble?

(Applause from certain quarters on the left)

President. — I call Mr Pranchère.

Mr Pranchère. — *(F)* I would like to put a first question to Mr Gundelach on the use of agricultural policy as a food weapon because, at bottom, Mr Carter's proposals, which are supported by the majority in this House, have that as their aim and this utilization is intolerable and dangerous for the future of international relations. Does Mr Gundelach feel that the Community's agricultural policy and in particular our policy on exports of agricultural produce is compatible with such an alignment? Should this policy, which you say incidentally should be extended to include exports of dairy produce, be the same for the Soviet Union as for other countries? In a word do you intend to honour the undertakings which have already been or may be entered into with the Soviet Union?

In addition, if we now have to hear the British Conservatives acting as the spokesmen of America, I would like to ask Mr Gundelach if he intends to tackle the problems involved in Great Britain's importing 120 000 tonnes of butter from New Zealand at a cost to the Community of 300 million Ecus, as recently pointed out by one of our Members in the Committee on Agriculture.

Lastly, does Mr Gundelach find it admissible that we should be talking about milk surpluses at a time when

Pranchère

50-70 million human beings in the world are dying of malnutrition every year? What measures does the Commission plan to take to bring about a decisive improvement in food aid to the developing countries?

(Applause from certain quarters)

President. — I call Mr Aigner.

Mr Aigner. — *(D)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I think that no-one is unaware of the Commission's difficulties in this question, but I would nevertheless like to say that this Parliament has very clearly expressed its political will. I would say to the Member of the Communist Group that it was not the voice of America but the voice of this Parliament saying that in no circumstances were we going to supply field rations for the invasion army in Afghanistan. I also think, Mr Gundelach, that the Commission has not only to make up for the lack of political will on the part of the Council but also to assume responsibility vis-à-vis this Parliament and execute its political will. It cannot simply act as though Parliament's intentions were not clear. With your permission I would like to ask two questions.

Mr Gundelach, are you prepared to submit all the Commission's decisions of recent months in writing to the Committee on Budgetary Control so that we can bring the course of events out into the light of day — for the public as well, if necessary?

Secondly — and this question I would like to ask Mr Jenkins — Mr Jenkins, this Parliament has often requested that the Commission should develop a specific set of instruments for dealings with the state-trading countries. Export and import instruments cannot be the same for free countries as they are for state-trading countries. Has then, after so many requests from Parliament, any study started on this question? I am concerned about this. We — and my Group — are in no mind simply to accept that we should go on supplying field rations for invasion troops in Afghanistan.

President. — I call Mr Newton Dunn.

Mr Newton Dunn. — Madam President, on a different subject, not butter. One month ago the Commission reported on the actions that they had taken on Parliament's opinions in the January session. They reported that in three cases out of five the Commission accepted our amendments. However, on one of these proposals, a report by Mr Combe on cocoa and choco-

late products, nothing has been done. The Commission reported that, I quote, 'an amended proposal which takes account of Parliament's opinion has been prepared and is to be sent to the Council and Parliament towards the end of the week'.

Now, Madam President, the Parliament's staff has checked for me and up to today, more than four weeks later, nothing has been received from the Commission. I find it utterly intolerable that they can fob us off with a piece of paper and not give us any action. Could we please have an immediate explanation?

President. — Mr Patterson, I am sorry that I cannot give you the floor. The same goes for all the other Members who have put down their names to speak. The time available has been used up.

I call Mr Gundelach.

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — Madam President, as will have been clear from my initial report to the House, the Commission considers this not just as a matter of economics, even if it is that as well, but as a political issue. I cannot therefore accept the statement that we are not respecting the political views of this House.

Before the debate on 15 February the Commission had already taken, and got the Council to take, very clear action on the whole range of agricultural exports to Soviet Russia — not only those dealt with by the United States of America but our own products, thereby establishing a uniform and united European policy. I am asking you, when you refer to the Council, to be sufficiently politically-minded to realize the impact it has had on the world that in this matter Europe has so far been able to act in unity and with dignity and firmness. Let us not turn a discussion on surplus products, however important they are to us, into an institutional squabble which will destroy that unity and dignity we have attained by our behaviour, in particular in regard to exports of agricultural products to Russia over the last two months.

As far as industrial products are concerned, they are being discussed as well, and I understand they are the subject of discussion in the Committee on External Economic Relations. However, so far there are not the same clear and decisive rules with regard to industrial commodities as there are in regard to agricultural commodities. It is no argument to say that as far as industry is concerned there is no element of subsidy, because there is. There are all kinds of credit facilities, and therefore there is not that sharp distinction between industry on the one side and agriculture on the other.

Gundelach

The agricultural policy has shown its determination to face up to this crisis, but there are limits within which we must operate. I can well understand that there may be taxpayers in Europe who would rather see the money used for storing the stuff or using it in other ways than export it with export refunds, not to mention the losses in tenders, but voices in this House and other discussions make it clear that there are others who have a different view on this subject. I believe we have come to a very clear understanding and a very strict definition of the way we have to behave, and I think we should stay with it.

In this context I would like to say quite clearly to Mr Scott-Hopkins that when I am talking about normal trade I am most definitely not talking about selling as much as possible. I am talking about keeping the exports — if exports there must be, because that seems to be the political decision of the Council — within narrow confines, i.e. what can be considered as normal exports looking at a sufficiently representative reference period. It cannot be a free-for-all. Secondly I have guaranteed that we must — and that is in reply to Mr Aigner as well — have a very close look at the prices at which such exports are taking place. I would not like to express an opinion tonight about what exactly that price level should be in any given set of circumstances, but I do agree with the sentiment, as I expressed it myself in my initial statement, that losses to the Community must be minimal.

But here I must emphasize once again that the Community has never sold butter or dairy products on world markets below world market prices. Our prices have always been at the same level as, or higher than, those of New Zealand, and we are the two who make up world markets. I beg the House once again not to forget New Zealand in this context, and I would like to take the opportunity to answer the Honourable Member who asked me about the imports of New Zealand butter. Just as we feel a political commitment on the subject we are discussing here, the Community also feels a political commitment in this troubled world towards a small allied friendly nation on the other side of the globe.

(Applause from some quarters)

We do believe it is the responsibility of this Community to continue to import butter in reasonable quantities and under reasonable conditions from that country, and I have therefore no intention of making proposals to this House and to the Council for stopping these imports. On the contrary I intend to make proposals for their continuation.

(Applause from some quarters)

In reply to the same Honourable Member we have undertaken no commitment of any kind to Soviet Russia in the agricultural field, and I therefore have no commitment to Soviet Russia to honour. We have exported, as I said, because we put ourselves in the unfortunate situation of having to do so, but not because of any commitment towards Soviet Russia. It is not true that butter has cost eight times more in Russia than butter sold inside the Community itself. The figures are considerably smaller than that. And I repeat that we have actually been selling at world market prices — the same prices as New Zealand, if anything slightly higher. The figure is about 40 % of the internal prices.

Madam President, I do believe, as Mrs Barbara Castle underlined and as I said in my initial statement, that the root of the matter, as far as dairy products are concerned, lies in the continued generation of surpluses, and we shall be faced with this issue as long as that is the case. I therefore deeply welcome the statements made this afternoon by Sir Henry Plumb, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and by others, including Mr Scott-Hopkins, in regard to the willingness of this House to collaborate in arriving at a solution of this problem which is marring and undermining the credibility of the common agricultural policy. I guarantee Mr Aigner that he will receive from me a report on all the measures we have taken since 5 January, in order that the appropriate committees of Parliament may look into them, and I am at the disposal of any committee of this Parliament to explain what we have been doing with these various measures and what we intend to do in the future.

(Applause)

13. Question Time

President. — The next item is Question Time (Doc. 1-825/79).

Today we shall take the questions addressed to the Commission.

If you have no objections, I should like to take Questions No 5 and No 6 first, as Mr Davignon, who is responsible for these matters, has to leave us shortly.

Since its author is absent, Question No 5 by Mr Poncelet will be answered in writing*.

Question No 8 by Mr Deleau (H-436/79):

In its answer to my question (H-355/79), the Commission indicates that it has not yet approved the planned

* See Annex.

President

expansion of the works at Bagnoli. If it does give its approval, however, how can it justify its earlier pronouncement that an increase in total capacity (of which the Bagnoli works account for one quarter) would be contrary to Commission recommendations and accentuate the imbalance now in evidence in the flat-rolled products sector?

Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission. — (F) The Commission is at present considering investment projects relating to the modernization of the Bagnoli steelmaking complex. The Commission is not in favour of increases in net capacity in Europe, that is to say, increases in capacity not offset by reductions in the same geographical area. That is why, a year and a half ago, it persuaded the Italian government to abandon another project in this area relating to the fifth steelmaking complex of Gioia Tauro.

Secondly, the Bagnoli project will not result in an increase in steel production but it will lead to an increase in the production of wide hot-rolled strip, and that raises a problem. This is why the Commission is in discussion with the Italian authorities and the steel industry in order to clearly establish the financial conditions in which the project is planned and secondly to look into the production schedules in order to ensure that what would be produced would not undermine the steel industry restructuring programme for the whole of the European Community.

Mr Deleau. — (F) The question is clearly very important and I hope, in the light of Mr Davignon's reply, that the Commission will succeed in carrying through the intentions he has just expressed. Which products are currently giving most cause for concern?

Mr Davignon. — (F) The main problem is certainly flat-rolled products as a result of the big changes that have taken place in steelmaking in the Community with the changeover from long to flat-rolled products. Here there is, therefore, a clearcut risk of overcapacity. This is why, in all our discussions with the various steelmaking plants, we are looking into their schedules in order to ensure that, with the way production is spread over time, we are not creating worse difficulties for ourselves. On the other hand, flat products are better from the viewpoint of quality and future prospects, provided there is a balance between supply and demand.

President. — Question No 1 by Mr Ansquer (H/367/79):

Given the inflationary character of Euro-credits and their threat to the world economy, does the Commission intend to propose a system of supervision without making one country or continent suffer, and without any adverse effect on investments?

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) Opinions differ on the effects of the operation of the Eurocurrency markets, and the absence of agreement on international action has to be attributed to those differences.

Without questioning the positive aspects of these markets — one has only to think of the recycling of the oil countries' financial surpluses since 1973 — there is broad recognition of the importance of two factors: firstly, the increasing connection between international and national markets and secondly, the magnitude of certain risks at the level of financial discipline.

This explains why various international bodies are working more intensively on this subject. One conclusion is that, of the various control systems that might be considered, the one with the best chance of receiving general agreement entails the monitoring, in other words systematic inspection, of the consolidated accounts of the big international banks and their subsidiaries.

The solution therefore requires an international discipline extending beyond the Community. As far as the Commission is concerned, it can only take part in international proceedings provided these develop.

The question put by the honourable Member covers another aspect as well, i.e. the solvency and liquidity of the banks which grant loans. The Commission is considering devising a consolidated bank control system in which the purpose would be to ensure that the responsible national authorities would not be satisfied just to inspect banks with their headquarters in the country but would also include their subsidiaries inside or outside the Community.

Mr Ansquer. — (F) The matter would certainly be worth discussion on a very wide basis, because no-one can fail to realize the important role that Euro-credits are playing and will continue to play in the European and world economies. The point is that though Euro-credits have largely consisted up to now of Eurodollars, from now on their main constituent is the petrodollar, as Mr Cheysson has just pointed out.

I have noted that the question is very complicated and I thank Mr Cheysson for having told us what steps are now being taken to monitor the situation and organise inspections.

My supplementary question covers two aspects. Firstly, since we are talking about petrodollars, can we have an estimate of what these petrodollars amount to for 1980 and secondly — a question which is obviously related to the first — is it possible to tell whether the significance of these petrodollars is apparent and wholly clear? If there is no way of controlling them, could they not be channelled towards productive investment inside and outside the European Community?

Cheysson

Mr Cheysson. — (F) On 24 October, in reply, I believe, to Mr Ansquer, Mr Ortoli, Vice-President, stressed the importance that the Commission attached to this problem of the Eurocurrencies or rather Xenocurrencies because, as Mr Ansquer has pointed out, the Eurodollar is now no more than just one of these Xenocurrencies.

Our estimate is that the dollar is no longer more than 75 % of the Xenocurrency market and that other currencies are gaining in importance with the Deutschmark at 15 %, the Swiss franc at 4 % and the pound sterling at 2 %.

Mr Ansquer asked a question about the volume of these currencies. As he knows, and as was said in reply to a written question by Mr Leonardi last November, statistics are badly lacking. Nevertheless, according to a Morgan Guarantee Trust Company estimate, these currencies, which amounted to about 19 billion dollars in the sixties, may now be estimated (Autumn 1979) at 1 thousand billion dollars or more. This once again shows the considerable importance of this matter. The positive role of these currencies in the recycling of capital and particularly petrodollars was described at length by Mr Ortoli in the debate on 24 October. Like the honourable Member, we too feel that this positive role does indeed exist, but we must not forget the potential disturbances on the national and international markets that they may cause, when the need to take steps to improve our study and knowledge of these markets and to have greater discipline in the management of these currencies.

Mr van Aerssen. — (D) Mr Cheysson, would the Commission then, although the discussion on this subject is not yet at an end, undertake to ensure that at least the following three short-term objectives are reached: firstly, greater transparency in the Eurodollar markets, secondly, the introduction of a minimum reserve requirement and thirdly, the introduction of a substitution account as security for the International Monetary Fund?

