

Annex

# Official Journal

## of the

### European Communities

No 190  
April 1975

English edition

## Debates of the European Parliament

---

1975-1976 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 28 to 30 April 1975

European Centre, Luxembourg

Contents

<b>Sitting of Monday, 28 April 1975</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Resumption of session, p. 1 — Apologies for absence, p. 1 — Appointment of members of the Audit Board, p. 2 — Membership of committees, p. 2 — Texts of Treaties forwarded by the Council, p. 2 — Forwarding of the draft supplementary budget No 2 of the Communities for 1975, p. 2 — Documents received, p. 2 — Decision on urgent procedure, p. 4 — Order of business, p. 4 — Limitation of speaking time, p. 5 — Action taken by the Commission on the opinions of Parliament, p. 5 — Draft Annual accounts of the European Parliament for the 1974 financial year, p. 6 — Draft of the second supplementary budget of the Communities for 1975, p. 7 — Agenda for next sitting, p. 11.	
<b>Sitting of Tuesday, 29 April 1975</b> .....	<b>12</b>
Approval of minutes, p. 14 — Documents received, p. 14 — Texts of Treaties forwarded by the Council, p. 14 — Question time, p. 15 — Debate immediately after Question time, p. 23 — Amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the Communities for 1975, p. 29 — Request for debate by urgent procedure and inclusion in the agenda, p. 46 — Amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the Communities for 1975, p. 47 — Supplementary budget No 2 of the Communities for 1975, p. 48 — Oral question with debate: humanitarian aid to Cyprus, p. 49 — Directive on equality of treatment between men and women workers, p. 52 — Oral question with debate: Community initiatives following on the National Conference on Emigration, p. 58 — Directive on the classification, packaging and labelling of pesticides, p. 69 — Agenda for next sitting, p. 72 — Annex: Questions which could not be answered during Question Time, with written answers, p. 73.	

(Continued overleaf)

#### NOTE TO READER

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

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

(Continued)

Sitting of Wednesday, 30 April 1975 ..... 75

Approval of minutes, p. 76 — Documents received, p. 76 — The Community's overall development cooperation policy, p. 77 — Welcome to Mrs Thatcher, p. 84 — The Community's overall development cooperation policy (cont.), p. 84 — Membership of committees, p. 93 — Regulation on the supply of skimmed milk powder as food aid, p. 94 — Directive and decision on the procedures of the Standing Veterinary Committee, p. 97 — Regulation fixing the market target price and the intervention price for olive oil for 1975/1976, p. 98 — Regulation laying down the trade arrangements applicable to certain goods processed from agricultural products, p. 106 — Regulation temporarily suspending the autonomous customs duties on certain agricultural products, p. 107 — Regulations on Community tariffs for bulls, cows and heifers of certain mountain breeds, p. 108 — Oral question with debate: Fishing sector, p. 109 — Directive on the reduction of water pollution caused by wood pulp mills, p. 114 — Beef imports, p. 117 — Date and agenda for next part-session, p. 124 — Adjournment of session, p. 125 — Approval of minutes, p. 126.

## SITTING OF MONDAY, 28 APRIL 1975

### Contents

1. Resumption of session .....	1	11. Action taken by the Commission on the opinions of Parliament:	
2. Apologies for absence .....	1	Mr Spinelli, member of the Commission of the European Communities ..	5
3. Appointment of members of the Audit Board .....	2	12. Draft annual accounts of the European Parliament for the 1974 financial year — Adoption without debate of the motion for a resolution contained in the interim report drawn up by Mr Gerlach on behalf of the Committee on Budgets (Doc. 58/75) .....	6
4. Membership of committees .....	2	13. Draft of the second supplementary budget of the Communities for 1975 (Doc. 55/75):	
5. Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council .....	2	Mr Aigner, rapporteur .....	7
6. Forwarding of the draft supplementary budget No 2 of the Communities for 1975 .....	2	Mr Deschamps, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group; Mr Lange, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Lord Reay, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Laudrin, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Spinelli, member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Aigner .....	7
7. Documents received .....	2	14. Agenda for next sitting .....	11
8. Decision on urgent procedure .....	4		
9. Order of business:			
Mr Lange .....	4		
10. Limitation of speaking time .....	5		

#### IN THE CHAIR: MR SPÉNALE

##### President

(The sitting was opened at 6.05 p.m.)

President. — The sitting is open.

##### 1. Resumption of session

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 11 April 1975.

##### 2. Apologies for absence

President. — Mr Calewaert and Lord Gladwyn regret their inability to attend the sittings of 29 April.

Mr Poher and our French Communist colleagues also regret their inability to attend tomorrow's sittings. They will be attending the funeral of Mr Jacques Duclos.

Mr Baas, Mr Bayerl, Mr Hartog, Mr Hougardy and Mr Starke regret their inability to attend this part-session.

### 3. *Appointment of members of the Audit Board*

**President.** — I have received from the President-in-Office of the Council a letter informing me that the Council has appointed Mr G. Freddi President of the Audit Board and Mr Bernard, Mr Burgert, Mr French, Mr Gaudy, Mr Hartig, Mr Johansen, Mr O'Maolchathaig and Mr Molitor as members.

Note is taken of these appointments.

### 4. *Membership of committees*

**President.** — I have received from the Socialist Group a request for the appointment of Mr Gerhard Flämig to the Committee on Development and Cooperation to replace Mr Ludwig Fellermaier.

Are there any objections?

The appointment is ratified.

### 5. *Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council*

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

- ACP-EEC Convention of Lomé with final act;
- Minutes of the signature of the ACP-EEC Convention of Lomé;
- Exchange of letters between the President of the Council of the European Communities and the President of the Council of Ministers of the African, Caribbean and Pacific States on the occasion of the signing of the ACP-EEC Convention in Lomé on 28 February 1975, relating to the setting up of an interim committee and the advance implementation of certain provisions of the Convention;
- Agreement on products within the province of the European Coal and Steel Community;
- Exchange of letters on cane sugar.

These documents will be filed in the European Parliament's archives.

### 6. *Forwarding of the draft supplementary budget No 2 of the Communities for 1975*

**President.** — I have received the draft supplementary budget No 2 of the European Communities for the financial year 1975 established by the Council of the European Communities (Doc. 52/75).

This document has been referred to the Committee on Budgets.

### 7. *Documents received*

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

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

— the communication from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council on Community financial and technical aid to non-associated developing countries 1976-1980 (Doc. 38/75).

This document was referred to the Committee on Development and Cooperation as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets for its opinion;

— three proposals for the transfer of appropriations from one Chapter to another in Section III—Commission—of the general budget for the 1975 financial year (Doc. 39/75).

This document was referred to the Committee on Budgets;

— the initial list of requests to carry forward appropriations from the financial year 1974 to the financial year 1975 (appropriations not carried forward automatically)—(Doc. 40/75).

This document was referred to the Committee on Budgets;

— the communication from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council on relations between the European Economic Community and the Associated Overseas Countries and Territories (OCT)—(Doc. 43/75).

This document was referred to the Committee on Development and Cooperation;

— the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation temporarily suspending the autonomous duties in the Common Customs Tariff on a number of agricultural products (Doc. 48/75).

This document was referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and to the Committee on External Economic Relations for its opinion;

— a letter from the Council of the European Communities concerning the resolu-

**President**

tion of the European Parliament of 8 April 1975 on the draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the European Communities for the financial year 1975 (Doc. 51/75).

This document was referred to the Committee on Budgets;

- the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation extending the scope of Regulation (EEC) No 1067/74 on the common organization on the market in dehydrated fodder to cover certain products processed from potatoes (Doc. 60/75).

This document was referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets for its opinion;

- the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation opening, allocating and providing for the administration of a Community tariff quota for apricot pulp falling within sub-heading ex 20. 06 B II c) 1 aa) of the Common Customs Tariff, originating in Israel (Doc. 61/75).

This document was referred to the Committee on External Economic Relations as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Agriculture for its opinion;

- the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation establishing general rules concerning the supply of milk fats as food aid under the 1975 programme to certain developing countries and international agencies (Doc. 62/75).

This document was referred to the Committee on Development and Cooperation;

- the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation amending Regulations (EEC) No 1408/71 and No 574/72 and relating to the standardization of the system of paying family benefits to workers the members of whose families reside in a Member State other than the country of employment (Doc. 63/75).

This document was referred to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

**(b) the following oral questions:**

- oral question with debate by Mr Scott-Hopkins on behalf of the Political Affairs

Committee to the Commission of the European Communities on humanitarian aid to Cyprus (Doc. 41/75);

- oral questions by Mr Broeks, Lord Reay, Mr Marras, Mr Herbert, Mr Lenihan, Mr Durieux, Mr Premoli, Mr Bordu, Mr Van der Hek, Mr Hougardy, Mr Normanton, Mr Nolan, Mrs Orth, Mr Gibbons, Mr Kavanagh, Mr Fellermaier, Mr Klepsch and Mr Girardin to the Council and Commission of the European Communities pursuant to Rule 47A of the Rules of Procedure for Question Time on 29 April 1975 (Doc. 46/75);

**(c) from the committees the following reports:**

- report by Mr Giovanni Bersani on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation on the Community's overall development cooperation policy (Doc. 42/75);
- report by Mr Heinz Frehsee on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 7/75) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1059/69 laying down the trade arrangements applicable to certain goods resulting from the processing of agricultural products (Doc. 44/75);
- report by Mr Helveg Petersen on behalf of the Committee on Cultural Affairs and Youth on the information programme for 1975 and a complementary information programme for 1975 (Doc. 45/75);
- report by Mr Camille Ney on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 8/75) for
  - I. a directive amending Directives Nos. 64/432/EEC, 64/433/EEC, 71/118/EEC, 72/461/EEC and 72/462/EEC as regards the procedures of the Standing Veterinary Committee
  - II. a decision amending Decision No 73/88/EEC as regards the procedures of the Standing Veterinary Committee (Doc. 47/75);
- report by Mr Willi Müller on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the communication from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 5/75) on