Mr Cheysson. — (F) The comments by the honourable Member are exactly along the lines described by Mr Ortoli on 24 October. The first need indeed is greater transparency and that is the reason why, in the monitoring measures currently being planned and recommended, we would like to have access to the consolidated accounts of banks and their subsidiaries which would give us a better sight into the effects of these Xenocurrencies. The idea of compulsory reserves is now being considered. There was a time when the United States, that is to say the American monetary authorities, attached very considerable importance to this, but the technical difficulties of implementation are very great if regulations with teeth, including compulsory reserves, are to be brought in.

Even so, this approach should not be abandoned and it is probably one of the directions in which we should be looking.

President. — Question No 2 by Mr Provan (H-407/79):

Will the Commission make certain that in the negotiations for entry to the Community with Greece the question of fair competition is properly agreed, so that restrictions imposed on Scotch Whisky imports applied as from 3 December 1979 can be removed and free and fair competition result?

Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission. — (D) Under Article 60 of the Association Treaty, Greece is allowed to impose certain temporary restrictions in the event of a drastic deterioration of her balance of payments. Greece has done this. In 1979 the Greek balance of payments worsened seriously, with the deficit increasing from 1.25 to 2.5 billion dollars between 1978 and 1979. These measures will, however, be temporary, and the Greek Government has announced that they will be lifted on 30 June.

Mr Provan. — I would like to point out the importance of whisky distillation in a large and vital area of Scotland which is suffering from depopulation. Any removal of discrimination has, of course, a tremendous beneficial effect on employment in these areas, and we welcome recent judgments of the Court of Justice on cases involving discrimination. But the Commission's answer, Madam President, implies that the Community will take no further action on these pro forma invoice systems. I wonder therefore if the Commission can give me an assurance that at the next meeting of the EEC-Greece Association Council it will take this matter up in the strongest terms.

Mr Brunner. — (D) The Commission takes the view that, if correctly applied, this method is not in conflict with the Association Treaty. If it should emerge that the method is not correctly applied in certain exceptional cases, then the Commission will take this matter up as the honourable Member requests.

Mr J. D. Taylor. — Whilst welcoming Mr Provan's efforts to remove discrimination, will the Commission ensure that the relaxation is not limited solely to Scotch whisky, but will be extended to *real* whiskey which, as we in another part of the United Kingdom know, comes from Bushmills in Northern Ireland. It is known to us as the *real* stuff, w-h-i-s-k-e-y and not simply whisky.

(Laughter)

Brunner

Mr Brunner. — (D) The Commission makes no discrimination in its whisky preferences.

(Laughter)

President. — Since their authors are absent, Questions No 3, No 4 and No 5 will be answered in writing*. Question No 6 by Sir John Stewart-Clark (H-422/79):

In view of the real conflict of interest between animal welfare and the need to supply food at reasonable prices, that is revealed in the battery method of producing eggs and poultry; will the Commission confirm that satisfactory minimum standards of animal welfare apply to such production methods in all Member States, and does the Commission have plans to monitor the observance of such standards in the interest of animal welfare and fair competition?

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DK) In my view there need not necessarily be any conflict of interest between animal welfare and the need for reasonable prices, even with the battery method of rearing poultry.

The Commission is not, however, in a position at present to determine whether the minimum standards required to safeguard animal welfare are observed in all the Member States. We know that the minimum floor space per hen varies a great deal, depending on the country, from 350 cm² in some Member States to more than 600 cm² in others. In other words there is a problem both as regards safeguarding animal welfare and ensuring fair and reasonable terms of trade.

The Commission has therefore set up a special working party to draw up a report shortly on the provisions applicable in the individual Member States. On the basis of that report the Commission will submit a proposal to the Parliament and the Council laying down rules on this serious matter, both, as I say, to safeguard animal welfare and to ensure fair competition. We hope to be able to present the report and the proposal a few months from now.

Sir John Stewart-Clark. — I am glad to hear the Commissioner's assurance that a working party has been set up. May I just ask him that Parliament should be informed immediately as soon as the first results of this working party are known. I would also like to suggest that the parliamentary Committee on Agriculture should also be consulted during the term of this working party so as to make absolutely certain that the best results are obtained. I am sure that the Commissioner would agree with me that this is a matter which needs urgent attention. He has in fact underlined this

by the statistics which he has given showing that there are significant and great variations from country to country and, I think it would be right to say, between the establishments operating within these countries. It may, indeed, be the case that abuses occur in only a very small number of instances, but it is important that these instances should be identified and dealt with, so that reason can prevail.

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) Problems obviously do exist in this field. The Commission will certainly be prepared to notify Parliament of the findings in the report from our special working party and I am also prepared, either in person or through my representative, to discuss developments concerning the report with Parliament's Committee on Agriculture, even before the report is finalized. This is a serious problem. The only other point I should like to make is that in dealing with this matter we must not forget that there are a number of other problems connected with animal welfare. Moreover, we must ensure that we maintain a consistent approach to them. This problem is one of a number of problems concerning calves, horses and so on.

Mr Curry. — May I ask the Commissioner what plans he has to make sure that once the soul has passed from these animals in their battery conditions and they become carcasses, the regulations governing the treatment of animals in processing plants throughout the Community are observed to an equal extent in all Member States and that those industries that are inflicted with governments in the habit of observing the rules are not placed at a competitive disadvantage *vis-à-vis* industries which have governments that do not observe them.

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) Yes, of course, this is one aspect of the problem and the reason why we are looking into it — the fact that there is no uniform legislation and that, where there are provisions, they are not being implemented in a uniform way in the Member States. It is therefore necessary to lay down Community rules to ensure uniformity in regard both to the treatment of the animals and to trade. This applies to the conditions of production, but also, of course — as the honourable Member indicated at the end of the original question — when we come to implement rules on slaughterhouses. Here, in contrast to the production stage, certain rules do already exist, and we have means of ensuring that they are observed. There is a question of a second investigation, which must be carried on at the same time as the first, to ascertain how far these rules are really being observed. This was one of the reasons why I said in my last answer that our action in setting up a working party to study one problem must be seen in a wider context, that is to say, in connection with the concerted programme which we are carrying out in the interests of animal welfare.

* See Annex.

van Aerssen

Mr van Aerssen. — (D) The Commissioner will certainly not be unaware of the fact that at the moment, in the Federal Republic of Germany, a very lively controversy is going on about battery hens, a subject that certainly needs to be looked into from the point of view of animal protection. The Federal Government has proposed to increase the number of square centimetres for a laying hen from 450 to 600 or even 900 which, in practice, means that a hen can use two batteries. But that also means a quite considerable disadvantage as regards competition from the Netherlands poultry and egg producers, for example. I therefore feel that it really is high time for the Commission to do something, and my question is: does the Commission share the view that national efforts in the interests of animal protection, which are certainly desirable, should be deferred until the Commission and Council have discussed the matter, so that we do not arrive at a situation of different national legislations on this subject.

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) I believe this problem must be dealt with on a Community basis. This is the only way we can be sure that the question of animal welfare is solved in a uniform and satisfactory manner. And it is quite clearly the only way that will not lead to distortion of competition and put one or other Member State at an impossible disadvantage. Since such wide differences do exist, as we have heard in this debate, and since the new legislation being drawn up in the various Member States is likely to make those differences even greater, it is of vital importance that this work should be completed quickly.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Can the Commissioner assure the House that all Member States are carrying out the revisions of the hygiene regulations for slaughterhouses, and will he present a report to the House to that effect?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) It is the Commission's duty to see that these regulations are implemented in a uniform way in all the Member States and if we hear that this is not happening, we shall act accordingly and take the necessary measures to ensure that it does. I have already told the honourable Member that, along with the enquiry into the conditions under which animals are bred, I intend to have a second enquiry carried out into the implementation of existing regulations on slaughterhouses and to make this report available to this House and to the Council.

President. — Question No 7 by Mr Maher (H-423/79):

In view of the high costs of imported timber, in view of the problems of land utilization for food production and in view of the need to save energy, when does the Com-

mission propose to establish a common policy for afforestation within the Community?

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DK) I agree with Mr Maher that afforestation is one of the areas in which the common agricultural policy has lagged behind in the past.

Whenever we speak of surplus production we raise the question of an alternative use for land which would be rational and economic. It is quite obvious that there are large tracts of land in Europe which are not particularly well suited to other uses, but which would be extremely suitable for afforestation. It is also obvious that forests are of growing economic importance. The world's need for timber will go on increasing as time goes by. By the end of this century there will be an acute shortage of forest, not least in our part of the world. Investment in afforestation will therefore be of vital importance for the future development of the common agricultural policy.

Since the Commission submitted its first proposal in 1974 the Council has not been able to reach agreement on an afforestation policy. I think, however, that there has been a change of heart since then. One indication of this is the fact that afforestation measures have been adopted within a short space of time in connection with the policy on the Mediterranean — decisions on the use of quite substantial Community funds for the planting of forests in the Mediterranean region to make better use of the land and also improve the ecological conditions.

What is right for the Mediterranean region must also be right for other parts of the Community. This applies to central Europe, the Northern European countries and, not least, Ireland, where the Commission is aware that large areas could very profitably be planted with forest.

Mr Maher. — I feel somehow that what Mr Gundelach has just said has been said many times already over the last few years, and I should like to ask Mr Gundelach whether he intends to take any new initiatives in this area in view of the very problems that he mentioned himself: the question of energy, the fact that world consumption of wood is rising at double the rate of production, that after oil it is, in terms of cost, the second highest import into the Community, and the grave fears being experienced by farmers, particularly in the more remote regions, as a result of the current agricultural situation. The inadequate price increases and the proposals currently being made by the Commission will spell disaster for many of these farmers. There is no way they can continue to live in these regions without some possibility of using land in some other way than for the production of food. Is there any new initiative that can be taken? We can go on talking about this matter for the next decade and no-

Maher

thing will be done. I am glad of course that some minimum steps have been taken in relation to the Mediterranean regions. But there are also regions in the Community that are just as disadvantaged — areas in the north of Scotland, the west of Ireland, parts of France and Wales, to mention just a few — and where the situation is just as distressing, in its own way, as in the Mediterranean regions. I should like to ask the Commissioner whether he intends to take any new initiative and whether we can expect any new progress.

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) I made it clear in my first answer that I fully agree with Mr Maher about the need to take further steps towards setting up a forestry policy and that there is a need in all the Member States to use land at present being used for agriculture for forestry instead, since this is becoming increasingly desirable from the economic point of view.

At the end of December 1978 the Commission forwarded to this Parliament and the Council a document on the objectives and principles of a forestry policy. As Mr Maher rightly pointed out, it is all very well to have these reports and debates about the reports, but up to now they have not resulted in any action, compared with the quite considerable progress made in regard to forestry measures in the Mediterranean region.

I believe that we should not waste any more time on general reports and general discussions. Enough is known about the subject, about the need for measures and about how to proceed. The Commission therefore expects — and this is my reply to Mr Maher — to submit a proposal during this year on concrete measures for a more extensive forestry policy.

Mr Hutton. — Mr Maher and, I hope, the House will note that I put down a similar question to the Council for Wednesday. I sincerely hope that the question will be taken so that we can debate the matter with them, since I feel that it is with the Council we should be debating this matter and not the Commission. However, in view of the Commissioner's answer in which he referred to the spending of money on forestry, could I ask him whether he wishes to imply the setting up of a common forestry fund, and if so where does he suggest that we find the money for what I believe to be an extremely important matter?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) As with a number of other structural policy measures in the agricultural sector — and this is a structural policy measure — funds must be made available for the support measures needed to enable Community policy to get off the ground. There must be Community financing and the funds for these structural measures can only be found if we achieve the necessary economies by reducing the production of surpluses, which has already been discussed here this evening and which we shall be discussing again in

a week's time, in two weeks' time and, I hope, until these problems are solved.

The funds exist within the framework of the agricultural budget itself, provided we pursue a rational policy.

Mr Clinton. — Commissioner Gundelach has told the House that he did in fact put a set of proposals before the Council of Ministers approximately two years ago, early in 1978. Could I ask him if the Council has acted on these proposals, and does the next move rest with it or must there be fresh proposals from the Commission before we get action in this sector?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) The Council had only very limited discussions on the communication which we sent it in December 1978. It is as if it had used up all its energy in implementing the Mediterranean policy. I therefore think, as I have told Mr Maher, that a new move is required from the Commission and that is why I mean to put forward concrete proposals.

President. — Question No 9 by Mr Berkhouwer (H-525/79):

Is the Commission aware of events in Surinam, where power seems to have been taken over by members of the armed forces shortly after the new agreement with the ACP countries was concluded by the Community. Does the Commission intend to take any consequential action and if so, what?

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) The Community is linked to Surinam by the Lomé Convention, which is being implemented in the normal manner. However, we are obviously interested in what goes on in an associate and friendly state.

What happened was that on 25 February last a few noncommissioned officers, later joined by a lieutenant, seized power and set up a Military Council. The situation is still confused, but in the last few days some positive features have emerged and I am happy to give the honourable Member this news.

Firstly, the President of the Republic has been confirmed in his office. He is a man of great authority and experience, and we can count on his wisdom.

Secondly, on 5 March the previous government resigned in accordance with constitutional procedure. The ministers have been released and are under house arrest. One of them, Mr Bruma, has been given the task of forming a civilian government. He is currently consulting leaders in the political, economic and social fields before making his proposals to the Military Council.

Cheysson

In another statement, the Military Council has undertaken to respect basic human rights and has asserted its intention of observing existing treaties.

True enough, there are still many unknowns in the situation, but some efforts are apparently being made to restore a kind of legality. Let us hope that this will be possible, thanks to President Ferrier. One point is that the situation is already normal again after a few days unrest in Paramaribo; the schools and administrations are functioning and the press has begun to appear again without restriction.

Mr Berkhouwer. — (F) May we rely on the Commission continuing to keep a close watch on developments?

Mr Cheysson. — (F) We are, of course, following what is happening with the closest attention through our man on the spot, through the Surinam Embassy in Brussels, where the Ambassador happens to be President Ferrier's brother himself, and lastly and above all through the governments of our Member States, among which the country closest to the honourable Member should *a priori* be the best informed.

Mr Penders. — (NL) why did Mr Cheysson speak about the restoration of 'a kind of legality' and not just 'legality' in Surinam?

Mr Cheysson. — (F) It was a euphemism. This military *coup d'état* is a departure from legality. We cannot tell whether the concern of those currently holding power to restore that legality will be effective. Once again, we are counting very much — as regards a return to that legality — on the wisdom of the President of the Republic who is in office in constitutional conditions and whose authority as Head of State has been confirmed.

President. — Since its author is absent, Question No 10 will be answered in writing*.

Question No 11 by Ms Clywd (H-434/79):

What progress has the Commission made in establishing trade links with Yugoslavia and will it explain why they have taken so long to do so;

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) The Commission conducted final negotiations with Yugoslavia on 21, 22 and 23 February last. This made it possible to sign the agreement on co-operation and that on coal and steel products on 25 February. These

agreements are the concrete materialization of the joint Declaration signed in Belgrade on 2 December 1976 which, in the minds of the two parties, constituted a basis for the development of deeper-reaching links through intensified cooperation. It is true that the negotiations were somewhat long and difficult before reaching a positive outcome and there were two main reasons for this. Firstly, finding a suitable legal framework enabling the objectives that had been set to be achieved in the most satisfactory manner necessitated full and deep discussion with our partners. Once that legal framework had been defined it was necessary to adapt it to Yugoslavia's specific characteristics, i.e. those of a non-aligned European and Mediterranean country and a member of the 'group of 77' developing countries.

In spite of the protracted negotiations, the Commission considers that the agreement reached is an agreement of the Mediterranean type but with many specific features in addition, to which Yugoslavia had always attached considerable importance right from the outset of the negotiations. One basic feature was, without a doubt, the potential for co-operation contained in the agreement. As is known, the agreement was signed to the satisfaction of both Yugoslavia and the Community, as recently stated on the occasion of President Jenkins' visit on 29 February.

Mrs Clwyd. — I congratulate the Commission on reaching a swift conclusion and for establishing this agreement with Yugoslavia. I am sure it will provide a firm basis for further development of relationships between the European Parliament and the Yugoslav Assembly. Would the Commission confirm that it does plan to open a delegation office in Yugoslavia next year?

Mr Natali. — (I) I would like to confirm to the honourable questioner that the Commission does plan to open a delegation in Belgrade this year. May I also tell you, in connection with a question that has been put to me, that the contracting parties have said, in a joint statement, that they will further the continuance of contacts between the European Parliament and the Yugoslav Legislative Assembly.

Mr Tyrrell. — Is the Commission aware that under this trade agreement Yugoslav producers of chrome will be able to sell chrome in the Community without paying duty at all, either on the import of the raw material from South America or its export into the Community, whereas Community producers will be paying 5¼ % import duty on that raw material from America? What is the purpose of placing Community producers of chrome at such a competitive disadvantage as against Yugoslav producers?

* See Annex.

Natali

Mr Natali. — (I) I have stressed that one of the most interesting aspects of the agreement with Yugoslavia is the fact that it brings into being a cooperation council whose task will be to solve on a friendly basis the various difficulties that may arise in the various sectors including, of course, that referred to by the honourable Member.

President. — Since their authors are absent, Questions No 12 and No 13 will be answered in writing*.

Question No 14 by Mr van Aerssen (H-453/79):

Can the Commission inform the European Parliament to what extent EC directives have been implemented through appropriate legislative provisions in the individual Member States, and what obstacles have been created in the Member States which seriously obstruct the implementation of EC directives?

Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission. — The honourable Member has asked a wideranging question and without abusing the time of the House with an answer of a length which I would regard as inappropriate during Question Time, I can only offer some remarks upon one or two aspects of it.

First, I can assure him that the Commission is informed of all national measures to implement Community directives. These national measures naturally vary widely from one Member State to another according to differing national practices and may emerge in the form of laws, regulations or administrative decisions.

Second, the Commission has recently developed a computerized system to process this data. It is not yet fully operational but will in due course provide the means for a fuller and more detailed statistical analysis of national implementation measures.

Third, the Commission is of course concerned about any delays which may occur. These seem to arise mainly from a certain lack of internal coordination within Member States, causing delays in the drafting of the relevant legal texts.

Mr van Aerssen. — (D) We are very much concerned about the legal situation in the Community precisely because of the recent increase in the number of cases in which the European Court of Justice has reminded national Governments of their obligations under the Treaty and asked them — to an unprecedented extent — to bring in national implementing measures. I therefore thank you for your clear answer.

Do you feel that the system, once it is in service, will allow the ordinary Member of this House to find out, sitting in the back benches, which countries have brought in national measures to implement Community directives and which have not, or shall we have to rely on a report from the Commission in such cases?

Mr Jenkins. — I thank the honourable Member for what he has said. I of course share his concern that there should be effective and speedy implementation. So far as information is concerned it is not possible for us to give continuing information because there are 700 directives currently in force and these directives all have to be implemented nationally. However, some 5 000 implementation measures, i.e. the number of directives multiplied approximately by the nine Member States, are currently being studied through the computerized programme, the automated system for monitoring directives' execution, and the collated results of that we can of course inform the House about and will do so most readily. It is difficult to give information when there are 5 000 processes separately involved, but if there is any particular piece of information that the honourable Member or anyone else requires, if they will communicate with me I will do my best within the limits of what is possible to provide information to the House.

Mr Howell. — In connection with EEC Directive 77/99 on intra-Community trade in meats. I would like to draw the Commissioner's attention to the massive difficulties which are being faced by British processors and producers in the poultry field and in the meat preparation field, soup companies and food manufacturing companies, where tremendous difficulties are being experienced, really at the hands of the British civil service rather than of the Commission.

I would very much like to know if the Commissioner is aware of the problems these firms are facing in trying to meet the requirements of EEC Directive 77/99, and whether his department is taking action to define the phrase 'a competent authority' in terms of inspecting meat products in the Community. Great difficulty is being experienced at the moment, especially as all poultry products, to use an example, are having to be inspected by veterinarians rather than the old public health inspectors, and an awful lot of people, in my constituency at least, would welcome some answer very shortly to the problem of what a competent authority in inspecting meat products is.

Mr Jenkins. — A fair way to answer the one question the honourable Member put to me would be to say that as a result of his intervention I am at least a little more aware of the problem than I was before.

(Laughter)

* See Annex.

Jenkins

I can assure him that I have taken full note of what he has said. I thank him for saying that the primary difficulty is not with the Commission, but I will have the matter looked into. If I can give him any useful information I will write to him.

Mr Enright. — Is the Commission aware that the enactment of legislation is not always followed by enforcement, so that some Member countries can put into their legislation directives which have come from the Commission, but do not then proceed to enforce them? What difficulties has this caused, and how far can it be monitored?

Mr Jenkins. — It is of course the case that enforcement is as important as enactment. In the majority of cases where there has not been enforcement, it is our view that this is not so much for lack of good intentions as perhaps through some administrative weakness. There are difficulties, greater in relation to some countries than others, but we endeavour to reduce them as far as possible and to draw Member States' attention to them, and in general we receive a cooperative response.

Mrs Squarcialupi. — (I) While the Member States do not set a good example in the implementation of Community directives, the Council can certainly not be regarded as a model in the matter of approving directives proposed by the Commission. What does Mr Jenkins feel about this big book printed by the Commission containing a list of all the directives that have not been approved by the Council of Ministers, some of which go back to the early 1970s?

Mr Jenkins. — I will certainly consider the honorable Member's suggestion that we should publish a list of the sort she has described. It is of course the case that sometimes proposals of this kind are overtaken by events and we should look and see whether they should still be maintained. But although there is a considerable backlog of proposals which have not been acted upon, there is also a reasonably high percentage of proposals which have been put forward and acted upon by the Council.

Mr Johnson. — The President of the Commission spoke about dialogue between the Commission and Member States in the case of non-enactment or infractions. Would the Commission consider making a report to Parliament on this question of infractions of Community directives?

Mr Jenkins. — Yes, of course, without question, the Commission will consider this matter. I would not like to give an undertaking as to how succinct or suitable a

report we could produce, but if we can produce a useful report — yes, I will very readily do so.

President. — Question No 15 by Mr Tyrrell (H-463/79):

In developing the Community's relations with the Socialist Republic of Romania, with cognisance has the Commission taken of the infringement of religious and minority rights by the Government of Romania?

Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission. — (D) The Commission has reported to this Parliament on various occasions about its efforts on behalf of human rights. In some cases human rights are a live issue in countries with whom we maintain trade relations. Romania may be such a case. The problem is dealt with more particularly in political cooperation. It will come up at the forthcoming Conference to be held in Madrid on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Mr Tyrrell. — I heard what the Commissioner said and I appreciate the political difficulties. But a new trade agreement does give the Community a splendid opportunity. Having regard to the continued oppression of religious and ethnic minorities in Romania, does the Commission not think it could take positive steps within the framework of the new trade agreement to protect those minorities, perhaps for a start inviting the Romanian Government to repeal its Decree 225 of 1975 under which accommodation in private homes may not be provided to those who are not Romanian citizens? This decree prevents the large Hungarian and German minorities from entertaining their friends in their homes. Does not the Commission think that in matters of this kind the new trade agreement gives them an opportunity to take some action?

Mr Brunner. — (D) Mr Tyrrell has himself referred to the difficulties which arise in this context. In terms of the division of responsibility in such questions it is not an easy matter for the Commission to find the path to take. To postulate now, in a general way, that the Commission will use the trade negotiations as a way of enforcing the rights of minorities obviously goes too far. The Commission will consider further how it can most effectively contribute to the enforcement of matters of human rights, in its relations with Romania and other countries. Perhaps there are better opportunities than the trade treaty negotiations. I have already referred to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Mr Balfe. — Does the Commission accept that, whilst there is obviously considerable concern about minority rights in all countries, some Members of this House are becoming increasingly concerned that the Conservative party is using this chamber for a sustained attack on the Comecon countries, with whom

Balfe

we must expand trade if we are to develop a peaceful Europe? We would suggest that they look at their own Prevention of Terrorism Act and other oppressive legislation in the UK when expressing concern for human rights. Maybe they should repeal that legislation.

Mr Brunner. — (D) The Commission answers the questions put to it.

Mr Jakobsen. — (DK) When Mr Brunner refers to the Madrid Conference as the appropriate place to deal with these questions rather than in a trade conference, where the Community is all the same directly involved, does this mean that he is assuming already that the results of the Madrid Conference will be just as good as those of the Helsinki Conference, where we have seen case after case of minorities being persecuted? Is Mr Brunner really expecting such wonderful results from the Madrid Conference or shall we say outright that we are expecting nothing of the kind? We expect that minorities will be persecuted throughout the Comecon countries and we can do virtually nothing about it. But we can at least say outright that they are behaving like this and that we abhor such behaviour.

Mr Brunner. — (D) As one of those involved in the drafting of the Final Act of the Helsinki Agreement and as a Member of the Commission I would like to state that substantial progress was made as a result of the Helsinki Conference. The decisions in the Helsinki Final Act will be reviewed this year in Madrid. Then we shall be able to measure progress against a jointly agreed yardstick. To my mind it is better to have such a common yardstick than to have still to formulate one.

President. — At its author's request, Question No 16 is held over until the April part-session.

As their authors are absent, Questions No 17, No 18 and No 19 will be answered in writing*.

Question No 20 by Mr Balfe (H-471/79):

Is the Commission aware that a considerable body of informed public opinion in the United Kingdom is in full support of the Commission's proposals for sugar beet production quotas for the next five years and can the Commission give an assurance that they will maintain their policy in this matter?

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DK) I was not aware until now that there was a large

body of public opinion in Europe that supported the Commission's attempts to limit surplus production, including sugar. I am glad to hear it. I can assure the honourable Member that the Commission will fight hard to get its proposals in this field implemented.

Mr Balfe. — Is the Commission also aware that in the opening speech of the ACP/EEC Conference, Finance Minister Jemal of Tanzania stated, an I quote, 'if developing tropical countries which have a comparative advantage in producing sugar are going to become frustrated simply because of the insistence of Europe to produce much more costly sugar for its own consumption, what hope do these countries have of accumulating capital rapidly enough to be able to deal with technology in the decades ahead and to exchange their products with Europe?' Not only within the Community but also in the Third World, many people regard the Commission's proposals on sugar as being a test case by which we can demonstrate our willingness to give positive assistance to the Third World and, in that old English phrase, 'put our money where our mouths are'.

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) Unless the European Community is willing to bring its production, in this case of sugar, under control, our problems with our trading partners — whether developing countries or other parts of the world — will become exceedingly difficult. I would remind the House that up to 1976 the European Community was a large net importer of sugar. It was between 1976 and 1980 that we became exporters of sugar, for a total roughly of 2.5 million tonnes per year over and above re-exports of 1.3 million tonnes, which is the amount of sugar imported from ACP countries.

Of course, I agree with the honourable Member that our trading partners, whether they are developing countries or others, are looking to the Community to play its part in international cooperation in regard to sugar, and the main objective of the Commission's proposals is to show whether it can do this.