**President**

technological problems of nuclear safety, and draft resolution (Doc. 49/75);

- report by Mr Brøndlund Nielsen on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 19/75) for a regulation establishing the general rules concerning the supply of skimmed milk powder as food aid to certain developing countries and international organizations under the 1975 programme (Doc. 50/75);
- report by Mr Augusto Premoli on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 507/74) for a directive on the pollution of sea water and fresh water intended for bathing (quality objectives)—(Doc. 53/75);
- supplementary report by Mr Heinrich Aigner on behalf of the Committee on Budgets on the draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the European Communities for the financial year 1975 (Doc. 51/75)—(Doc. 54/75);
- report by Mr Heinrich Aigner on behalf of the Committee on Budgets on the draft supplementary budget No 2 of the European Communities for the financial year 1975 (Doc. 52/75)—(Doc. 55/75);
- report by Mr Frankie Hansen on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 48/75) for a regulation temporarily suspending the autonomous duties in the Common Customs Tariff on a number of agricultural products (Doc. 56/75);
- report by Mr Albert Liogier on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 20/75) for a regulation fixing the market target price and the intervention price for olive oil for the 1975/76 marketing year (Doc. 57/75);
- interim report by Mr Horst Gerlach on behalf of the Committee on Budgets on the draft accounts of the European Parliament for the financial year 1974 (1 January - 31 December 1974)—(Doc. 58/75);
- report by Mr Horst Gerlach on behalf of the Committee on Budgets on the pro-

posal (Doc. 502/74) for the amendment of the Statute of the European Investment Bank (Doc. 59/75).

**8. Decision on urgent procedure**

**President.** — I propose to deal by urgent procedure with the reports not submitted within the time limit laid down in the ruling of 11 May 1967.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

**9. Order of business**

**President.** — In accordance with the instructions given to me by the enlarged Bureau at its meeting of 2 April 1975, I have prepared the following draft agenda which has been distributed. The following three reports have been withdrawn:

- report by Mr Willy Müller on technological problems of nuclear safety
- report by Mr Härzschel on financial aid for the non-associated developing countries
- report by Mr Früh on dehydrated fodder.

Moreover, at the request of the committee responsible, I propose entering on the agenda for Tuesday, in place of Mr Willy Müller's report on technological problems of nuclear safety, the report by Mr Della Briotta on pesticides which had been entered on the agenda for Wednesday. Finally, an oral question with debate tabled by Mr Corrie on behalf of the European Conservative Group to the Commission of the European Communities on the fishing sector has been entered on the agenda for Wednesday, before Mr Premoli's report.

I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange.** — (D) According to the agenda voting will take place at 12 noon on Tuesday. But the telegrams you had sent to the Members of the House set the time for voting at 3 p.m. I feel that we should keep to the latter time, 3 p.m., in case Members have received the telegram but have not noted what the draft agenda says.

**President.** — Thank you for your comment, Mr Lange. The vote will indeed take place at 3 p.m. tomorrow. May I remind you that the draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the Communities for 1975 requires a qualified majority.

**President**

The agenda for this part-session will therefore be as follows:

**This afternoon:**

- Commission statement on action taken on the opinions of Parliament;
- Interim report by Mr Gerlach on the draft annual accounts of the European Parliament for 1974;
- Presentation and discussion of the report by Mr Aigner on the draft supplementary budget No 2 of the Communities for 1975.

**Tuesday, 29 April 1975**

10.00 a.m. and 3.00 p.m.:

- Question Time;
- Debate and vote on the supplementary report by Mr Aigner on the draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the Communities for 1975;
- Vote on the draft supplementary budget No 2 of the Communities for 1975 and on the motion for a resolution contained in Mr Aigner's report;
- Oral question with debate on humanitarian aid to Cyprus;
- Report by Lady Elles on equality of treatment between men and women workers;
- Oral question with debate on Community initiatives following the Conference on Emigration;
- Report by Mr Della Briotta on pesticides;

**Wednesday, 30 April 1975**

9.30 a.m. and 3.00 p.m.:

- Report by Mr Bersani on the Community's overall development cooperation policy;
- Report by Mr Nielsen on the general rules for the supply of skimmed milk powder as food aid;
- Report by Mr Ney on the procedures of the Standing Veterinary Committee;
- Report by Mr Liogier on olive oil prices for 1975/76;
- Report by Mr Frehsee on trade arrangements for certain goods processed from agricultural products;
- Report by Mr Hansen on suspension of customs duties on certain agricultural products;

- Report by Mr Baas on Community tariff quotas for bulls, cows and heifers;
- Oral question with debate on the fishing sector;
- Report by Mr Premoli on the reduction of water pollution by wood pulp mills.

Are there any objections?

The agenda is adopted.

I propose to fix the time limit for tabling draft amendments and proposals for modification to the draft supplementary budget No 2 and for tabling amendments to the modifications by the Council to the amendments adopted by Parliament to the draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 for 8 p.m. this evening.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

**10. Limitation of speaking time**

**President.** — Pursuant to Rule 31 of the Rules of Procedure I propose to limit speaking time as follows:

**Reports :**

- 15 minutes for the rapporteur and for one speaker on behalf of each group,
- 10 minutes for other speakers and
- 5 minutes for speakers on amendments.

**Oral questions with debate:**

- 10 minutes for the author of the question and
- 5 minutes for other speakers.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

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

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

I call Mr Spinelli.

**Mr Spinelli, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have the honour to inform you of the action taken by the Commission on the opinions and proposals of the

**Spinelli**

European Parliament at its previous part-sessions.

1. Because of the aggravation of the situation in South Vietnam, the Commission decided on 16 April 1975, in accordance with the resolution adopted by the European Parliament on 10 April 1975, and with the Council discussions of 14 April, to send initial supplies of aid for the populations affected.

This aid is to benefit the whole of those populations, whether they are in the area administered by the government of the Republic of Vietnam or in that controlled by the provisional revolutionary government of South Vietnam. It is assigned as follows:

- to the international Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC): 100 metric tons of skimmed milk powder and 1 000 metric tons of milled rice, for delivery cif. These quantities are the maxima the Commission was authorized to make available on behalf of the Community in application of the outline agreement concluded with the Red Cross on 3 February 1975. The procedure for sending this aid was initiated on 7 April.
- to UNICEF: an amount of 300 000 u.a., under Article 400 of the Commission budget (aid to disaster victims). This aid largely represents a supplement to the food aid of 590 metric tons of skimmed milk powder decided on by the Council on 14 April under the 1975 programme: this financial contribution will in fact be used to purchase 100 metric tons of sugar to add to the milk rations intended for children, to transport about 100 tons of milk by air, and to purchase medicine, clothes, etc.

The Commission is aware that these provisions, representing a total amount of 1 126 000 u.a. will probably be insufficient, and is considering proposing further action as soon as it has more detailed information on the scale and nature of the need.

2. In the resolution in the report by Mr Dondelinger on the programme to combat poverty, Parliament expresses disappointment at the fact that this programme had been submitted by the Commission in the form of a note and not in the more binding form of a Council decision.

The Commission has taken account of Parliament's suggestion, and drew up on 16 April 1975 the text of a resolution, which was sent to the Council on 18 April. The contents of this decision are identical to those of the communication on which you expressed your opinion.

3. Regarding the reports by Mr Walkhoff on dangerous substances and by Mr Notenboom on duty-free importation of small consignments not for commercial purposes, I would inform Parliament that the Commission has already submitted to the Council amendments in accordance with the answer given at the plenary sittings in this House.

As far as the draft directive on alcoholometers, dealt with in the report by Mr Mitterdorfer, is concerned, a proposed alteration of the draft directive to accord with Parliament's resolution will be submitted to the Council in the next few days.

4. Following the report by Mr Seefeld (adopted by the European Parliament on 11 June 1974), the Commission has decided to alter its proposals relating to the setting up of a committee on youth problems and the setting up of a consultative committee on youth, hereinafter called the European Youth Forum.

In its revised proposal (forwarded to the Council on 7 March), the Commission accepted almost all the amendments proposed by Parliament. As regards the setting up of the 'Forum', the Commission has added a few amendments, by agreement with international youth organizations. These concern in particular the possibility, but not the obligation, to subdivide the Forum into several sections. Finally, the Forum's running expenses will be charged to the Community budget under a different chapter from the 'Kreyssig Fund', which is intended to provide aid for action programmes in the context of the youth programme.

**President.** — I thank Mr Spinelli for his statement, which is of special importance in the light of Parliament's exercise of its rights in respect of Community legislation.

*12. Draft annual accounts of the European Parliament for the 1974 financial year*

**President.** — The next item is the vote without debate on the motion for a resolution contained in the interim report drawn up by Mr Gerlach on behalf of the Committee on Budgets on the draft annual accounts of the European Parliament for the 1974 financial year (1 January - 31 December 1974) (Doc. 58/75).

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 111 of 20. 5. 1975.



13. *Draft of the second supplementary budget of the Communities for 1975*

**President.** — The next item is a debate on the report drawn up by Mr Aigner on behalf of the Committee on Budgets on the draft of the second supplementary budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1975 (Doc. 55/75).

I call Mr Aigner.

**Mr Aigner, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, honourable Members, what I have to say largely follows on from the discussion on Community action in favour of the Third World. This House has already debated the Cheysson Fund, as it is known. I would remind you that the Community has undertaken to donate \$500 million to a UN fund for aid to the poorest in the Third World.

This supplementary budget, Mr President, covers what will probably be the last instalment of the donation to the United Nations' programme of immediate assistance. It amounts to \$100 million or 83 million u.a.

Mr President, there has never been any difference of opinion or discussion on the amount involved. This supplementary budget has consequently not given rise to any dispute between the Council and Parliament.

In this case, we have refrained from applying the conciliation procedure, even though we did not agree on one point: the classification of the funds. As you know, both the Council and the Commission told Parliament that they would like to see these funds classified as compulsory pursuant to the Luxembourg Agreement. Parliament has never been in any doubt that they should be regarded as non-compulsory and thus subject to Parliament's budgetary powers, and Parliament sticks to this view. Although Parliament is prepared to accept international agreements concluded by the Community, it must be made absolutely clear to the Council that in future Parliament must have a right of co-decision where such agreements are concerned and that the conciliation procedure must also apply to such matters.

I feel that although we have not applied the conciliation procedure in this case, so that this humanitarian aid can be given without delay, this Parliament must not allow anything to undermine its basic rights under the Luxembourg Agreement.

Mr President, I would make a point of saying that the views of the Committee on Budgets

of this Parliament on classification have not changed in any way. We have foregone the possibility of applying the conciliation procedure in this case so that action can be taken quickly. I would, however, expressly draw the Council's and Commission's attention to the fact that they should not see this as giving them any additional rights when it comes to the 1976 budgetary procedure.

With this reservation, I ask the House to approve our motion for a resolution.

(Applause)

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

**Mr Deschamps.** — (F) Mr President, Parliament knows that both in this Chamber and in committee. I have always strongly opposed the idea that Community could not to meet all its obligations to contribute to the Cheysson Fund.

I could not and I still cannot believe that it is not possible to find a way of including in the budget of the Communities amounts for purchasing and transporting emergency food aid for so many starving people in the world. I am therefore delighted that this solution has been found and I hope it will be unanimously approved.

Much courage and political sense was required of some of you before this result could be achieved. The principle stubbornly defended by the Committee on Budgets and Mr Aigner in particular affects us all. He is speaking on behalf of us all when he takes a firm stand on the classification problem. At a time when at last Parliament will shortly be elected by direct universal suffrage and when it hopes to have its rights legally extended, it would be out of the question for it to give up the rights it is already acknowledged to have or not to request as much control of the budget as possible for us who represent the peoples of Europe.

The main characteristic of a good strategy is a well-chosen battle-field. Appropriations for the Cheysson Fund were not, however, a good choice for a battle of principle. The European Parliament would not strengthen its position and its chances of gaining public support for its legal point of view if it provoked all men of feeling in Europe and the world. The members of the Committee on Budgets and the rapporteur were well aware of this. They themselves, being men of feeling and thus conscious of the most immediate, tragic and cruel problems of under-development, decided to take up the just and legitimate battle they are fighting

**Deschamps**

at a later date and in a different area, where we will join them.

By taking up this position, the European Parliament can say today that it wanted the European Community as a whole to meet in full the obligations it entered into towards the most unfortunate peoples of the world, without giving up any of its rights. Although we note with regret that even today the so-called great powers do not seem to want to play their full part in this effort, we nevertheless note with pleasure that some who seemed to delay making a contribution have now done so. That is why we Europeans have today decided to play our part.

Mr President, the Committee on Budgets' rapporteur has said that he hoped we would be able unanimously to approve the inclusion of 150 million u.a. in our budget so that the honour of the European Parliament and of Europe will be saved in the task of saving the most unfortunate peoples of the world. I, like him, believe that we should unanimously carry out what is merely our basic duty.

*(Applause)*

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

**Mr Lange.** — *(D)* Mr President, honourable Members, the Socialist Group—I can say this straight away without reservation—supports the motion for a resolution tabled by the Committee on Budgets. It therefore approves the purpose and amount as set out in the budget submitted to us by the Council. There is just one matter to be settled.

In another context, which we shall be discussing tomorrow morning, meetings were held with the Council on two days, 15 and 22 April, during which the Council had intended to discuss this supplementary budget with the delegation from Parliament. But as it did not have an opportunity to do this, no conciliation took place, and consequently no agreement was reached on classification, by the Council and Parliament, a matter which, as you know, must be decided unanimously.

I need not stress that the Socialist Group's position on this is the same as Parliament's generally, that Parliament's rights must be safeguarded. But I do feel, ladies and gentlemen, that a very slight distinction must be made, not as regards our rights, but as to the nature of the expenditure. What we have here are international obligations entered into by the Community, and Parliament has not the slightest interests in blocking these international

obligations. Nevertheless, Parliament must state very clearly today that it sets store by having a say when such international obligations are entered into. They cannot simply be a matter for the Council and Commission; Parliament must also be involved, since we know of course that such international agreements usually have to be ratified by the national parliaments of at least some of the Member States. If they are subject to no control whatsoever, I feel that this Parliament would also find itself in an unfavourable position. However, the question then arises as to whether the qualification 'compulsory' or 'non-compulsory' can be maintained in the case of expenditure incurred as a result of international obligations. In this case I should not like to dwell on these terms 'compulsory' and 'non-compulsory', but merely say that Parliament should be involved in such international agreements.

And if we now add this category of expenditure, Mr President, honourable Members, to the other two, we have in effect a third category of expenditure. And this in itself makes it clear how pointless the division into compulsory and non-compulsory really is.

Discussions should therefore take place between Parliament and the Council, with the Commission possibly involved, since this will lead to more reasonable budgeting which comes closer to meeting requirements and in which Parliament has a decisive say. I cannot envisage things developing in any other way, Mr President, for as we see in this case, we are concerned with a decisive political question, and everything that will undoubtedly be said tomorrow about the first supplementary budget will be more political than budgetary in nature. We must of course safeguard Parliament's rights, but in such a way that it is possible to draw up the budget in a reasonable way, with Parliament having a say. With this in mind, the Socialist Group unanimously supports this motion for a resolution on the secondary supplementary budget.

**President.** — I call Lord Reay to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

**Lord Reay.** — Mr President, we in this group also support the adoption of this supplementary budget and we agree with the opinion of Mr Aigner, the rapporteur, that, in view of the exceptional, urgent and humanitarian nature of this expenditure, the budget should be adopted, notwithstanding the fact that there has been no conciliation between the Council and the Parliament on the question of classification and

**Lord Reay**

that there are differences of opinion on this matter.

This budget will account for the second instalment of the Cheysson Fund and we hope will be the last instalment which will need to be covered by special budgetary provision. Because of the once-and-for-all nature of the fund, Parliament would not be winning any future right to vary the amount under it if in fact it insisted on the recognition of its claims that the expenditure should be classified as non-obligatory.

The first instalment under this fund provided for \$150 000 000, of which \$30 000 000 was paid into the United Nations special fund. This second instalment covers a further \$100 000 000 of which \$33 000 000 will be paid in the United Nations fund. The promised target for the Community contribution under the fund is \$500 000 000. The Council, at its meeting of 23 January, promised that if Member States' contributions under the scheme have not covered the balance between the \$250 000 000 and the \$500 000 000 by 1 June, then this balance will be paid for out of the Community's own budget. The condition of making the payment of the full amount dependent on others making comparable payments has therefore apparently been dropped.

The Community has now unconditionally committed itself to the payment of the full and originally promised amount. The only open question as I see it is whether a further supplementary budget will, in fact, be necessary, and it would be interesting to hear whether the Commissioner can enlighten us at this moment on that matter.

In fact, in its communication of 17 January, concerning this second instalment, the Commission reported favourably on the response of other donor countries to the most seriously affected developing countries. For example, they gave the OECD estimate that emergency payments by OPEC countries for those developing countries most seriously affected in the years 1974 and 1975, and which strictly satisfy the criteria laid down by the United Nations and the Community, will total \$1 760 000 000. Mr President, the Cheysson Fund has been one of the principal means of diversification of Community aid to non-associated countries. Out of the first instalment, \$80 000 000 out of \$120 000 000 was dispersed directly to non-associated developing countries who were also members of the Commonwealth. In other words, the Cheysson Fund has already made nonsense of the claim that the Community has done nothing for developing countries with whom it does not have special relationships. We believe

that it was a generous fund, humanely conceived, and we hope that the obligation which the Community entered into in June 1974 will be fully and finally discharged as soon as possible.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Laudrin to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

**Mr Laudrin.** — *(F)* Mr President, honourable Members, in our opinion there are two sides to supplementary budget No 2; a budgetary one with which we are concerned today, and a development policy one which will be discussed at greater length tomorrow in connection with the Bersani report and to which Mr Deschamps has referred briefly.

From a budgetary point of view, the size of the second instalment of the Community contribution to United Nations emergency aid presents no particular difficulty for our group, but our conception of development policy could give rise to some general comments. We, like Mr Lange, note with regret that once more classification of the nature of the expenditure has resulted in a difference of opinion between the Council and the European Parliament. The same difficulty has arisen in the case of the Cheysson Fund as in the case of the Regional Fund.

Since, as the Council admits, classification of the expenditure should be agreed between the institutions, what might happen when there is a difference of opinion?

No legal measures have been proposed for solving it. We have thus to resort to subterfuge; acting as though the expenditure was obligatory or not or as though we had forgotten to classify it. We have thus found a solution to our regular difference of opinion with the Council on the classification of the nature of the expenditure. While we understand the reasons for resorting to supplementary budgets fairly frequently, we feel we must deplore the fact that Community action is not more broadly planned in the general budget so that the institutions are not subjected to budgetary discussions which take up all their time throughout the financial year which might sometimes even bring them into disrepute.

The Group of European Progressive Democrats welcomes the fact that the Council has quickly released 250 of the 500 million dollars originally earmarked for the purpose, although it bitterly regrets that the other industrialized countries do not seem to be as willing as the Community to aid underprivileged countries.