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — Would the Commissioner accept that all his economic advisers say that the demand for sugar throughout the world is rising by 3 % and that by 1984 at the latest demand will outstrip supply? Would he not further accept that to cut UK production, if it means the closure of factories, would be disastrous in the short-term? Therefore would he look again at his proposal to cut production if it means closing of these factories. There must be a minimal reduction in sugar production throughout the Community but not to the extent which he has proposed in his amended proposals.

* See Annex.

Gundelach

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) Mr Scott-Hopkins has raised two questions. The first is how far estimates of production and consumption both in the Community and in the world at large may be said to constitute the main argument against the Commission's proposals. Here I must reaffirm my position and I cannot accept Mr Scott-Hopkins' view.

The increase in sugar prices which occurred recently was clearly very largely the result of speculation. The price of a number of raw materials rose, because an outlet had to be found for petrodollars and the purchase of raw materials provided the answer. Secondly, in the last few years there has been overall a slight fall-off in production in certain Latin American countries. If one looks at the graph for production and consumption for the last years and takes into account the fact that the countries which could become major consumers in the future are mainly the underdeveloped countries, whose balances of payments are facing total collapse as a result of the present energy crisis, one is driven to the conclusion, that, though there may be a physical need for sugar in the world at large, there is no purchasing power to purchase it. And up to now the Community has not been willing to make large funds available to increase food aid in the form of sugar.

I am convinced that sugar production will increase in the years to come as a result of the high prices this year which are largely of a speculative nature, and that we shall then be faced again with a situation on the world market in which production exceeds consumption, as has been the case for the last 25 years apart from two years.

I cannot, therefore, agree that the main object of the Commission's proposals has changed. Whether there has been some decrease or increase at the present time is not the determining factor.

The other question is how far one can, if you like, spread the loss equitably. I would point out that the Commission's proposals do not mean that any Member State will suffer a reduction in the A and B quotas combined in relation to average production over the last five years. We are not, therefore, talking of anything as radical as one might imagine. But it is obvious that the reduction — of some 800 000 tonnes, not more — which we are proposing in the A and B quotas must be divided in an equitable way. We have already agreed that the United Kingdom was affected by the drought in some of the years in the reference period and that consequently there must be certain adjustments in our calculations to ascertain the fairest way of dividing the reduction in the quotas which we believe necessary.

Mr Lomas. — It is obvious that the Commissioner is trying very hard to reduce the surplus beet sugar production and I, for one, wish him well in his difficult

task. But I wonder whether he could give a firm categorical assurance that, whatever happens with regard to the beet sugar quotas, the quotas for imports of cane sugar from the Third World will not be affected and will not be cut.

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) The Community's commitment to import at least 1.3 million tonnes of sugar from the ACP countries is one that cannot be evaded.

Miss Hooper. — What steps is the Commission taking to consider diversification in the use of sugar, both beet sugar and cane sugar, in the field of energy, for example?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) We, like other sugar-producing countries, have got experts examining the question of when it will be economically feasible to use alcohol produced from sugar — and this applies to other agricultural products which can be used to produce alcohol — and at what moment it would be right to launch the large investment programme required to produce petrol made partly from alcohol, when that stage is reached. We know, technologically, how it can be done, but we do not yet know at what moment it will become economically feasible to carry out these extensive investments. I have my doubts about whether we shall get to that stage within the next two or three years, but it is a matter that is constantly under review in the Commission and in cooperation with the divisions for agriculture, energy and technological research.

Mr Moreland. — I am sure that the Commissioner would agree with me that the consumer should be able to obtain sugar from the cheapest and — I emphasize — the most reliable source. Therefore, would he not agree that the aims of the consumer and the objective of reducing the sugar surplus would be better served if imports rather than UK production were cut, and that the needs of the ACP countries would be better served by increasing aid rather than supporting costly imports?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) As I have already pointed out, the Community has entered into a commitment toward the ACP countries, which are developing countries, and this commitment must obviously be respected. The Commission's proposal does not entail any reduction in relation to the United Kingdom's average production over the last five years. What is being suggested is that the one year, last year, in which the A quotas were met is the year that should be taken as the basis for fixing quotas. That is one point of view, but it is one that can be debated and no doubt will be when we come to discuss the price proposals in two weeks' time, and when this matter must finally be decided, both in the Parliament and in the Council.

President

President. — Question No 21 by Mr Cariglia (H-472/79):

What has been the effect of the anti-pollution directives in the Member States? In particular, what measures have been adopted or are currently being studied with a view to containing the eutrophication of coastal waters and inland waterways, which is in large measure due to the phosphorus in synthetic detergents, bearing in mind that other products have been tested which are capable of maintaining the effectiveness of the cleaning properties of detergents?

Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission. — (I) My reply will deal solely with the problem of eutrophication of water which seems to be the honourable Member's particular concern. The fact is that many of the directives approved by the Council are aimed at controlling this phenomenon. In particular I would remind you of directive 73/404 which limits the biodegradability of detergents to 80 % and the four directives establishing water quality standards according to their various uses and limiting their phosphorus content.

All these directives are too recent — some are not even at the implementation stage — for the Commission to assess their effect on water pollution just yet. Even so, the problem is being watched very closely by means of the joint information exchange procedure on the quality of fresh surface water, through which the Commission receives the information it needs about measures taken by the Member States.

The first general report on the results of all these measures will be published this year and will, of course, be made available to the European Parliament.

Mr Cariglia. — (I) I thank Mr Natali for his reply to my question.

Mr Natali knows about the situation I refer to in my country, the serious harm done mainly to the ecological equilibrium of certain seas — I refer in particular to the Adriatic — and the grave harm of a commercial nature suffered by the tourism industry in this context. For that reason I hope that the Commission will pay greater attention to this phenomenon that has adverse effects from so many standpoints.

Mr Natali. — (I) I would like to assure the honourable Member that the situation he complains about is well known to us and that we shall do everything we can to try and avoid the damaging effects he has referred to.

Mr Howell. — Is the Commissioner aware of the view of this Parliament concerning the North Sea and

in particular the tremendous lack of concern that the Commission seems to be showing with regard to pollution in the North Sea? It seems for some time now that the bells have been tolling, with collisions of oil tankers and other such vessels in the most heavily populated ocean-going area in the world. Will the Commission indicate when it intends to put forward to this Parliament a marine policy to ensure the safety of the North Sea and antipollution measures in that area?

Mr Natali. — (I) The honourable Member has raised a series of problems relating to various causes of pollution. The causes of pollution may stem from the discharge of certain products into the waters of the North Sea or from the incidents to which he refers.

It is not true that the Commission is unaware of the serious dangers of pollution in the North Sea in either of the two cases, and in this context I would like to recall — with regard to the problems connected with oil tanker traffic — that, following certain serious accidents such as that to the Amoco Cadiz, the Commission put forward a programme of measures covering the whole sector and ranging from traffic control to depollution methods and arrangements.

Mr van Aerssen. — (D) In the opinion of the Commission, when can we count on combating the eutrophication of the Rhine through the bringing into force of the de-salting agreement?

Mr Natali. — (I) The honourable Member knows that the Rhine problem, as far as salt pollution is concerned, is the responsibility of a convention to which the Commission is not a contracting party. Nevertheless, we have frequently taken the opportunity to say that we would take every possible action to bring the solution to this problem nearer.

However, that may be, I would like to tell the honourable Member that next month there will be a further meeting of the International Commission for the Rhine which we will attend and where we shall endeavour to make our contribution to the finding of a satisfactory solution to this problem.

President. — Since their authors are absent, Questions No 22 and No 23 will be answered in writing*.

Question No 24 by Mr Seligman (H-482/79):

What are the institutional problems inhibiting involvement in encouragement and participation of the Community in the work of the European Space Agency?

* See Annex.

Cheysson

Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission. — (F) The Commission considers that the differences in legal basis between the European Space Agency and the Community do not at the moment cause any real problems between these two institutions, witness the joint projects that have already been undertaken, particularly in the telecommunications field, namely the Stella and Spine pilot experiments, remote observation of the earth, provision of data for the CCR programme via the Earthnet network, the proposals for joint CCR/ESA experiments using Canadian equipment and data banks, and the incorporation of the Information Retrieval System of the Space Agency's space documentation centre in the Euronet-Diane network.

On top of these concrete actions there is the continuous consultation as regards industrial policy and external markets.

Lastly, the Commission and the European Space Agency are actively cooperating in formulating a tele-data action programme following the Commission's submission of a report to the European Council in Dublin on European society and the challenge of the new information technologies. This programme is a definite Community response. The cooperation in question covers the use of satellites, the harmonization of protocols and standards for the interface between satellites and Earth-station equipment.

The Commission would point out that it is pursuing its cooperation with the Space Agency in the spirit of the resolution adopted by this Parliament on 25 April 1979 on the basis of Mr Ripamonti's motion for a resolution. It intends, whenever the situation permits, to strengthen its links with the Agency.

Mr Seligmann. — I very much welcome the Commissioner's reply. Certainly the cooperation seems to be much more close and effective than I had thought. I would like to add one other aspect of satellite work, namely, the area of capturing solar energy, which is another field of the future. Anyhow I hope that the Commission will continue to play a very official and active part in the European Space Agency.

Mr Cheysson. — (F) I shall report to Mr Davignon and we shall inform our services of the suggestion made by the honourable Member. On behalf of the Commission I can assure him that we attach the utmost importance to our cooperation with the Space Agency for the sake of that cooperation itself and also because it signposts a series of industrial policies which, in our view, should be dealt with by the nine governments on a joint basis and developed by the Community.

President. — Since its author is absent, Question No 25 will be answered in writing*. Question No 26 by Mr Battersby (H-484/79):

Now that Chairman Hua Guofeng has visited four Member States, will the Commission invite China's leaders to visit the Community's institutions during any subsequent visit to Europe, noting that Chairman Hua Guofeng has accepted in principle invitations to visit Japan and the USA and that Vice Premier Deng Xiaoping has already visited the USA?

Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission. — (D) Two deputy prime ministers, the minister for postal services and the minister for foreign trade of the People's Republic of China have visited Brussels and had talks with the Commission. When he went to Peking in February 1979, Mr Jenkins invited Prime Minister Hua Guofeng to visit him in Brussels. We shall make every effort to develop further our many contacts with the People's Republic of China.

Mr Battersby. — It most interesting to hear the Commission's reply. However, is the Commission satisfied that the Community has established an in-depth relationship with the government and officials of the People's Republic of China and the various government departments, for example, in sectors such as energy, agriculture and industry? I think in the present world climate it is essential that we intensify and accelerate our relations with the Chinese People's Republic.

Mr Brunner. — (D) Planning in various economic sectors is currently being developed in the People's Republic of China. We are trying to keep as close a watch on these developments as possible. At the end of March — this month — a delegation from the Commission will travel to the People's Republic of China in order to acquaint itself with the details of planning in the People's Republic of China in the various sectors of agriculture and industry. At the same time we shall endeavour to continue to develop our contacts.

Mr van Aerssen. — (D) Is it the intention to include senior managers with many years experience of business with China in this delegation in the same way as the Japanese government does?

Mr Brunner. — (D) We did this once before on the occasion of a visit by Vice-President Haferkamp. In this specific case the mission is a technical one, and its primary purpose is to establish planning details. We

* See Annex.

Brunner

shall certainly apply this method of including prominent people from economic life in the delegations on a later visit.

President. — Question No 27 by Mr Harris (H-487/79):

Was the report accurate in the Daily Telegraph of London of 11 February 1980, which claimed that 'freshly made Common Market butter can still be exported to Russia with a 50p a lb subsidy paid for by EEC taxpayers — so long as it is in packets, not bulk', and if the report is correct, what steps is the Commission taking to block this loophole in the light of the assurance of its President, Mr Roy Jenkins, to the Parliament's Political Affairs Committee on January 31 that 'we anticipate no exports of butter to the Soviet Union in the near future'?

Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission. — (DK) This question has been more or less answered in another debate. It concerns the possibility which exists in principle for refunds on packets of butter of less than 500 grammes. There is no lacuna in the system of supervision and control which I described earlier this evening. If this butter is offered for sale in this form to the Soviet Union, the Commission will be informed directly, because exporters are required to reveal not only the price, but also the destination of the goods for which they are claiming refunds. The Commission can thus intervene in accordance with the guidelines I have already spoken of. This has not been necessary up to now, because there have been no applications for refunds on sales of small packets of butter to the Soviet Union.

Mr Harris. — While appreciating the Commissioner's difficulty and dilemma concerning this whole matter, could he please give a straight answer to a clear question? Is the Commission now considering the resumption of sales of butter to Russia? That is the impression he gave in his answers earlier this afternoon. If the Commission is indeed considering such a resumption, does the Commissioner realize that this will be followed by a storm of protest, at least in the United Kingdom? The public there simply does not understand why the Community should be giving a far far better deal to its potential enemy than to its own people.

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) The original question was about exports of small packets of butter; now we must return to the fundamental question of butter exports to the Soviet Union.

The Commission made it clear earlier that — since last autumn — it has been looking at the possibility of sales, firstly, of butter that has lain in our stores for some time and, secondly, perhaps, of other quantities of butter in accordance with the guidelines adopted by the Council. But I must emphasize that this is a fundamental attitude which I am bound to adopt in keeping with the Council's resolutions. Up to now we have not agreed any sales of any kind, either in small packets or larger quantities, or any advance fixing of prices on exports to the Soviet Union. And we do not intend to do so without seriously considering the political aspects which have been presented by a number of Members in this House. But we must also take into consideration the fact that big interests in the agricultural sector are at stake and big exporting interests in a number of Member States. It is a very serious dilemma and it is not easy to find the right solution. I can only assure the honourable Member that no decisions will be taken without considering extremely carefully all the factors involved, including the views expressed in the debate this evening and in previous debates in this House.