**Laudrin**

Let me remind you here that we are all aware of the fact that the Cheysson plan should be regarded as an exceptional measure taken as the result of an exceptional situation, and should in no account become the starting-point for a development policy. The purpose of development aid is to enable such populations to live normally with their own resources and it should not therefore merely take the form of alms. Mr Cheysson's dynamic action is thus of great benefit to those who are now suffering from famine, but at the same time it is more necessary than ever to define a new world economic order if we are to abolish the climate of despair in which millions of men, women and children live.

The Group of European Progressive Democrats will thus vote for supplementary budget No 2 in the view that it meets an essential human need.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Since all the speakers seem agreed, I do not think Mr Spinelli will encounter any difficulties in this House.

I would be grateful, Mr Spinelli, if you could reply perhaps to the question raised by Mr Lange on the drafting, preparation and conclusion of international agreements when they involve Community expenditure. Mr Giraud has drawn up a report, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on improving the participation of Parliament in this kind of agreement.

We should be happy to hear the Commission's views on this matter.

I call Mr Spinelli.

**Mr Spinelli, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — *(I)* Mr President, I shall be very brief. I should like first of all to say to Lord Reay that we do not envisage a need for another supplementary budget, since between EEC contributions and bilateral aid, the undertaking we had taken has been almost completely covered.

Regarding the answer to Mr Lange, Mr President, I should like to ask you to give the Commission a little time to think about the question. We shall answer at the earliest opportunity, as soon as it becomes possible.

All that remains for me to do is to congratulate Parliament on the vote it is about to take and on the way in which it defends its rights.

**President.** — I call Mr Aigner.

**Mr Aigner, rapporteur.** — *(D)* In view of what has been said, I should like to add a few remarks.

Firstly, I am very grateful to Lord Reay for stating quite clearly here that the funds covered by this supplementary budget are not intended for the associated partners of the Community, but are part of a universal programme of aid. In this connection I should like to quote two figures: Bangladesh will receive 22 million from the first and 13 million from the second instalment, India 15 million from the first and 25 million from the second instalment in 1975; in other words, these two Asian countries alone will have received the major share of Community funds.

If you look at the other sums—I do not want to list them all—going, for example, to the African countries, you will realize that this is really a universal activity, and I feel we should thank the Commission for this. It is one of the most exemplary activities that the Commission has ever set in motion, and I believe that it represents a formula which can also be accepted by third parties for the way in which industrial countries can find solutions to their own problems—which we of course have as a result of the oil crisis—that are not to the detriment of the Third World, but take full account of the distress of others in an atmosphere of genuine solidarity.

Mr President, in reply to what Mr Lange said, I should like to point out that there is a formula which all three institutions should really accept, and that is the formula, Mr Lange, that the Council set out in the explanatory memorandum, which is Volume 7 of the 1975 general budget, where the question of classification was for the first time discussed in full. This states quite clearly that any expenditure which an institution cannot itself decide, but is the subject of obligations entered into under legal acts adopted earlier, i.e. before 1975, is considered as compulsory expenditure. I would therefore ask the Commission when preparing future agreements or the Council when concluding future agreements which touch on Parliament's budgetary rights, to apply the conciliation procedure in good time. This should in fact be a matter of course, seeing that the Luxembourg Agreement prescribes it; Parliament and the Council approved the Luxembourg Agreement, and our national parliaments ratified it. All three institutions are therefore under an obligation to put into practice the will of our national parliaments.

Such international obligations cannot be entered into by the Council or Commission alone; Par-

**Alger**

liament must maintain its rights in this respect. I would therefore appeal to the Commission not to think about it too long, but to keep to the Council's wording, according to which the Council and Parliament can only enter obligations of a budgetary nature jointly.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

Thank you Mr Spinelli.

May I remind you that the vote on the draft supplementary and amending budgets Nos 1 and 2 will take place tomorrow at 3 p.m.

*14. Agenda for next sitting*

**President.** — The next sitting will be held tomorrow, Tuesday, 29 April with the following agenda:

*10.00 a.m. and afternoon:*

- Question Time;
- Oral question with debate on humanitarian aid to Cyprus;
- Report by Lady Elles on equality of treatment for men and women workers;
- Oral question with debate on Community initiatives following the Conference on Emigration;
- Report by Mr Della Briotta on pesticides;

*3.00 p.m.:*

- Vote on the draft supplementary budgets No 1 and No 2.

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 6.45 p.m.)*

## SITTING OF TUESDAY, 29 APRIL 1975

### Contents

<p>1. Approval of the minutes ..... 14</p> <p>2. Documents received ..... 14</p> <p>3. Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council ..... 14</p> <p>4. Question time (Doc. 46/75):</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Questions to the Council of the European Communities:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Question No 1 by Mr Broeksz: Expediting of Community decision-making procedures:</p> <p style="padding-left: 60px;">Mr FitzGerald, President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities; Mr Broeksz; Mr FitzGerald; Mr Fellermaier; Mr FitzGerald ..... 15</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Question No 2 by Lord Reay: Amalgamation of embassies of Member States:</p> <p style="padding-left: 60px;">Mr FitzGerald; Lord Reay; Mr FitzGerald; Mr Fellermaier; Mr FitzGerald ..... 16</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Question No 3 by Mr Marras: Measures to guarantee Italian migrant workers the right to take part in the elections to be held on 15 June 1975 (See Annex)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Question No 4 by Mr Herbert: Regional Fund:</p> <p style="padding-left: 60px;">Mr FitzGerald; Mr Lenihan; Mr FitzGerald ..... 16</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Questions to the Commission of the European Communities:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Question No 5 by Mr Lenihan: Regional Fund:</p> <p style="padding-left: 60px;">Mr Thomson, member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Lenihan; Mr Thomson, Mr Lenihan; Mr Johnston; Mr Thomson; Mr Cifarelli; Mr Thomson ..... 17</p>	<p style="padding-left: 40px;">Question No 6 by Mr Durieux: Creation of a European Regional Development Fund:</p> <p style="padding-left: 60px;">Mr Thomson ..... 18</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Question No 7 by Mr Premoli: Establishment of a regional policy committee (withdrawn) ..... 18</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Question No 8 by Mr Bordu: Chilean external debt (held over) ..... 18</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Question No 9 by Mr Van der Hek: Preparatory conference on energy:</p> <p style="padding-left: 60px;">Sir Christopher Soames, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Van der Hek; Sir Christopher Soames; Mr Della Briotta; Sir Christopher Soames; Mr Espersen; Sir Christopher Soames; Mr Suck; Sir Christopher Soames ..... 19</p> <p style="padding-left: 60px;">(See debate following Question Time)</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Question No 10 by Mr Hougardy: Harmonization of oil product prices (held over) ..... 20</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Question No 11 by Mr Normanton: Recycling of waste products:</p> <p style="padding-left: 60px;">Mr Cheysson, member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Normanton; Mr Cheysson ..... 20</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Question No 12 by Mr Nolan: Dumping of radioactive waste in the eastern Atlantic (See Annex) ..... 21</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Question No 13 by Mrs Orth: Annual Commission report on structures for the fishing industry:</p> <p style="padding-left: 60px;">Mr Thomson, member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mrs Orth; Mr Thomson; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Thomson ..... 21</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Question No 14 by Mr Gibbons: Aids for casein (See Annex) ..... 21</p>
--	--

Question No 15 by Mr Kavanagh: Conciliation procedure relating to transport infrastructure:		Mr Aigner; Mr Maigaard; Mr Cheysson, member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Fitzgerald, President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities; Mr Aigner .....	33
Mr Cheysson, member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Normanton; Mr Cheysson .....	21		
Question No 16 by Mr Fellermaier and No 17 by Mr Klepsch: Presence of the Commission at the 19th Meeting of the EEC/Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee from 21 to 25 April 1975 in Copenhagen .....	22	7. Request for debate by urgent procedure and inclusion in the agenda (Doc. 67/75):	
Question No 18 by Mr Girardin on the absence of the Commission from the meeting of the EEC/Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee:		Mr Liogier; Mr Deschamps; Mr Fellermaier, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Gibbons, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats .....	46
Sir Christopher Soames, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Fellermaier; Sir Christopher Soames; Mr Klepsch; Sir Christopher Soames .....	22	8. Amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the Communities for 1975 (Doc. 54/75) (Vote) .....	47
5. Debate immediately after Question Time:		Adoption of resolution .....	48
Mr Van der Hek .....	23	9. Supplementary budget No 2 of the Communities for 1975 (Doc. 55/75) (Vote) .....	48
Procedural motion: Mr Fellermaier ..	23	Adoption of resolution .....	48
Mr Normanton; Sir Christopher Soames, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Espersen; Mr Leonardi; Mr Springorum; Mr Fitzgerald, President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities; Mr Fellermaier; Sir Christopher Soames .....	24	10. Oral question with debate: Humanitarian aid to Cyprus (Doc. 41/75):	
6. Amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the Communities for 1975 —		Mr Scott-Hopkins, author of the question; Mr Cheysson, member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Fellermaier, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Lord Bethell; Mr Cheysson, Mr Scott-Hopkins .....	49
Debate on a supplementary report drawn up by Mr Aigner on behalf of the Committee on Budgets (Doc. 54/75):		11. Directive on equality of treatment between men and women workers — Debate on a report drawn up by Lady Elles on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment (Doc. 24/75):	
Mr Aigner, rapporteur .....	29	Lady Elles, rapporteur .....	53
Mr Kirk, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee Mr Artzinger, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group; Mr Lange, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Shaw, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Johnston, on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group; Mr Cointat, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Fabbrini, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Brugger; Mr Albertsen; Mr Maigaard; Mr Bersani; Mr McDonald;		Mr Härzschel, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group; Mrs Carrettoni Romagnoli, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Dykes, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Glinne, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mrs Orth, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Cifarelli, Mr Alfred Bertrand, chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment; Mr Hillery, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities .....	53
		Adoption of resolution .....	68

<p>12. <i>Oral question with debate: Community initiatives following on the National Conference on Emigration (Doc. 32/75):</i> <i>Mr Andreotti</i> ..... 69</p> <p>13. <i>Directive on the classification, packaging and labelling of pesticides — Debate on a report drawn up by Mr Della Briotta on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment (Doc. 16/75):</i></p>	<p><i>Mr Della Briotta, rapporteur</i> ..... 69</p> <p><i>Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Spice; Mr Hillery, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities</i> ..... 70</p> <p><i>Adoption of resolution</i> ..... 72</p> <p>14. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i> ..... 72</p> <p><i>Annex: Questions, which could not be answered during Question Time, with written answers</i> ..... 73</p>
---	--

IN THE CHAIR: MR SPÉNALE

*President*

*(The sitting was opened at 11.05 a.m.)*

**President.** — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. *Documents received*

**President.** — I have received the following documents:

(a) an oral question with debate put by Mr Corrie on behalf of the European Conservative Group to the Commission of the European Communities on the fishing sector (Doc. 64/75);

(b) from the committees, the following reports:

— report by Mr Knud Thomsen on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations on the recommendation from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a decision approving the exchange of letters between the European Economic Community and the Kingdom of Norway concerning the establishment by Norway of fishing zones closed to trawlers at certain times of the year (Doc. 65/75);

— report by Mr Willem Scholten on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive

on the coordination of laws, regulations and administrative provisions governing the commencement and carrying on of the business of credit institutions (Doc. 66/75).

3. *Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council*

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

— Agreement between the European Community and the Arab Republic of Egypt on the supply of butteroil as food aid;

— Agreement between the European Community and the Republic of Afghanistan on the supply of skimmed milk powder as food aid;

— Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Bolivia on the supply of common wheat as food aid;

— Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Republic of India on the supply of common wheat as food aid;

— Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Indonesia on the supply of skimmed milk powder as food aid;

— Agreement between the European Economic Community and the International Committee of the Red Cross on the supply of cereals, butteroil and skimmed milk powder as food aid;

— Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Yemen Arab Republic on the supply of skimmed milk powder as food aid;

— Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Lebanese Republic on the supply of butteroil as food aid;



**President**

- Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Lebanese Republic on the supply of skimmed milk powder as food aid;
- Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Islamic Republic of Mauritania on the supply of skimmed milk powder and butteroil as food aid;
- Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Islamic Republic of Mauritania on the supply of common wheat as food aid;
- Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Niger on the supply of sorghum as food aid;
- Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on the supply of butteroil as food aid;
- Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on the supply of skimmed milk powder as food aid;
- Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on the supply of common wheat as food aid;
- Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Democratic Republic of Sudan on the supply of skimmed milk powder as food aid;
- Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Eastern Republic of Uruguay on the supply of skimmed milk powder as food aid.

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

#### 4. Question Time

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is Question Time, pursuant to the provisions of Rule 47 A (1) of the Rules of Procedure. The text of the questions has been published in Doc. 46/75.

I would ask Members to put their questions strictly in accordance with the conditions laid down in those provisions.

We shall begin with the questions addressed to the Council of the European Communities.

I invite the President-in-Office of the Council to answer these questions and any supplementaries.

I call Question No 1 by Mr Broeks, the text of which is as follows:

'What actual measures has the Council taken since its note of 7 February 1974 on "practical measures concerning the Council's work"—drawn up partly in response to the fourth subparagraph of paragraph 15 of the Declaration of the Summit Conference held on 19-21 October 1972 in Paris—"to expedite the decision-making procedures in the Community" and thus give effect to paragraph 6 of the above note?'

**Mr FitzGerald, President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities.** — Mr President, since the measures taken by the Council on 23 July 1973 and 4-5 February 1974, about which the European Parliament has been informed, steady progress has been made in improving the decision-making procedures and the coherence of Community action thanks firstly, to the implementation of the measures adopted and, secondly, to the steps taken in this matter following the last Paris Summit Conference.

In this connection I should like to refer the honourable Member to the statement which I made to the European Parliament on 19 February last and in which I outlined the steps which the President-in-Office of the Council proposed to take in this matter.

**Mr Broeks.** — (NL) Mr President, I understand that the President-in-Office of the Council, whom I thank for his reply, asks at the beginning of each Council meeting whether there are questions of vital interest to individual Member States on the agenda. Could Mr FitzGerald tell us whether Member States often invoke 'vital interests' with the result that decisions are effectively taken by a minority, possibly even a minority of one single country; this is a highly undemocratic procedure vis-as-vis the majority, and it was apparently applied again recently in the matter of the Parliament's budgetary powers over the Regional Fund.

**Mr FitzGerald.** — Mr President, I think the answer is that in the period since January there have not been many instances where this has happened. But in further explanation I ought to say that the agenda of the Council includes many matters which are matters of political orientation rather than formal decision, many matters which are matters for formal decision by unanimity and, in the particular period in question at any rate, not very many matters which can be decided formally under the Treaties by methods other than unanimity. In other words, the question has not in fact arisen very often. I ought to add by way of explanation that the matter which you raised, is one that

**FitzGerald**

does require unanimity under the Treaties and where, therefore, this issue did not arise.

**Mr Fellermaier.** — (D) Mr President of the Council, can you tell the House whether the solution of abstaining is being used more frequently in the Council to enable the latter to reach its decisions rather more quickly than has often been the case in the past?

**Mr FitzGerald.** — Well, yes, that too does happen from time to time. And, moreover, it is fair to say that there are many matters in which agreement is reached by discussion and argument and where the formal question of voting does not arise because people do allow themselves to be persuaded by argument and to withdraw whatever objections they may have. The procedure in the Council is perhaps less formal in this respect than may be indicated by the question you are asking and the formal reply I have given.

**President.** — I call Question No 2 by Lord Reay, the text of which is as follows:

'Has the Council considered the possibility of amalgamating the embassies of Member States into a single Community embassy in any third country?'

**Mr FitzGerald, President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities.** — Mr President, the Council has not envisaged the possibility of reorganizing Member States' embassies in third countries into a single Community embassy since this matter is outside its jurisdiction.

**Lord Reay.** — Would the Council be in a position to set up a working group which could study the matter of the amalgamation of Member States' diplomatic missions, estimate the possible cost savings that could be made by doing so and study the question as to whether political cooperation has proceeded far enough for this to be feasible at this time or not? In the meantime, is there a possibility that the embassies of the Member States which at any one time had the presidency of the Council could be made responsible in Community matters for the Community's representation in third countries?

**Mr FitzGerald.** — As far as the Council is concerned, the matter which the honourable Member has raised is one which does not come within the Council's competence. The question of diplomatic representation is in fact an inter-governmental matter and the Council has no function in the matter.

On the question of the way in which the embassies of Community countries in third countries perform their functions in relation to Community matters, there is, of course, close coordination and the practice of regular meetings under the chairmanship of the ambassador of the country that holds the presidency at that time. These coordination arrangements have, I think, worked very satisfactorily and are an important new practical element in the diplomatic arrangements, but of course each country is still individually represented.

**Mr Fellermaier.** — (D) Mr President of the Council, am I right in supposing that this question is being studied in the context of European political cooperation? If so, would you be willing, as representative of the Foreign Ministers, to give more precise information to the Political Affairs Committee under the Davignon procedure, than you can do now as President of the Council?

**Mr FitzGerald.** — As President of the Council and answering questions on behalf of the Council, I am not in a position to say much about that. But there has been some discussion of one aspect of this in regard to political cooperation and it is a matter on which in due course further information may be available, but I am not suggesting that it is likely that the procedure which you have suggested will come into effect.

**President.** — Question No 3 by Mr Marras will be answered in writing, since the author is not present.

I call Question No 4 by Mr Herbert, who will be replaced by Mr Lenihan. The text of the question is as follows:

'Does the Council consider that the recent statement by the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers "that a majority of Member States will opt to use fund assistance in part repayment to their exchequers of expenditure on state aids rather than apply it to increase the level of aid granted to some individual projects" is contrary to the spirit and the intention of the Regional Fund which is to supplement national aids and not to be a substitute for them?'

**Mr FitzGerald, President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities.** — Article 4 paragraph 2 (a) of Regulation EEC No 724/75 establishing a European Regional Development Fund provides as follows: 'The contribution from the Fund thus defined may, pursuant to a prior decision of the Member State concerned communicated at the same time as the request for

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

**FitzGerald**

this contribution, either supplement aid granted to the relevant investment by public authorities or remain credited to those authorities and considered as a partial repayment of such aid'.

It will be clear therefore that a decision by Member States to opt to use Fund assistance in part repayment to their exchequers of expenditure on state aids, rather than apply it to increase the level of aid granted to some individual projects, is not contrary to the spirit and intention of the Regional Fund.

I should like, Mr President, if I may, to add a short remark in my capacity as an Irish Minister. In the statement referred to in the question, my colleague Mr Ryan also indicated that, as far as Ireland was concerned, he favoured the option of the repayment system under which monies received from the Fund by his country would be used to finance an increased volume of industrial and infrastructural investment as distinct from increasing the aid given to individual projects. The idea of using the receipts from the Fund under the repayment system to finance an increased volume of regional investment rather than increasing the aid to individual projects is shared by a number of other delegations.

**Mr Lenihan.** — Mr President, would the President-in-Office not agree that there is a very grave danger in the situation where Member States may use Regional Fund payments not as supplementary payments to regional aid projects but as supplanting particular Member State projects? Is there not a risk that in that type of situation regional aid may just be used to finance national budgetary deficits? Would this not be totally counter to the whole principle behind the establishment of a Regional Fund?