Mr Price. — The Commission has laid some stress on the decisions of the Council in this matter, and in particular the decision of 15 January. I would like to ask the Commission whether the Council of Ministers on that occasion discussed specifically the issue of butter sales to Russia as part of the discussion on the decision on trade with that country, and if so, whether the Council approved the continuance of subsidized butter sales to Russia, whether in packets or in bulk. Finally, was this agreed by all the Ministers attending that meeting?

Mr Gundelach. — (DK) The answer to this question is quite simple: 'yes' to each point. The Council did discuss specifically the sale of dairy products to the Soviet Union, including especially, of course, butter in all forms. It finally agreed on a resolution which included the words 'normal sales'. One Member State had wanted another solution; the eight other Member States wanted normal sales and the ninth then accepted this text. The question was re-examined closely by the Council at its meeting in February, at which the ninth Member State did not query the possibility of sales to Soviet Russia, but insisted that the terms and quantities involved must be acceptable. Clearly in its resolutions of 15 January, and again when adopting its text in February, the Council was particularly concerned with the question of butter sales.

President

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

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

Mr Scott-Hopkins. — I only wish, Madam President, to say that I think you have done remarkably well in the Chair to get through to Question No 27, and I hope that we shall be able to do the same amount on Wednesday. Thank you.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR DE FERRANTI

*Vice-President*14. *Urgent procedure*

President. — I have received a motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Clwyd and others with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the British steel industry (Doc. 1-836/79). The reason for this request for urgent debate is contained in the document itself.

I have received from Mr Jaquet and others a motion for a resolution, with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on measures to ensure respect for human rights (Doc. 1-841/78). The reasons for this request for urgent debate are contained in the document itself.

I shall consult Parliament tomorrow morning on the urgency of these motions for resolutions.

15. *Fight against drug abuse (vote)*

President. — We shall now proceed to the votes and we will use the electronic voting system, which I am assured is in 100 % working order.

I have three motions for resolutions on the *fight against drug abuse*.

We shall first consider the *motion for a resolution by Mrs Squarcialupi* (Doc. 1-752/79).

On the first indent to the preamble, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mrs Bonino, Mrs Macciocchi

and Mr Pannella and seeking to replace this indent by the following new text:

— Whereas those substances commonly thought of as 'drugs' form only part of the substances so defined by pharmacologists, and substances widely consumed in Europe such as alcoholic drinks, tobacco, tea, coffee and psychotropic products also deserve to be called 'drugs'.

What is the rapporteur's view?

Mrs Squarcialupi, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, I feel that generalizations, like those made in this amendment, are dangerous to the extent that they put substances which modify personal behaviour on the same level as other substances which are damaging to health. In any case this was not the intention of the committee that proposed the motion for a resolution. I am therefore against.

President. — I put Amendment No 1 to the vote. Amendment No 1 is rejected.

I put the first indent of the preamble to the vote.

The first indent of the preamble is adopted.

On the second indent of the preamble, I have Amendment No 2, tabled by Mrs Bonino, Mrs Macciocchi and Mr Pannella and seeking to replace this indent by the following new text:

— Whereas energies must be concentrated on the most serious problem in European countries — heroin addiction — and thus 'drugs' must be distinguished from derivatives of cannabis indica

What is the rapporteur's view?

Mrs Squarcialupi, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, there are several amendments concerning the liberalization of cannabis indica. In addition to this amendment — No 2 — there are amendments Nos 6, 7, 8, 9 and 13. I am saying this to save time. In my view they are not acceptable because the proposal made by Mrs Bonino, Mrs Macciocchi and Mr Pannella is based on old studies made between 1972 and 1974. It is clear that the proposers of this amendment have not read the latest reports of January 1980 by the World Health Organisation on narcotics or the reports of the American Congress. I therefore repeat that in my view amendments 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 13 on the liberalization of cannabis indica should be rejected, since in view of the latest studies and Reports on this matter any decision would seem to be premature. The whole question requires to be thought out much more fully.

President. — I put Amendment No 2 to the vote.

* See Annex.

President.

Amendment No 2 is rejected.

I put the second indent of the preamble to the vote.

I call Mr Ripa di Meana on a point of order.

Mr Ripa di Meana. — (*I*) Mr President, my key is not working.

President. — I wonder if it would be for the convenience of the House if in the event of one particular seat not working you could find another seat, that of a Member who is not present, where the system is working.

I call Mr Klepsch on a point of order.

Mr Klepsch. — (*D*) Mr President, would you please consider whether we might not vote by show of hands so that we can finish voting time by 8.00 p.m. If we go on the way we are I am afraid that we shall never finish.

(*Applause*)

President. — From the reaction of the House, Mr Klepsch, I conclude that there is general agreement on your suggestion. We shall therefore proceed to vote by show of hands.

I put the second indent of the preamble to the vote.

The second indent is adopted.

After the second indent, I have the following amendments tabled by Mrs Bonino, Mrs Macciocchi and Mr Pannella:

— Amendment No 3, seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

— Noting that international laws and the threat of improbable sanctions will not persuade large numbers of farmers to stop growing opium, which is essential to their survival and which has been a traditional part of the culture of those countries for thousands of years,

— Amendment No 4, seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

— Noting that the campaign against the traffic in drugs cannot be treated in the same way as conventional crime but that since it benefits from complicity in high places it has to be combated principally by political initiatives,

— Amendment No 5, seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

— Noting that generalized prohibition should be abandoned and replaced with a more selective approach to criminal behaviour, cases and substances,

— Amendment No 6, seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

— Whereas cannabis indica is by far and away the most commonly found illegal substance in the European Community today and, in particular, the use of cannabis derivatives has now become commonplace among some millions of citizens,

— Amendment No 7, seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

— Whereas measures to stamp out the use of cannabis derivatives still take up much of the capacity of the law enforcement agencies (police, courts) and divert them from the task of attacking the sources of the large-scale traffic in heroin,

— Amendment No 8, seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

— Noting that, as the Dutch government commission pointed out in its 1972 report, the legalization of cannabis would keep young people away from the black market in heroin,

— Amendment No 9, seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

— Noting that the legalization of cannabis would restore the credibility of the law, which has been seriously compromised in view of the evident inconsistency of prohibiting a substance which is clearly less harmful than alcohol or tobacco, which are state-controlled and culturally accepted drugs,

— Amendment No 10, seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

— Whereas the removal of cannabis from the list of narcotics was requested by a US government commission in its 1972 and 1974 reports.

I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

Mrs Squarcialupi, rapporteur. — (*I*) Amendment No 3 is a different amendment from those I mentioned earlier. I am against this amendment also because, put briefly, it abandons the possibility of agreements with countries producing dangerous substances and drugs.

President. — I put Amendment No 3 to the vote.

Amendment No 3 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 4 to the vote.

Amendment No 4 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 5 to the vote.

President

Amendment No 5 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 6 to the vote.

Amendment No 6 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 7 to the vote.

Amendment No 7 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 8 to the vote.

Amendment No 8 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 9 to the vote.

Amendment No 9 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 10 to the vote.

Amendment No 10 is rejected.

On the first indent of paragraph 1, I have Amendment No 11, tabled by Mrs Bonino, Mrs Macciocchi and Mr Pannella and seeking to replace this indent by the following new text:

— propose the most extensive cooperation possible between the Member States to combat the traffic in heroin and to enlist the support of the relevant institutions to that end;

What is the rapporteur's view?

Mrs Squarcialupi, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, the references in all these amendments to the support of the institutions should not be so general. They need to be supported by reasons to be credible. In addition this amendment No 11 adds nothing to what is stated in the motion for a resolution.

In view of the general nature of the statements I am therefore against.

President. — I put Amendment No 11 to the vote.

The amendment is rejected.

I put the first indent to paragraph 1 as it stands to the vote.

The first indent to paragraph 1 is adopted.

On the second indent to paragraph 1 I have two amendments, No 12 by Mrs Bonino and others, seeking to replace this indent by a new text to read as follows:

— in cooperation with the countries in which opium is produced and with which the EEC has political and economic relations, work out a plan for converting

land under poppy cultivation to other types of production;

and No 17 by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling and Mrs Krouwel-Vlam, seeking to amend the text to read as follows:

— in cooperation with the countries in which drugs are produced and with which the Community has political and economic relations, work out *plans for alternative crops and* a strategy which strikes at the very heart of the traffic in drugs;

These amendments are mutually exclusive.

What is the Rapporteur's view?

Mrs Squarcialupi, rapporteur. — (I) Mr President, I am in favour of Amendment No. 17 because I find it more complete in that it also includes the traffic in drugs.

President. — I put Amendment No 12 to the vote.

Amendment No 12 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 17 to the vote.

Amendment No 17 is adopted.

I put the second indent to the vote.

The second indent is adopted.

I put the third to fifth indents of paragraph 1, to the vote.

The third to fifth indents are adopted.

After the fifth indent, I have Amendment No 18 by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling and Mrs Krouwel-Vlam, seeking to add a new text:

— take steps to combat drug taking by young people by providing them with the appropriate education and information, including suitable proposals for recreational activities and assistance in problem situations;

What is the Rapporteur's view?

Mrs Squarcialupi, rapporteur. — (I) I am in favour, Mr President.

President. — I put Amendment No 18 to the vote.

Amendment No 18 is adopted.

After paragraph 1 I have five amendments seeking to add five new paragraphs, Nos 13 to 16 by Mrs Bonino and others, and No 19 by Mr Newton Dunn.

President

- '1a. Recommends the Governments of the Community to remove cannabis and its derivatives from the list of narcotics and, to legalize its production and marketing;'
- '1b. Recommends the Government of the Community to unequivocally remove legal penalties from the use of drugs and behaviour connected with their use;'
- '1c. Recommends the Governments of the Community to introduce as soon as possible appropriate structures to prevent drug addicts from being treated as outcasts;'
- '1d. Requests the Commission and the Council to promote a thorough political investigation into the structures of the international drugs trade and particularly institutional involvement;'
- '1e. Instructs its appropriate committee to report to it on the matter;'

What is the rapporteur's view?

Mrs Squarcialupi, rapporteur. — (*I*) As regards the amendment proposed by Mr Newton Dunn, I am, of course, in favour.

As regards Amendment No 13, I am against because it refers to cannabis indica which we have already discussed.

I am also against Amendment No 14 because it is highly ambiguous in its second part, which asks for the removal of legal penalties for all behaviour connected with the use of drugs.

I am also against Amendment No 15 because it is similar to another — No 18 — on which we have already voted.

Summing up, therefore, I am in favour of Amendment No 19 and against Amendments Nos 13, 14, 15 and 16.

President. — I put Amendment No 13 to the vote.

Amendment No 13 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 14 to the vote.

Amendment No 14 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 15 to the vote.

Amendment No 15 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 16 to the vote.

Amendment No 16 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 19 to the vote.

Amendment No 19 is adopted.

I put paragraph 2 to the vote.

Paragraph 2 is adopted.

Before passing on to the whole resolution, I have several requests for explanation of vote.

I call Mr Fernandez.

Mr Fernandez. — (*F*) Mr President, we know that the harmlessness claimed for the so-called soft drugs is, in fact, an excellent sales argument for their increased consumption. In any case, the most official statistics indicate that 10 % of young people move on from what are known as soft drugs to what are known as hard drugs. In a country like ours estimates put this number at 500 young people every year. We find this far too many — it is simply intolerable!

Young people, faced with no training, unemployment and lack of prospects as a result of the capitalist crisis, are easy prey for drug pedlars but above all for the big shot in the drugs business, because selling this poisonous dream potion brings big profits. To people talking about a new situation let me simply say that this new situation is, in fact, just the development of the destruction wrought by drugs. Some Members of this Assembly have decided to campaign for generalizing the use of drugs. Faced with the growth of this curse, they have opted for surrender to the drug pedlars, irresponsibility towards young people and encouragement to take up drugtaking. We cannot, for our part, be silent.

Just as there is no such thing as a distinction between good and bad drugs, neither is there between minor pleasure-seeking drug-takers and big drug-addicts. What we do have is human beings who are suffering, who must be helped and cared for. The use of drugs is the rejection of oneself, the destruction of one's personality, self-ruin and death. Yes, drugs are killing twenty times as many people today as ten years ago. That is what has to be stopped. That is why we urge the different governments to fight first and foremost against those who are really responsible for the traffic in narcotics, those exploiting young drug-takers and those organising the manufacture and marketing of all forms of drugs. This is why we shall be supporting the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Squarcialupi.

President. — I call Mr Capanna.

Mr Capanna. — (*I*) Mr President, I shall be voting in favour of the motion for a resolution proposed by Mrs Bonino and others and I regret that I was unable to put my signature to this motion for a resolution, which I find essential in relation to the problem. It was tabled during the last part-session in February when I was in

Capanna

America, where the Indian Mohawk tribe lives, a delegation from which will be present tomorrow in Strasbourg and will be speaking with various members of the Assembly.

If the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Bonino and others is not adopted — as I think we must presume — I shall nevertheless vote in favour of the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Squarcialupi, though noting that it runs the risk of playing a very limited role in relation to the seriousness of the problem. However, in the absence of anything better it does, in my view, still represent something positive.

President. — I call Mrs Bonino.

Mrs Bonino. — (*I*) Mr President, I am taking this explanation-of-vote opportunity to remind you that points of order may be raised even during the voting. Mr President, will you please tell me why we had no right to speak to withdraw an amendment we had tabled.