**Mr FitzGerald.** — The question of which way the aid is likely to be most effective depends upon the circumstances of the country. Where in a country particular forms of aid are already at a rate, in terms of percentage of the total cost, which seems adequate to induce investment, it would seem much more in accordance with the spirit and purpose of the Fund to increase the total volume of investment rather than to give more aid to projects which are already receiving enough aid to generate the necessary activity.

**President.** — We shall now proceed to the questions put to the Commission of the European Communities.

I invite the competent Commissioner to answer these questions and any supplementaries.

I call Question No 5 by Mr Lenihan, the text of which is as follows:

'Does the Commission consider that the recent statement by the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers "that a majority of Member States will opt to use fund assistance in part repayment to their exchequers of expenditure on state aids rather than apply it to increase the level of aid granted to some individual projects" is contrary to the spirit and the intention of the Regional Fund which is to supplement national aids and not to be a substitute for them?'

**Mr Thomson,** *member of the Commission of the European Communities.* — Mr President, in such cases it is not the Commission's practice to comment!

**Mr Lenihan.** — I appreciate the position in which the Commission finds itself, Mr President, because what we have here quite clearly on the record is a situation where the Council of Ministers has departed from the spirit and the principle and the intention behind the establishment of the Regional Fund as presented to us in the initial documentation from the Commission. It was clearly stated by Commissioner Thomson and indeed stated by all speakers in this Parliament who supported the establishment of a Regional Fund, that the Fund would be used to supplement national aids rather than used by national states to supplant existing national schemes and thereby act as a simple aid or hand-out to get them out of their budgetary difficulties.

I must say I appreciate the Commissioner's deference on this occasion; but if I cannot press him to answer to any greater degree, I take it that in itself is a tacit admission that what I am suggesting is a fact.

**Mr Thomson.** — No Sir, the honourable Member must not make that assumption. I was brought up in the parliamentary tradition where there was a convention that one Ministry did not comment on the other, and I think there is an equally good tradition in the Community that the Council and the Commission do not comment on each others' comments. That is all that can be inferred from my opening remarks.

On the honourable Member's remarks, I think there is a misunderstanding here. There are two distinct problems. There is the question as to whether the Regional Development Fund's contribution to an individual project should be added to what the Member State already gives or not. The regulation explicitly stated that that is at the discretion of the Member State. Then there is the quite separate question—the very importance one—as to whether the contributions from the Community's Regional Development

**Thomson**

Fund should be additional to the total resources made available for regional policies by Member States.

In the preamble of the regulation it is made clear that the Member States commit themselves to the general proposition that the totality of resources should be additional; certainly this has always been the Commission's view, and I have stated many times from this rostrum that there really is no case for a Community Regional Development Fund unless, in the end, it means that additional resources are made available to help with the regional problems. But that is quite distinct from the question of whether the contribution from the fund should be added to what a Member State gives to an individual project.

**Mr Lenihan.** — I want to thank the Commissioner for his statement that the fund in its totality should be additional, and I hope that Member States follow that in practice.

**President.** — May I remind Members that questions should be put consisely.

**Mr Johnston.** — Would Mr Thomson agree that the question of whether or not regional aid provided by the Community would be applied directly and would not result in any reduction on regional projects by a Member State was discussed at length with him by the Committee on Regional Policy and Transport of this Parliament during 1973 and that the committee was unanimous in its opposition to the view that nations should use money from regional funds as a substitute for their own national expenditure?

**Mr Thomson.** — Yes, Sir, I confirm that and I can perhaps remind my honourable friend that I said then that in ensuring that this aim was achieved we would rely a great deal on the vigilance of the European Parliament.

**Mr Cifarelli.** — (I) Mr President, since regional policies are nothing new, I should like the Commission to tell us what is the best way of ensuring that Community action in this area complements the aid and action already arranged by individual states. Unless a valid method of control is laid down I believe this may be very difficult.

**Mr Thomson.** — Mr President, the governments of Member States are under an obligation under the regulations to tell the Commission each year how much they plan to spend on their regional policies.

The Commission is under an obligation under the regulations to publish an annual report to this Parliament and that annual report, I think, is an important instrument in achieving the objectives that we share in common.

**President.** — I call Question No 6 by Mr Durieux, who will be replaced by Mr Johnston. The text of the question is as follows:

'Did the Commission, when setting up the European Regional Development Fund, make a detailed appraisal of the future relationship between this fund and the European Investment Bank?'

**Mr Thomson, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — Yes, Sir, this matter was gone into very fully by all concerned during the discussions which led up to the Council adopting on 18 March the Regulation EEC 724/75 establishing the Fund.

As a result, the regulation makes explicit provision for coordination between the Fund and the Bank, and the Commission sees no danger of either duplication or of inconsistency.

Article 5 of the regulation requires the Commission, when we decide on applications to the Fund, to take special account of EIB and other Community financial contributions to the same investments or others in the same region. The purpose of this is to coordinate any Regional Development Fund contribution with the others.

I would also draw the attention of the honourable Member to Article 4 of the regulation which contains a special provision for infrastructure projects to which the Bank and the Fund are both contributing. In such cases all or part of the Fund's assistance may take the form of a rebate of interest on the Bank's loan.

Under the Council's decision—also of the 18 March—setting up the Regional Policy Committee, the Bank is to appoint an observer to that committee. The Bank and the Commission will thus be able to continue their close collaboration in any discussion of this matter in the committee as well as bilaterally between themselves.

**President.** — Question No 7 by Mr Premoli has been withdrawn.

Question No 8 by Mr Bordu will be held over to the May part-session at the request of the author.

I call Question No 9 by Mr Van der Hek, the text of which is as follows:

'What were the respective positions of the Community and the Commission on the main questions raised at the preparatory conference on energy, in particular:

**President**

- oil
- primary commodities
- development cooperation (industrialization, the transfer of technology, etc.)
- international finance
- the number of countries represented at the Conference?

**Sir Christopher Soames**, *Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities*. — Sir, I will take the points raised by the honourable Member in order.

First, on the procedural point raised by the honourable Member, the Community was represented as such by a single delegation headed by the representative of the Council and by the Commission representative, who both acted as spokesmen for the Community. There was never any question of the Commission's position being opposed to that of the Member States—so that was good!

Second, on the specific subjects to which Mr Van der Hek's question refers, let me stress that this was a preparatory conference which dealt with questions of procedure rather than with issues of substance.

In the discussion of the agenda, the Community, as well as the United States and Japan, found it impossible and impracticable to accept the idea of a conference in which attention would not be concentrated on the problems of energy and the many questions which are directly related to energy.

These problems are important and urgent and no all-embracing international framework exists at present to deal specifically with them. We could accept that other raw material problems relevant to development policy should be dealt with in the conference, but we felt that this discussion should not duplicate similar discussions undertaken elsewhere in UNCTAD and in GATT, etc. So we asked that in dealing with the matters which were already being dealt with elsewhere, the conference should limit itself to conveying ideas and suggestions to those other forums.

Thirdly, this distinction in the way energy problems on the one hand, and raw material problems on the other, should be handled proved unacceptable to our partners who insisted on strict parity in the agenda as between energy and other matters. They also wanted to include the reform of the international monetary system in the discussion and insisted on wording in their draft agenda, which, in our view, would have prejudged such issues as indexation and the guarantee of real returns from financial investment.

Because of the difficulties in agreeing upon an agenda, no final conclusion was reached on the question of the number of countries which should participate in the main conference. But in the end we were close to agreement on this point.

To sum up, the Community's machinery at the conference worked very well. For much of the time the Community conducted discussions with the oil-producing and oil-consuming developing countries on behalf of the consuming countries, and presented new drafts and new ideas in an effort to reach agreement.

Further, the participants at the Paris meeting agreed that the meeting had been useful. It was the first dialogue of this kind and the Community certainly wishes to see it as the beginning of a process and by no means the end of it.

**Mr Van der Hek**. — (NL) Mr President, can the Commissioner give us the Commission's views on the reasons for the adjournment of the preparatory conference on energy in Paris?

**Sir Christopher Soames**. — Well Sir, I touched upon, I think, the most important ones in the main answer to my question, and it was as much the balance of the agenda as anything else.

I think, to sum it up, that the balance of how the agenda should be drawn up and what weight should be attached to one or to another point was really the major cause of difference between us.

And I hope that many of us will be taking up in various bilateral talks the question of where we should go from here and how we should get this matter off the ground.

**Mr Della Briotta**. — (I) The newspapers have published conflicting reports on the position of the Member States during the conference.

I should be grateful if the Commissioner could clarify this point.

**Sir Christopher Soames**. — Well, Sir, I am sorry. Perhaps the honourable gentleman would ask me a question on the specific point he wants me to answer. I tried to be as specific as I could in the main answer to the question. If there is any other specific point which the honourable Member would like me to address myself to, I will certainly try to do so.

**Mr Espersen**. — (DK) The Commissioner suggests that initiatives of a bilateral nature might be taken to maintain efforts to work out an energy policy. I should like to ask whether the

**Espersen**

Commission intends, after the failure of this conference, to take the initiative to maintain efforts, at a European level, to reach agreement with the countries concerned; and if the Commission does intend to take steps to renew its efforts, what measures does it envisage?

**Sir Christopher Soames.** — Sir, this is a matter not just for the Commission but also for the Council of Ministers of course. When separating on 16 April, the participants of the conference all agreed that they would remain in contact in various ways. This matter formed part of the talks which President Ortolí had recently when he was in India; and on my way back from China the week after next I will be visiting Iran and spending a couple of days in Teheran and I expect that this matter may well be talked about there as well. We are not thinking of any specific initiatives; I think it is a question now of people taking a pause for reflection and discussing among themselves where and how we should go from here.

**Mr Suck.** — (D) Could the Commissioner tell me what role the Commission representatives and the President of the Council respectively played during the conference?