The point is that we had asked to speak in order to withdraw Amendment No 14.

In addition, and still on a point of procedure, I would like to repeat that I find it unacceptable that we should have to vote on the amendments one after the other without any possibility of discussion and after the proposers of 20 amendments had only 7 minutes in the general debate during the last part-session to explain in full their position on drugs. To my mind this cannot be a serious debate, because it has not been possible to compare positions.

This having been said, I announce that I shall abstain from voting on the Squarcialupi motion because I feel that if one basic problem, that of the results of prohibitionism and not only the futility but also the danger of such a policy, is not tackled and if no distinction is made between soft drugs — or non-drugs — and hard drugs, all we shall be doing, to my mind, is to patch up the situation. But this motion for a resolution does not even apply a patch. It is just a resolution that hopes for things that no-one will ever do; it does not tackle the basic problems such as the fight against the traffic in hard drugs, which are, in my view, no better defined in the Squarcialupi motion for a resolution.

I shall close by telling the Communist Member who has just spoken that the drug problem is not, in my view, a problem of the capitalist society. I believe that it is a far more general problem and that it does not lend itself to a distinction between, on the one hand, the socialist countries that are perfect and where the sun of the future is dawning and the decadent countries on the other.

President. — I call Mr Sherlock.

Mr Sherlock. — Mr President, I have come into the warmth of this Chamber, having spent the last 31 years of my life at the sharp end of this story. How many of you have seen anybody die as a result of drug addiction?

I come in to explain two things about my vote. The first is that I voted for Amendment No 3 by Mrs Bonino, which notes that those people on poor land who can only grow the opium poppy are going to take a lot of persuading to start growing asparagus. This is perhaps one area where we might help. For the rest, while admiring Mrs Squarcialupi's devotion to this subject, I think that all our efforts are pretty well doomed to failure. You will do nothing for the elderly addict, but we must do something for the young victim. This is the Black Death of the twentieth century. This is the plague that is in our midst.

I have spent the whole of this last weekend in the privileged position of working with and being with dedicated young people, dedicated to their own futures, free from this scourge, and I will tell you now that we can only help them by increasing their own sense of their own dignity, by giving them good example ourselves, by encouraging their peer leaders — the pop singers and others — to have respect for the law rather than flout it in the way they do at the moment. That respect for one's body, respect for one's mind, perhaps even respect for one's soul, is the only way to counteract this filthy trade.

(Applause from various quarters)

President. — I call Mrs Groes.

Mrs Groes. — (*DK*) Mr President, the reason why I voted as I did is this: we Danish Socialists do not believe that health policy and the campaign against drug abuse are matters for the Community. On the other hand, I must tell Mrs Bonino and others that from both the social welfare and the political angles the romantic idea that a liberal policy in this sector would be a blessing for drug addicts is utterly mistaken.

President. — I call Mr Patterson.

Mr Patterson. — Mr President, I wish to explain why I abstained on Amendments 6, 7 and 10, contrary to my Group Whip. If you so rule, Mr President, I am prepared to submit my reasons in writing, provided they are annexed to the verbatim report afterwards. . .

President

President — It would be better for you to explain your reasons now, and urge the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to change the Rules.

Mr Patterson. — ... In that case I shall give a very simple explanation. I believe that Mrs Bonino is right to make a distinction between cannabis and heroin, and the observations she makes in those amendments are purely factual and should have been taken note of.

President. — I call Mrs Dekker.

Mrs Dekker. — (NL) Mr President, the positive feature in Mrs Squarcialupi's question is that it raises the problem of drug policy in this Parliament. What I also found positive in her question is that in it she attempts to translate the new realities with regard to the so-called soft drugs into a European policy and to bring about the harmonization of Member States' policies on this subject. To my regret, however, I do not find this aspect in the motion for a resolution that Mrs Squarcialupi has tabled on behalf of the Committee on Public Health.

The thing that I miss in her motion for a resolution and also in the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Newton-Dunn and his political colleagues is a distinction between hard and soft drugs. For this reason I signed the motion for a resolution proposed by Mrs Bonino and her colleagues. In other words we feel that the main accent needs to be on the control of hard drugs. We therefore take the view that drugs like Indian hemp should not be included among those subject to penalties.

That is the conclusion you reach if you establish priorities, which is something that we in this Parliament certainly have to do. I find that the other motions for a resolution fall short in that regard; points of emphasis are lacking.

I hope that the discussion of this problem here in this Parliament will help to shape our opinion on this point.

Finally I would point out that the proposers of motion for a resolution 766/79, who include myself, have tabled an amendment to the recommendations in this motion for a resolution, under reference No 1, to avoid any misunderstanding.

We propose that the use of drugs and the related behaviour, which is otherwise legitimate, should in a clear manner no longer be made punishable. I wanted to bring that to your notice too. I did not hear this amendment mentioned during the voting and propose that this amendment be included in the voting on the motion for a resolution proposed by Mrs Bonino and others.

President. — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole incorporating the amendment that have been adopted.

The resolution as amended is adopted.

16. *Agenda*

President. — In view of the lateness of the hour and the provisions agreed to concerning the length of sittings, the remaining votes fixed for today will be held over until the next voting time.

17. *Agenda for the sitting on 11 March 1980*

President. — The next sitting of the European Parliament will be held tomorrow, Tuesday 11 March 1980, with the following agenda:

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

- Opening of the annual session
- Motion for a resolution on the composition of committees
- Decision on urgency of five motions for resolutions
- Cronin-report on regional development projects (continuation)
- Joint debate on the Damseaux report, the Spinelli report and an oral question to the Commission, on competition policy
- D'Angelosante-report on transferable securities
- *3 p.m.:* Voting time

18. *Closure of the session*

President. — I declare the 1979/1980 annual session of the European Parliament closed. Pursuant to the provision of the Treaty, Parliament will meet tomorrow, Tuesday 11 March 1980, at 9 a.m.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 8.15 p.m.)

ANNEX

COMMISSION ACTION ON OPINIONS DELIVERED BY THE EUROPEAN
PARLIAMENT AT THE FEBRUARY PART-SESSION

1 At its February 1980 part-Session the European Parliament delivered 11 opinions in response to Council requests for consultation. In three cases the no-report procedure was used, to deliver favourable opinions on:

- a proposal for a Regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2579/79 opening, allocating and providing for the administration of Community tariff quotas for certain wines having a registered designation of origin, falling within subheading ex. 22.05 C of the CCT and originating in Tunisia,
- a Commission proposal for a Regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 805/68 on the common organization of the market in beef and veal;
- a proposal for a Regulation amending Regulations (EEC) 3081/78, 3082/78 and 3083/78 opening, allocating and providing for the administration of Community tariff quotas for certain wines originating in Portugal.

2. At the last part-Session Parliament debated and delivered favourable opinions on five reports:

- report by Mrs Weber on a proposal for a second five-year programme on management and storage of radioactive waste;
- report by Sir David Nicolson and Miss Forster on proposals for
 - (i) a Decision on Community intervention in favour of the shipbuilding industry,
 - (ii) a Decision on Community intervention in favour of the man-made fibres industry;
- report by Mr Sablé on two proposals concerning
 - (i) processing of ACP agricultural products,
 - (ii) transitional measures up to the entry into force of the Second Lomé Convention;
- report by Mr Enright on two proposals concerning
 - (i) assistance for Middle East refugees,
 - (ii) provision of sugar to UNWRA as food aid;
- report from Mrs Squarzialupi on a decision to conclude the Convention on Long-Range Cross-Frontier Atmospheric Pollution.

3. Parliament proposed amendments to Commission proposals in three cases and in all three the Commission accepted them:

- report by Mr Fuchs stating Parliament's opinion on the communication on the Community's energy objectives for 1990 and the convergence of Member States' policies, and on nuclear energy and energy policy

The Commission has prepared an amended proposal taking account of Parliament's opinion and has sent it to the Council and Parliament;

- report by Mr von Wogau on a proposal on Community transit

The Commission has prepared an amended proposal which will be formally adopted this week;

- report by Mr Sherlock on a Directive on protection of workers against chemical, physical and biological agents on the job

An amended proposal embodying some of Parliament's proposed changes is being prepared and will be formally adopted in the next few days.

*

* *

*Question which could not be answered during Question Time, with written answers**Question No 3 by Mr Remilly (H-408/79)*

Subject: Development of wind energy

In view of the potential contribution of wind energy towards the Community's energy requirements over the next few decades, has the Commission drawn up plans for the development of this energy source in the Community?

Answer

The Commission considers wind energy an important alternative energy source the practical applications of which should be encouraged as much as possible. The present energy situation in the Community is such that every opportunity must be taken to reduce our dependence on oil. Even though, according to the experts, wind energy will contribute a mere 1 to 2 % of the Community's energy supplies by the year 2000, every effort must be made as of now to promote the development of wind energy by means of research and the financing of pilot projects. In its proposal for the second energy research programme the Commission has therefore included a wind energy project in which new wind generator systems will be tested and the associated environmental problems examined. The Council has adopted the Commission proposal with minor cuts in the appropriations. In addition, the Commission is currently making preparations for the publication of an invitation to tender for wind energy pilot projects. The first results in this area can be expected in 1981.

Since, in the last Parliament, there was some criticism of the Commission's proposal regarding wind energy, the Commission welcomes the opportunity provided by this question to underline once again the importance of this form of energy. Naturally, the environmental problems associated with wind energy, most notably the protection of the environment, must not be neglected. The aim behind the Commission's endeavours is to contribute to generally acceptable solutions in precisely this area.

*

* *

Question No 4 by Mr Gillot (H-417/79)

Subject: Directive on architects

In view of the fact that a draft directive on architects has been under consideration for more than 15 years, that it now bears only a slight resemblance to the text submitted for consideration by the Assembly of the European Communities, that it takes no account of the new significance attaching to the concern for the quality of life and that it has been repeatedly rejected by the Liaison Committee of the Architects of the United Europe, can the Commission indicate whether it plans to consider the proposals drawn up unanimously by the Liaison Committee of the Architects of the United Europe and whether it intends to consult the Assembly a second time, as required by the far-reaching amendments made to the initial text and warranted by the election by universal suffrage of the new Assembly?

Answer

1. As it has already pointed out in its answer to Written Question No 348/79, the Commission does not share Mr Gillot's view that the proposed Directive relating to the right of establishment and provision of services in the field of architecture takes no account of new environmental requirements.
2. The Commission also feels that the proposal, in its present form, meets as far as possible contemporary needs and requirements in the matter of professional qualifications in the context of freedom of movement within the Community. It is convinced that this proposal is the only possible basis of agreement between the Member States; it has reached this conclusion after extensive consultations, over a period of years, with all the parties concerned and, in particular, the Liaison Committee of Architects in the common market, whose ideas and suggestions it duly took into account.
3. In spite of the undeniable changes made to the texts submitted for the European Parliament's approval, the Commission does not consider it necessary to consult Parliament a second time. The changes made do not affect the substance of its initial proposals, but essentially only the form; to a

large extent, the amendments were designed to take account of the judgments of the Court of Justice in the *Reyners* and *van Binsbergen* cases and of the general rules already adopted for other professions.

4. As it has already pointed out at the meeting of Parliament's Legal Affairs Committee held on 18 February 1980, the Commission is nonetheless prepared to keep that committee informed of all developments concerning its proposal. It will, as promised, present at the committee's next meeting a note on the current state of negotiations on the proposal.

*

* *

Question No 5 by Mr Poncelet (H-418/79)

Subject: British Leyland/Honda agreement

In view of the agreement which has just been signed between the British company British Leyland and the Japanese company Honda on the manufacture and distribution of a car in the common market, can the Commission indicate whether this agreement complies with the Treaty of Rome (Arts. 85 and 86), whether the engines and transmission gear manufactured in Japan will be subject to the common external tariff and, if not, whether it does not constitute a deflection of trade and a violation of the Treaty to sell a vehicle 'Made in Great Britain' when it is clearly Japanese?

Answer

The agreement concluded in December 1979 between Honda Motor Co. Ltd and BL Limited (British Leyland) has just been notified to the Commission in accordance with Article 4(1) of Council Regulation No 17/62. Under the administrative procedure which has accordingly just begun, the Commission is considering whether the conditions for exemption from Article 85(3) of the EEC Treaty are entirely satisfied. It has no information entitling it to consider the matter under Article 86 of the Treaty.

Under the BL-Honda agreement, the car in question will be wholly manufactured under licence in the United Kingdom, with the exception of the engine and transmission gear which account for approximately 20 % of the cost of the car.

These two components will be subject to the Common Customs Tariff on importation into the Community

*

* *

Question No 10 by Mr Collins (H-426/79)

Subject: Use of lead additives in petrol

In view of the mounting evidence of the effects that lead has on young children, has the Commission any plans to legislate for the total abolition of the use of lead additives in petrol?

Answer

Before submitting any new proposals concerning the lead content of petrol, the Commission wishes to await the outcome of the application of the directive adopted by the Council on 29 June 1979 (OJ L 197, 22 July 1978) which in fact involves the approximation of the laws of the Member States concerning the lead content of petrol. This directive provides — with effect from 1 January 1981 — for a maximum permitted lead content of 0.40 g/l. Moreover, the Member States may subsequently reduce this level further provided they do not establish limits lower than 0.15 g/l.