**Sir Christopher Soames.** — Sir, it was as if it were, in the best sense of the word, a two-headed animal and both heads sat in—both at the high-level group meetings and also in the plenary sessions of the conference. As the conference went on a whole week, and participants had no sleep at all for three nights of that week (it went on all through three nights and up to about three or four in the morning on the remaining nights), I think that the honourable Members will appreciate that there was plenty for both sides to do and they worked in harness together.

**President.** — I have received from the Socialist Group, pursuant to Rule 47 A (2) of the Rules of Procedure, a request for a debate on the Commission's answer to Mr Van der Hek's question.

Question No 10 by Mr Hougardy will be held over to the May part-session at the author's request.

I call Question No 11 by Mr Normanton, the text of which is as follows:

'What measures does the Commission propose to adopt for promoting the recovery and re-cycling of waste products, both domestic and industrial, and are they satisfied that trade in waste materials is flowing freely within the Community and in accordance with the Treaty of Rome?'

**Mr Cheysson, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (F) Mr President, as the honourable Member has pointed out, waste constitutes a product which enjoys freedom of movement within the Community under the Treaty provisions.

Secondly, in its proposals for directives on waste and waste oil, the Commission has stressed the need to promote the recovery, re-use and recycling of waste products.

The second of these two proposals, dealing with waste oil, was already adopted by the Council on 7 November 1974. Both provide for a formal commitment by the Member States to the desired policy.

In addition, CREST has set up a working party on raw materials research and development. A sub-group on secondary raw materials has been formed with the basic task of promoting, through research and development the recovery and recycling of waste materials with a view to their re-use as secondary raw materials. In the second environmental action programme, now being drawn up, the emphasis will again be placed on measures for the recovery and recycling of household and industrial waste.

**Mr Normanton.** — Mr President, I am grateful to the Commissioner for his reply and I note the present position which he has described. But has the Commission noted the ever-increasing public concern at what they believe is the total absence of any sense of urgency to deal with this problem? To illustrate briefly the two aspects of my question, there is the growing accumulation of waste car tyres and commercial vehicle tyres, and, secondly, the non-tariff barriers which, despite the Commission's proposals, impede the free flow of iron and steel scrap throughout the Member States. Will the Commission therefore bring a sense of urgency to bear on this matter and make sure that it is reflected at Council level and the problem is seen by the peoples of Europe to be regarded as urgent.

**Mr Cheysson.** — (F) Mr President, as I have already told the Assembly, the first proposal for a directive dealing with waste oil was adopted by the Council in November 1974. It provides for a formal commitment by the Member States.

The honourable Member's remark was concerned with other types of waste; he referred in particular to old tyres, scrap iron and so on. There is no doubt that this subject must be dealt with as a matter of urgency, and I am grateful to the Assembly for supporting our action in this area.

**President.** — Question No 12 by Mr Nolan will be answered in writing, since the author is not present.<sup>1</sup>

I call Question No 13 by Mrs Orth, the text of which is as follows:

'Article 7(1) of Regulation No 2141/70 of the Council of 20 October 1970 on a common structural policy for the fishing industry<sup>2</sup> provides that the Commission shall submit an annual report to Parliament and the Council on structures for the fishing industry in the Community. Why has no report yet been produced, and when does the Commission intend to comply with this regulations?'

**Mr Thomson, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — Mr President, the Commission regret the delay in producing this report, a delay which been due to staff shortages and other difficulties. But a report on fishery structure in the Community is now in an advanced state of preparation in the Commission. It will be presented to Parliament and the Council before the autumn of this year.

**Mrs Orth.** — (D) Is the Commission aware that the structure of the fishing industry has deteriorated badly and that the aim of this directive, namely to improve the standards of living of persons working in this sector, now seems most unlikely to be achieved?

**Mr Thomson.** — Mr President, the Commission recognizes the importance of the issues that the honourable Lady has raised and I will draw the attention of my colleague, Mr Lardinois, to the particular point that she has made in her supplementary question.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — Could the Commissioner elaborate a little further on what will be contained in this document? Is he aware that there is grave disquiet within the fishing industry, and that it is not in a happy state, not only in the United Kingdom but throughout the rest of the European fishing areas, and will he put forward proposals for some kind of minimum import price or some form of subsidization of certain inshore or middlewater fleets?

**Mr Thomson.** — With respect, Mr President, I do not think that supplementary question arises directly out of the question on the agenda, though I recognize the general concern throughout the Community about developments in the worldwide fishing industry. It is a matter on which the Commission has made proposals to the

Council and a matter which is now under discussion within the Community.

This particular report that the honourable Lady asked for related to the structure of the Community fishing industry itself. The Commission has been giving priority to the implementation of the legislation already adopted and to the preparation of new proposals in the fisheries sector, in particular on the structure side. We have been concerned with Community measures such as the harmonization of state aids in the fishery sector.

**President.** — Question No 14 by Mr Gibbons will be answered in writing, since the author is not present.<sup>1</sup>

I call Question No 15 by Mr Kavanagh, the text of which is as follows:

'Does the Commission consider that the conciliation procedure relating to transport infrastructure, introduced by the Council decision of 28 February 1966 can be appropriately applied to the situation where British Rail has announced their intention of closing Holyhead port for shipment of Irish cattle?'

**Mr Cheysson, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (F) Mr President, the case referred to by the honourable Member does not fall within the framework of the procedure for consultation on transport infrastructure investment established by a Council decision of 28 February 1966. This procedure in fact applies only to new projects for transport infrastructure investment of interest to the Community; that is not the case in this instance. Nevertheless, the matter is being examined by the Commission which will not fail to give due information to the honourable Member and to the Assembly.

**Mr Normanton.** — Mr President, by way of supplement to the question which has just been answered, may I remind the Commission that there is genuine widespread concern, literally throughout the whole of Europe, at the physical conditions under which cattle are transported, and may I ask the Commission—perhaps the individual Commissioner would refer to the assurance given by Monsieur Lardinois 18 months ago—to take further steps to try to reduce the amount of suffering to which cattle are undoubtedly subjected during their long transportation throughout and into the Community.

**Mr Cheysson.** — (F) Mr President, I shall not fail to draw the attention of Mr Lardinois to the

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

<sup>2</sup> OJ L 236 of 27. 10. 1970.

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

**Cheysson**

sufferings of cattle during transport; we are all very sensitive to these problems.

**President.** — Question No 16 by Mr Fellermaier, Question No 17 by Mr Klepsch and Question No 18 by Mr Girardin all deal with the same subject and I therefore call them together. The text of these questions is as follows:

**Question No 16:**

'Why was the Commission not represented by a Commissioner or Secretary-General or at least by a Director-General at the 19th Meeting of the EEC/Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee held in Copenhagen from 21 to 25 April 1975?'

**Question No 17:**

'Does not the Commission, as the executive body of the European Community, consider it necessary in a difficult international situation to have a competent Commissioner attend the twice-yearly meetings of the EEC/Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee, such as the one held in Copenhagen from 21 to 25 April 1975, in order to address the Members of Parliament and answer their questions?'

**Question No 18:**

'Why was it not possible for the competent member of the Commission to attend the meeting of the EEC/Turkey Joint Parliamentary Committee of 23 April despite its relevance to current problems and its special political importance.'

**Sir Christopher Soames, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — I hope that the House will accept my apologies on behalf of the Commission for the fact that their member of the Commission was unable to be present at the meeting of the Joint Parliamentary Committee at Copenhagen, which the honourable Member rightly describes as being of special political importance.

As the representative of the Commission explained to the Members at Copenhagen, Mr Spinelli had agreed to attend the meeting of the Joint Committee, but at the last minute he was unable to go because of illness and it proved impossible in the time available to find another member of the Commission to replace him at such short notice. I can assure the House that very energetic efforts were made to find a member of the Commission to attend the meeting of the Joint Committee, for it is our view that it is only Commissioners who are competent to take up positions on behalf of the Commission in discussions of an essentially political character, such as those which take place at the Joint Committees.

**Mr Fellermaier.** — (D) We recognize that members of the Commission have a great many calls

on their time because of their large number of international commitments. Does the Commission not think, however, that it would be appropriate, in view of the political situation, for at least a Director-General responsible for external economic relations to follow the progress of the proceedings, even if he feels that he cannot personally speak? Or does the Commission feel it acceptable in the matter of relations with Turkey for only a director of social affairs to have been present in Copenhagen, although it was known that wide-ranging political questions would be raised and that the Turkish Government would be represented by its Secretary-of-State for Foreign Affairs?

**Sir Christopher Soames.** — Sir, I think I can say no more than that I would ask the House, as I said, to accept the Commission's apologies. We had made what we thought were the best arrangements possible, and at the last moment it was not possible to find another Commissioner.

As to the question of a Director-General being present, we did feel and we continue to feel that in these circumstances, in these sort of committees, it is essential for a Commissioner as opposed to an official, however senior, to be there and to participate in the debate, and it was on this line that our minds were working.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) May I ask you—while accepting your apologies—to see to it that in future a substitute is available for such important meetings as this, which after all are only held twice a year, in case the Commissioner due to attend falls ill. If I have understood you rightly, Sir Christopher, the Commission shares the Parliament's view that this is an extremely important matter which require the presence of a Commissioner.

Are you therefore willing to make arrangements to prevent a repetition of a case like this?

**Sir Christopher Soames.** — It was a totally unusual circumstance that happened this time, and it just so happened that there was no other Commissioner available. But this situation is very rare and I can assure the honourable Member that it will not happen again, certainly not if we can possibly help it. It was a question of illness at the last moment, and we are very sorry for it, but there it is.

In fact my colleague Mr Gundelach could have come on Thursday afternoon to the meeting, and this was indeed suggested but it turned out that the agenda was such that by the Thursday afternoon there would have been no point in being there. However, we did make this effort at least.



**President.** — Question Time is closed.

I thank the representatives of the Council and the Commission for their statements.