*

* *

Question No 12 by Mr SPINELLI (H-438/79)

Subject: Future of the EMS

What steps is the Commission taking to ensure that two years after its inception, the European Monetary System is consolidated as a permanent system, in particular through the establishment of the European Monetary Fund (possibly giving some idea of the institutional form it would take), how does it intend to deal with the economic consequences of the EMS, both in the subsequent stages of development of the EMS and in bringing the policies of economic revival and transfer of resources into line with monetary commitments, especially at the level of the Community budget, and how does it intend to involve the European Parliament in the delicate preparatory stage for the progressive institutional developments subsequent to the establishment of the EMS?

Answer

In March 1980 the Commission will present to the Council a *report* 'reviewing the progress made in this area (project to set up the EMF) and pointing out the difficulties'; for this purpose it will consult the Committee of Governors and the Monetary Committee, which are at present carrying out a detailed survey. The Commission proposes at a later date to draw up *proposals*.

With regard to the policies of economic stabilization and revival, the Commission plans to ensure that the Member States apply more systematically the existing procedures for coordination at Community level so as to achieve greater convergence in this area. This is particularly necessary since the margin for manoeuvre at national level is reduced by fresh inflationary tensions. Prior consultations must therefore be stepped up to take account of the implications of any significant changes in national policies for the economies of the other partners and for the smooth functioning of the EMS.

As to the policies for transferring resources at regional level, the Commission intends to step up its regional activities, with particular emphasis on the least-favoured areas and on the energy sector. It should be noted that budgetary instruments for structural purposes, including interest relief grants, doubled in value in real terms between 1977 and 1979 from 1 300 m EUA in 1977 to 2 600 m EUA in 1979.

The Commission will, of course involve Parliament in work on the European Monetary Fund.

*

* *

Question No 13 by Mr Leonardi (H-449/79)

Subject: Reduction of capacity in the man-made fibres sector

There have been frequent and sometimes conflicting reports in the European press concerning the reduction of capacity and redundancies in the man-made fibres sector. Can the Commission give precise, up-to-date information on this matter?

Answer

As regards employment, the Commission does not automatically receive information on redundancies in undertakings in the various Member States. It can merely, therefore, indicate to the Honourable Member trends in employment over the years without distinguishing between redundancies properly so called and other forms of reduction in employment: thus, employment in the man-made fibres sector as a whole dropped from 148 000 in 1976 to 117 000 in 1979.

As regards production capacity, the Commission, after studying the whole question of man-made fibres (which accounts for nearly 80 % of the industry's total production) received fairly precise information on these products from the producers. Overall production capacity dropped from 2 800 000 tonnes in 1977 (maximum capacity reached), to 2 400 000 tonnes at the beginning of 1979.

It should be noted that the rate of utilization of capacity in 1977 was just 60 %, while in 1979 it was just 80 %.

*

* *

Question No 17 by Mr Ruffolo (H-467/79)

Subject: Medium-term programme

Could the Commission state whether reports are true that it does not intend to submit plans this year for updating the medium-term programme?

Answer

The Commission is under no obligation to submit each year an updating of the medium-term policy programmes, but merely a review of the quantified projections. This year is devoted to preparing the 5th programme, which is due to be adopted in 1981. It therefore seemed advisable to prepare the new projections in this context rather than submit them separately.

However, the Commission does of course share Parliament's views on the importance of the medium-term problems. It has taken note of the intention of its Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs to cover this area, and intends to assist it. It also intends to keep Parliament informed, through the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, of the work preparatory to the 5th programme.

*

* *

Question No 18 by Mr Dido (H-469/79)

Subject: Commission action to support the shipbuilding and textile sectors

Following the decisions adopted by the Council on 21 December 1979 to promote conversion schemes in the man-made fibres sector, could the Commission state what funds are still available under headings 3 750 and 512 and what further funds it intends to request under the same headings in the preliminary draft budget for 1980 and successive financial years for industrial restructuring and conversion and for essential social support measures, making due allowance for the measures now under consideration by Parliament to assist the shipbuilding and textile sectors?

Answer

Item 3 750 of the 1979 financial year (Community restructuring and conversion aid connected with the crisis in certain industrial sectors), has been allocated, following transfer from Chapter 100, the sum of 15 m EUA.

The preliminary draft budget for 1980 provides for a token entry under this item. The Commission, which had originally proposed an entry of 35 m EUA, accepted the idea of a token entry (as proposed by the Council and the European Parliament). The amounts for the 1979 financial year, carried over to the 1980 financial year, have not been spent since want of a legal basis makes utilization of the funds very difficult. Appropriations for the 1978 financial year, for example, could not be used until the end of 1979, and then only on the basis of an *ad hoc* procedure. At this particular moment, the 1979 appropriations carried over to the 1980 financial year can be considered sufficient in the light of the experience acquired in the use of 1978 appropriations (14 out of 17 m EUA available).

As to the 1981 appropriations, Community aid should approximate to the level of aid in the 1978 and 1979 financial years.

On the other hand, it is too early to give more precise information for the subsequent budgets since an overall approach is being sought on aid to industries in difficulties.

*

* *

Question No 19 by Mr Pintat (H-470/79)

Subject: Effects of Spain's accession to the EEC on the Community's iron and steel industry

The Spanish Government's programme in the iron and steel sector aims at achieving a very substantial increase in the production of crude steel and rolled steel products between now and 1985.

Would the Commission not agree that this is likely to aggravate considerably the imbalances within the Community which are already proving so difficult to remedy?

Answer

It is quite true that the Spanish iron and steel programme published in the spring of 1979 aimed at a considerable development of effective capacity¹ in crude steel production — from 13·9 m tonnes in 1978 to 18·6 m tonnes in 1985.

This programme has been reconsidered on the Spanish side; from contacts the Commission has had with the Spanish Government it seems likely that the deliberations of the latter will lead to a modification of the above objectives.

In any event, the Commission is paying the closest attention to foreseeable trends in Spanish iron and steel production: the development of the Spanish iron and steel policy is considered by the Community and by the Commission an important factor in relation to accession. For this reason the Commission has begun a series of consultations with the Spanish authorities.

*

* *

Question No 22 by Mrs le Roux (H-473/79)

Subject Boarding and inspection of two Breton lobster boats on 14 January 1980

What is the Commission's attitude to the boarding and inspection of two more vessels by the British Navy on 14 January 1980? What new measures has it adopted or does it intend to adopt pursuant to the Regulation on mesh size and catch zones, and what is its position on the scientific data examined by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea at its last session?

Answer

The Commission has taken note of the boarding and inspection of two Breton lobster boats on 12 January 1980. This brings to six the number of such cases since 13 September 1979

I would remind the honourable Member that the Commission referred the matter to the Court of Justice on 9. 11. 1979 following the national measures taken by the United Kingdom from 1. 7. 1979.

The Commission considers that, by taking such national measures, the United Kingdom has failed to comply with its obligations under Community law.

With regard to mesh size and catch zones, the Commission's latest proposals are contained in its amended proposal of 26. 11. 1979 (COM (79) 709 final) forwarded to the EP on 4. 12. 1979.

In the light of the scientific data examined by the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) at its last session in Warsaw in October 1979, it has adopted two resolutions², one of which called for a meeting of the working party on lobsters. The Commission is closely following the work of this group and expects its findings to be delivered in August 1980.

¹ Nominal current capacity is 15·4 m tonnes, including 8·8 in the integrated undertakings

² C. Res. 1979/7: 30 and 4: 36.

Question No 23 by Mr Sieglerschmidt (H-475/79)

Subject: Procedure for replies to written questions

Is it true that before finally adopting drafts of replies to written questions, the Commission submits them to the Council so as to be able to amend them according to the Council's reaction?

Answer

No. The Commission does not submit its answers to written parliamentary questions to the Council for approval, nor would it be appropriate to do so.

Once the Commission has approved an answer there is, however, a longstanding arrangement whereby the Council is enabled to check the accuracy of technical information, before the reply is transmitted finally to Parliament. These arrangements are applied reciprocally for replies approved by the Council.

*

* *

Question No 25, by Mr Normanton (H-483/79)

Subject: Television transmissions within the Community

What policy is the Commission pursuing to further understanding and cultural development among the citizens of the Community through fostering direct television transmissions by satellite?

Answer

Direct television transmission by satellite would certainly be an effective means of encouraging understanding and cultural development among the citizens of the Community.

The technology of satellite transmission was originally developed in Europe by the European Space Agency. At present several European states are considering using direct television satellites in the 1980s. In its communication to the Council on new information technologies (Doc. COM (79) 650), the Commission provided for the harmonization of legal and technical measures in this field.

As for the more general question raised by Mr Normanton, the Commission will closely observe the introduction of this new technology and take account of its potential for bringing about further understanding among the citizens of the Community.

*

* *

Question No 29 by Mr Welsh (H-490/79)

Subject: EEC/Malta Association Agreement

Allegations have been made that the Government of Malta has been permitting discriminatory non tariff barriers to trade to operate against imports of some textile products from certain Member States. Although less serious than the total ban on imports imposed in November 1978 such restraints would be contrary to the EEC/Malta Association Agreement and fly in the face of repeated public statements by the Maltese authorities.

Can the Commission confirm that all discriminatory practices have ceased?

Answer

In the second half of 1979 the Commission established contact with the Maltese authorities with a view to removing the barriers erected as a result of the ban on imports of textiles from the United Kingdom.

The Commission was not aware that these difficulties had continued until 1980. It is, however, observing the situation very closely and would not hesitate to take appropriate steps were new difficulties to arise.

*

* *

Question No 30 by Mr Hopper (H-494/79)

Subject: Exchange controls

Which Member States are meeting in full the Community obligations on capital movements?

Answer

All the Member States have accepted the commitments given by the Community as regards movements of capital under the directives of 11 May 1960 and 18 December 1962 in implementation of Article 67 of the EEC Treaty. These commitments are mainly concerned with direct investments, movements of personal capital, trade credits and portfolio investments.

It should, however, be remembered that, on the basis of the safeguard clauses provided for in the Treaty, the Commission has authorized Ireland, Denmark, Italy and France to restrict certain capital movements.

The Commission is constantly monitoring economic developments in the countries in question and carries out investigations from time to time so that, when necessary, it can modify the authorizations granted.

*

* *

Question No 31 by Mr Davern (H-495/79)

Subject: Grants for improved beef breeding techniques

Will the Commission state whether or not it intends to make any proposals concerning grants for improved beef breeding techniques?

Answer

The Commission does not intend to propose aid for improving beef breeding techniques.

It feels that this is something each farmer should decide for himself without interference from the Community.

*

* *

Question No 32 by Mr de la Malene (H-496/79)

Subject: Fixing of refunds

What is the Commission's thinking on the subject of fixing refunds?

Answer

It is impossible to deal with this subject exhaustively within the framework of Question Time. In general I can say that the aim in fixing refunds in advance is to create greater stability in the Community's exports of agricultural products. The implementing measures vary from product to product, depending on the technical and commercial conditions in the different sectors.

Question No 33 by Mr Caillavet (H-498/79)

Subject: The Community and telematics

Is the Commission able to inform Parliament of the decisions which it intends to propose to harmonize and coordinate as a matter of urgency the policies of the various EEC countries in the field of telematics and thus to achieve ranges of common uniform industrial products? Also, what does it intend to do with regard to video discs (standard heads and advanced heads) so as to prevent the United States or even Japan from gaining a stranglehold on these two sectors?

Answer

The Commission has drawn up, in the field of telematics, proposals for a strategy which were submitted at the Dublin Summit of 29 November 1979. These proposals are set out in 'European society in the face of the new information technologies; a Community reply' (Doc. COM(79) 650¹). They aim at coordinating and supplementing the policies of the various EEC Member States in the field of information technologies.

The Commission does not propose to draw up 'ranges' of common industrial products, the reaction to market demand being a matter for industry. Rather it is at the level of the market itself that the Commission proposes action. This would consist in laying down standards. Standardization would ensure, that users of telematic services could communicate with one another and at the same time pave the way for a uniform and Community-wide market. With the creation of a uniform market, industry should be able to organize its production to meet the demand.

Standardization will cover two areas:

— Telecommunications

The Commission will seek Council decisions this year which:

- support the effort to harmonize telecommunications administrations in regard to the new numerical codes, the new services and future equipment;
- lay the foundations for an open Community terminals market offering private enterprise opportunities for competing with public administrations;
- arrange in 1981 for an initial project to be undertaken by the telecommunications administrations to increase their potential sources of Community supply
- Data-processing

The Commission will step up the work it has been doing in this field for the past few years — namely encouraging the establishment of standards in the international organizations (International Organization for Standardization — ISO) and the implementation of standards and procedures at Community level.

If the desired effect on the market is to be obtained, the standards adopted at Community level must be actually applied; this can be ensured by using them in public contracts. The Commission will submit to the Council at the appropriate time a decision under which the Member States will urge their administrations to adopt, for all their equipment, common standards and a set of procedures for drawing up equivalence tests for each standard.

With regard to videodiscs, the Commission is aware of the fierce competition existing between European, American and Japanese firms.

It feels that at this stage the industrial firms should be allowed to develop their own strategies.

Europe is represented in this competition by two powerful groups, one of which is primarily interested in the general public, the other in the professional sector. These groups are the best able to decide on product standards and industrial alliances. The Commission reserves the right to intervene where distortions of competition develop on the Community market or where barriers prevent European products from reaching certain markets.

¹ This communication was sent to the EP on 29. 11. 79

Question No 34 by Mr Curry (H-499/79)

Subject: Principles of Management of the Guidance Fund

Is there any and what agreement or understanding which has the effect of limiting the amount any particular Member State receives from the FEOGA Guidance Fund to an annual percentage of disbursements?

Answer

No scale exists for the distribution of resources from the Community's Agricultural Guidance Fund to Member States, but the Commission obviously tries to ensure that funds are distributed fairly between them.

*

* *

Question No 35 by Mr Lalor (H-501/79)

Subject: EEC aid to anthracite mine in Castlecomer, Co. Kilkenny

Will the Commission agree to carry a study of the anthracite coal stocks in South Laois and North Kilkenny, where coal mining could now be economic, and would help to provide much needed further energy resources in Ireland?

Answer

The Commission is happy to note that action is to be taken to examine the possibility of exploiting domestic energy sources — in this case anthracite coal stocks. Unfortunately, under the provisions of the ECSC Treaty, the Commission cannot undertake geological mining surveys or carry out the relevant studies. In all the Member States such studies are carried out either by geological institutes or by private companies. Should they produce positive results, the Commission would welcome it if any undertaking were prepared to mine the anthracite coal deposits. Pursuant to Article 54 of the ECSC Treaty, the Commission could then grant investment loans to finance the necessary production facilities.

*

* *

Question No 36 by Mr O'Donnell (H-505/79)

Subject: Industrial development

Has the Commission any proposals to enable the Community to play a more active and positive role in industrial development and other job creation through share holding in such projects or otherwise?

Answer

1. The Commission has no proposals about Community share-holding in industrial development or job creation projects.

The Commission considers that private undertakings have the major role to play here and, in cases where it is up to the public sector to take measures in this field, the Commission believes that the appropriate national and regional bodies are the most conveniently placed and best equipped for the task. Nevertheless, certain Community instruments do exist to back up Member States' activities in this field:

- projects in which Member States hold shares often qualify for EIB and ECSC loans;
- under the coal and steel conversion policy, regional development companies which can hold shares in projects also act as intermediaries for certain ECSC conversion loans for small and medium-sized undertakings. In this case the undertakings in question can often secure assistance from the regional development companies in addition to obtaining ECSC loans.

2. Moreover, in its aid policy the Commission has not objected to shareholding by public bodies provided such participation is not of a kind to distort the conditions of competition.

3. The other Commission proposals on industrial development and job creation have already been debated extensively in Parliament, under the following headings:

- renewal of the Regional Fund, in particular the non-quota section;
- proposals for industrial conversion and reorganization;
- ECSC conversion policy.

*

* *

Question No 37 by Lord O'Hagan (H-506/79)

Subject: Feed grain sales to USSR

Did Mr Cheysson speak on behalf of the Commission when he denounced the ban by the USA on sales of feed grain to the USSR?

Answer

As Mr Cheysson has already explained in writing to the Chairman of the European Parliament's Political Committee, there has been no denunciation on his part of the ban by the USA on sales of feed grain to the USSR

*

* *

Question No 38 by Mr Basil de Ferranti (H-508/79)

Subject: Computer systems

What steps is the Commission taking to ensure that Member States' computer systems for processing import documentation are mutually compatible?

Answer

1. As early as 1975 the Commission proposed a feasibility study aimed at linking up the independent data processing systems used by the customs authorities in the Member States and by the Commission's departments responsible for administering the agricultural policy. This proposal was adopted by the Council at the end of September 1977. It is known as the 'CADDIA Project' (Cooperation for the Automation of Data and Documentation on Imports, exports and Agriculture).

Subsidiary aims of the project are to devise standards for the exchange of information and to identify the need for other collaborative projects.

2. Naturally, this study also deals with the question of compatibility raised by the honourable Member. Indeed, it covers an even broader field, extending to exports and data processing.

3. The conclusions and recommendations of this study are expected by the end of this year.

4. The honourable Member can rest assured that the matters which concern him are taken fully into account in the Commission's paper entitled 'European society and new information technologies'. An answer outlining Community policy was forwarded to Parliament a few weeks ago.

* *

*

Question No 40 by Mr Beumer (H-510/79)

Subject: Draft directive on the advertising of proprietary medicinal products

On 14 June 1979, in answer to a Written Question, the Commission stated that it would submit 'without further delay' a draft directive on the advertising of proprietary medicinal products.

The draft directive has still not materialized. What exactly does the Commission consider 'without further delay' to mean?

Answer

The Commission's delay in submitting to the Council the draft directive on the advertising of proprietary medicinal products stems from its desire to expand the consultations undertaken in preparation for the directive. The positions adopted by the national authorities during consultations with the Pharmaceuticals Committee differed widely as to principles and legal bases as well as to the measures to be taken; the position of the Consumers' Consultative Committee was also sharply divergent from that of the pharmaceutical industry.

The Commission therefore has to decide whether it is desirable to submit a draft which can have no appreciable effect on the movement of products. Given the very different situations and practices in the Member States, the draft could only contain minimum standards which the States would have to develop. In addition, and more generally, a draft directive on misleading and unfair advertising, already forwarded to the Council, lays the foundations for consumer protection.

*

* *

Question No 42 by Mr Møller (H-512/79)

Subject: Consistency between statements by Parliament and the Commission

Does the President of the Commission approve of the fact that one of the Members of the Commission, Mr Claude Cheysson, has expressed public disapproval of the position adopted by the popularly elected European Parliament and the Foreign Ministers of the Member States with regard to the Soviet Union's military intervention in Afghanistan?

Answer

The Commission has no knowledge of any statement of disapproval by Mr Cheysson or by any of its Members on the subject referred to by the Honourable Member.

*

* *

Question No 43 by Mr Prag (H-513/79)

Subject: Centre for European Education, Brussels

The Commission has long regarded it as necessary, with a view to awakening among the peoples of Europe a consciousness of their common heritage, culture and interests, to promote a European dimension in education. The result has been an encouraging expansion of European Studies in the schools and universities of the member countries.

An enormous amount remains to be done, however, particularly in schools. Will the Commission explain in these circumstances its intention to withdraw its grant to the Centre for European Education in Brussels after the end of 1980?

Answer

The Commission attaches the greatest importance to promoting education about the Community and its enlargement in our schools. Young people must have an opportunity to learn about the Community, its strengths and its weaknesses, so that they can contribute to the development of a Europe in which they would like to live.

I agree with the honourable Member that there is still a great deal to be done to arouse an interest in schools in the European dimension. We are dependent on the cooperation of private organizations to achieve this aim, cooperation which is to be continued and intensified in the next few years. The funds provided in the Community budget for this purpose should be concentrated on the implementation of practical measures designed to promote European studies in schools and universities.

In accordance with Parliament's wishes, Community funds will be used to finance both specific projects in the Member States and Community projects, so as to reach as wide a public as possible.

Community assistance is therefore provided for practical projects and not to pay the general infrastructure costs of private organizations. This is the principle generally applied by the Commission in its relations with private cultural bodies, although it does provide aid for the foundation of new organizations.

With regard to the Centre for European Education, the Commission intends to stop subsidizing the infrastructure costs, as in other cases, but it will continue to support the Centre's projects which are of interest to the European Community and, where appropriate, to increase such support. A final decision has not yet been taken. The Commission has therefore not stated that it intends to withdraw support for the Centre's activities from 1981.

Finally, I should like to repeat my assurance that the Commission will continue to provide practical and theoretical assistance to private organizations which have a commitment to the European Community. In this connection we are particularly dependent, as we have always been, on Parliament's support.

*
* *
*

Question No 45 by Miss Brookes (H-516/79)

Subject: Marginal lands

In the light of the Council of Agriculture Ministers' discussions on 21 January, and of existing 'less-favoured areas' aids, will the Commission state what discussions it had with the British Government with the objective of extending these aids to 'marginal lands' in the U.K.?

Answer

The Commission has not been approached on the subject of marginal lands and consequently the subject was not discussed in the Council of Ministers on 21 January.

*
* *
*

Question No 46 by Mr Moorhouse (H-518/79)

Subject: Financial regulation in the field of transport infrastructure

What are the reasons for delay in making the financial regulation relating to transport infrastructure referred to in a letter from the Council to Parliament on 22 July 1976 and when is it anticipated such regulation will be made?

Answer

On 5 July 1976 the Commission submitted to the Council two proposals on transport infrastructure:

1. A proposal for a decision establishing a consultation procedure and creating a Committee for Transport Infrastructure.
2. A proposal for a Council regulation on support for projects of Community interest in transport infrastructure.

Despite pressure from the Commission, the Council decided not to consider the proposal on financial support until agreement had been reached on the first proposal. As a result the draft regulation was not considered until 1978. Progress on this was slow and beset with difficulties, largely because of the consultation procedure embodied in the proposal, the retention of which was strongly urged by the European Parliament. In addition, the Council wanted precise details concerning the type of project to be considered for financial assistance and on 23 November 1978 accordingly requested the Commission to carry out two studies. The first of these relates to the major problems currently encountered with the transport network. Results will soon be forthcoming, having been held up by delays in the supply of information from Member States. A decision will therefore be possible at the next Council meeting (in May or June). However it is uncertain whether the Council will agree on the consultation procedure, to which, as mentioned above, Parliament attaches great importance.

*

* *

Question No 48 by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-520/79)

Subject: Increased employment and environmental protection

Does not the Commission consider that, in order to make it possible at an early date for Community rules on environmental protection to be observed and, at the same time, to increase the number of those employed in industries producing anti-pollution equipment, investment should be encouraged, particularly in the less-favoured areas and in sectors in difficulty also with a view to promoting research and the use of new, clean forms of technology and new techniques for combating pollution, the first steps being to check the state of the environment?

Answer

The Commission shares the Honourable Member's view that it is desirable to encourage — in so far as they are compatible with the principle of 'the polluter pays' — various forms of investment designed to protect or improve the environment, especially those entailing a rapid implementation of Community standards.

On the basis of economic studies, the Commission agrees with the Honourable Member that investment of this kind could at this time have positive effects in the employment sector. It has therefore entered in its new draft budget — in response to a request from Parliament — specific lines for this purpose. In addition, it purposes to submit to Parliament and the Council, at an early date, specific programmes to encourage not only investment of an environmental character in certain sectors in difficulties or in disadvantaged areas, but also the development of new, cleaner technologies less wasteful of natural resources.

*

* *

Question No 49 by Mrs Ewing (H-521/79)

Subject: EEC oil tax discussions

Will the Commission make a statement on the success or failure of their discussions with regard to an EEC oil tax and state what support this idea has received and from which Member States?

Answer

During the last part-session, held in mid-February this year, both Mr Jenkins and I made statements to Parliament concerning possible new measures by the Commission in the field of energy investments.

Since then the Commission has continued to examine all major issues arising in this connection and, as soon as it has completed its deliberations, will refer the matter to the Member States. Only then may an official response from the Member State Governments be expected.

*

* *

Question No 50 by Mr Kavanagh (H-522/79)

Subject: Situation in the Community concerning citizen band radio

What is the situation relating to the legality of citizen band radio and the extent of its use both legally and illegally within the Community, and does the Commission envisage proposing any initiatives at Community level?

Answer

The possession and use of Citizen Band Radio transmitter-receivers are either forbidden or subject to widely differing rules in the Community Member States.

The Commission is aware of the difficulties that these rules may create for intra-Community trade. Accordingly, it is quite prepared to give thorough consideration to this problem in the light of the EEC Treaty provisions governing freedom of movement of goods within the Community, provided that specific cases are brought to its attention, accompanied by all the relevant information.

CEPT (European Conference of Postal and Telecommunications Administrations) has put forward a recommendation in respect of radio-telephone transmitter-receivers operating on the 27 MHz frequency band. CEPT has set up several working parties and the Commission liaises with one of them.

The Commission accepts that CEPT is the organization best qualified for the work in question. Nevertheless, it has to rely on the Member States to implement the CEPT recommendation in a uniform manner.

It would seem that there is a definite demand for Citizens Band Radio. In Denmark, for example, the number of 'Cbists' is estimated at 150 000, while in Belgium the number operating 'outside the law' is put at 100 000. It may be inferred from this that the number of clandestine sets in use in the Community is high. At the same time, there seems to be a tendency in the Community Member States to relax the regulations governing their use.

*

* *

Question No 51 by Mr Debre (H-526/79)

Subject: Export sales of Community agricultural produce

Can the Commission indicate the measures it has taken to implement without delay the decision of the Council of Ministers of 15 January 1980 on the maintenance of patterns of trade, which allow in particular export sales of Community agricultural produce?

Answer

As I said in the statement I made to Parliament earlier, the Commission implemented the necessary measures immediately after the Council in January adopted guidelines on exports to the Soviet

Union. These measures, which comprise strict controls on exports to the Soviet Union, mean that we are able to monitor export trends to the Soviet Union day by day. The result has been that exports of agricultural products to the Soviet Union in the first few months of this year have been within the normal limits for exports to that country over this length of time.

*

* *

Question No 52 by Mr O'Leary (H-529/79)

Subject: Community aid for the development of the Port of Dublin

In view of the importance of the Port of Dublin to the Irish economy, what possibilities exist, either under the Regional Fund or from other Community sources, for aid for its improvement and development, and to what extent has any existing aid been applied for?

Answer

The European Regional Development Fund may, at the request of the Member States, grant subsidies to assist industrial and infrastructure investment projects which contribute to the development of the less prosperous regions of the Community. Although some priority must be accorded to the 'designated areas', the whole of Ireland is eligible for assistance from the Fund. Moreover, ports come within the category of infrastructures that may be assisted.

Hitherto, however, the Commission has not received any application for Regional Fund aid for the Port of Dublin.

As for the other sources of Community aid, neither the EIB nor the New Community Instrument (NCI) has granted financial assistance to the Port of Dublin, since no project has yet been submitted. Both the EIB and — through the NCI — the Commission are, of course, ready to consider any development plan for the Port of Dublin submitted by the competent authorities.

*

* *