I have decided to comply with the request from the Socialist Group for an immediate debate.

##### 5. Debate immediately after Question Time

**President.** — The next item is the debate requested by the Socialist Group pursuant to Rule 47A(2) of the Rules of Procedure on the answer given by the Commission of the European Communities to the question put by Mr Van der Hek on the preparatory conference on energy.

I call Mr Van der Hek.

**Mr Van der Hek.** — (NL) Mr President, in connection with the questions which I put, the Commissioner's thinking evidently went something like this: 'Oh, the preparatory conference was a procedural matter—an agenda was to be drawn for the conference proper and a decision taken on who was to participate—so that I had better give a procedural answer to Mr Van der Hek's questions to the effect that we met for such and such a time, we spoke with such and such a person, we are still talking and we shall see what comes of it all; the Commission is taking care of the matter.'

The Commissioner obviously had some difficulty with the Question Time procedure which stipulates that short questions are put followed by a short answer and possibly by short supplementary questions.

Now if the Commission has this difficulty with our procedure, it seems to me that we ought to help him and give him an opportunity to answer our questions properly. That is why the Socialist Group has asked for this short debate to enable the Commissioner to answer our questions in rather more detail and depth.

I have three questions to put. What is the Commission's aim in this preparatory and then in the actual energy conference? Does it hope to arrive at very broad cooperation with the oil-producing countries and developing nations or does it subscribe to the objective of the American Government, summed up as follows by the leader of the US delegation: 'Our aim is in fact to break the producers' cartel.' Does the Commission also want to break the oil-producers' cartel or is it and the European Community pursuing a different aim from the United States at this conference? This is not an unimportant question, as the position of the European Community on energy supplies is essentially different from the position of the United States of America.

My second question is as follows: can the Commission now explain in rather more detail the position of the European Community and in particular of the Commission on the proposals made by Algeria on behalf of seven countries? What is the Commission's position on the desirability of dealing simultaneously with the question of the organization of the petroleum market and that of the organization of the primary commodity market in general? It is important to know the Commission's views on this matter—what are the points of real interest? Is the European Community only interested in an international organization of the market when it is the weaker party, as in the case of oil, or is the Community willing to talk to the developing countries on the organization of certain markets on which these countries are weaker than us? It is important to know how the Commission stands on this point as the answer will have a decisive bearing on the readiness of the oil-producing developing countries to reach agreement with us. In particular I should like to hear from the Commission what approaches it has made to Algeria, the oil-producing countries and the developing countries, to clarify the Community's intentions at this energy conference. Was it not one of the Commission's aims to make a declaration of intent on behalf of the Community, clearly stating for the benefit of everyone, including the developing countries and oil-producing countries concerned, what the Community has in mind, namely the organization of primary commodity markets in general, and not just the organization of the oil market, however important the latter may be? What is the Commission's position on the requests made in particular by Algeria, as spokesman for seven developing and oil-producing countries?

We are particularly concerned here with the relationship between this conference and the question of financial cooperation, aid to the countries most affected by the oil crisis, and monetary problems resulting from that crisis. Does the Commission consider that these matters should be dealt with, and if so how? This will condition the readiness of the Community to take part later in the final conference with a view to reaching practical results for the producer countries on the one hand and the Community on the other.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Fellermaier for a procedural motion.

**Fellermaier.** — (D) Mr President, I believe that a topical debate can only be meaningful if the Commission now answers these specific questions put by my colleague; the debate can then be

**Fellermaier**

continued in the light of the Commission's answer.

**President.** — I call Mr Normanton.

**Mr Normanton.** — Mr President, may I first of all congratulate Mr Van der Hek for introducing this question and pressing it forward for a brief debate. Very clearly, what we are doing now, in this brief debate, is considering the institution of the International Energy Agency rather more than the individual items listed in the question on the agenda. And therefore any contributions and comments I make relate to this agency as such.

Firstly, I do not believe that the International Energy Agency has in itself the capability of solving the problems facing the industrialized western world. It is too abstruse, it is too loosely associated—indeed, worst of all, it of course does not include in its conference and around its table all the industrialized nations which have an important role to play.

The second point I would make is that the International Energy Agency is, or certainly appears to be, concentrating on the question of oil. We of course recognize in this House, and certainly in the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology, that oil is but one component part of the totality of energy and cannot be debated, cannot be considered, cannot be negotiated in isolation from the other sources of energy. Therefore I really do feel that the very existence and function of the International Energy Agency leaves an enormous question mark in our minds. The solution can, in my opinion, and in the opinion of the European Conservative Group, only be discussed within the framework of the Community, where policy formulation, policy presentation, are institutionalized in the Commission and the Council, and where the parliamentary framework associated with it provides a kind of common bond amongst the nine Member States. It is only in this institutional environment that I believe we can find a chance for real, positive, constructive progress.

More particularly, we are aware as members of the Committee on Energy, Research and Technology and Members of this Parliament that we are currently considering a large number of proposals, all of which require vast and growing investment of Community funds, and I cannot help but feel that there is still a deep-seated anxiety amongst the European Parliamentarians at the inadequacy of machinery for regulating and controlling the expenditure of Community funds. But if we have anxieties in this House on this subject, how much greater are the anxieties and the grounds for anxiety in this context

about wider international agencies. These international agencies that are so loose, so non-institutionalized are in my opinion totally unsuited for formulating proposals involving large sums of public investment and more particularly large sums to be monitored, checked and controlled.

Therefore, I think Mr Van der Hek has provided an extremely valuable opportunity for this House to express its growing anxiety and concern at the inadequacy of the progress which is being made and the inappropriateness of the International Energy Agency to achieve this particular progress.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Sir Christopher Soames.

**Sir Christopher Soames, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — Sir, I am grateful for this opportunity to talk in a somewhat more relaxed manner than is possible in a pure question-and-answer session about this conference and all that it means and could mean in the future for the Community's relationship with other countries which are of great importance to her, and also about the capacity of the Community to make a notable contribution to a matter of great world importance.

Honourable Members will of course realize that the initiative, the concept of this conference goes back a long while. It goes back to the time of the oil crisis some 18 months or 2 years ago now, when we were questioning ourselves as to how the Community should react faced with these difficulties, and how it would like other countries to react. To put it in the crudest terms, the choice was between confrontation or dialogue and we opted of course for dialogue. But it wasn't enough just for the Community to talk to various oil-producers, because this is a world problem. Neither, indeed, did we think it was right just for the industrialized world to talk to the oil-producers. We saw this as a dialogue between the oil consumers both in the industrialized world and in the developing world, and the oil producers. Let us face it, nobody knew what the end effect was going to be of what was known in shorthand as the oil crisis.

Let us now look at the effects that this has had. And let us look together, for we have common interests here although it may seem on the face of it that the oil producers' interests could run counter to the interests of the oil-consumers. One lesson that we have surely learnt again and again in these last 18 months is the extent to which we are living in an interdependent world. There is no such thing as the producers of one

## Soames

commodity being able to say that they themselves are doing well, to pull up the drawbridge and as it were exclude themselves from the rest of the world. We have learnt that this possibility does not exist.

Certainly very considerable difficulties have arisen from the oil crisis—difficulties which have been particularly felt among those developing countries who are highly dependent on their imports of oil, whose import bill rose out of all proportion, and who are finding enormous difficulties now in getting their economies back into balance again. And undoubtedly the price of oil has also had its effect upon the economies of the developed world. To some extent our inflation, the recession through which we have been passing has been affected by it. I don't say that it had its origins in it, but it has certainly been considerably affected by the oil crisis.

The Community's view was that we should therefore take up a dialogue not just between producers and consumers, but between all of us together, consumers both rich and poor and producers, to see how we should tackle all the issues, the energy issues, the monetary issues and all others that flow from this, and to try to find out, by getting a dialogue going, where we should go from here and what should be our intention.

As you can imagine, although in general terms it is true that we are all interdependent, there are many countries today who think that now is the moment when it would serve their interests better if they were to concentrate on certain aspects. We found it quite natural that when we discussed with our partners in this conference what the agenda should be, they should wish to include raw materials—that the conference shouldn't be only about energy. We absolutely appreciated that there should be discussion of important financial matters which flowed from this. But we also felt that this conference which was, as it were, an *ad hoc* conference, should not constitute itself in such a way as to seek to take away from other international forums already in existence the responsibilities for what they themselves were doing in their day-to-day work.

Now, Sir, what did we seek to get out of this conference?

To answer the first question which Mr Van der Hek asked, were we looking at our relations with the world in general or did we just have our eye on the United States? The answer is very much that we were looking to the world in general. We saw this conference as being potentially a major contribution to world affairs. Our concern was by no means limited to the United States—in fact we found in the conference that apart

form certain nuances and emphases here and there, our position and the position of the United States were very often, more often than not, in accord. No, it was not that. It was the first point. It was anxiety about our relations with the whole world and the extent to which the economic order has been changed and is changing as a result of what has happened in the past 18 months, particularly in regard to terms of trade.

Now, Sir, what do we hope to get from this conference? We hope to get a dialogue. We hope to get an understanding. We think that it is wrong in principle that producers and consumers should be standing back and shouting at each other.

There are a lot of things to which the oil producers attach importance, such as indexation. It is not unnatural, in this time of extremely high inflation, that they should want to be sure that with the money they get from their oil they will be able to continue to buy what they need from the developed world. It is not unnatural that they should want to discuss raw materials as well. But, Sir, during the course of that week when, as I say, they were sitting night and day—indeed many collapsed of physical exhaustion during the conference—they were not really able to put thoughts together enough.

The honourable Member also asked what the Commission was doing to explain to other countries what our intentions are. Well, the Commission does a lot. We have a lot of talks at diplomatic level with the countries concerned and I gave the example of Monsieur Ortoli having important talks with the Indian Government when this matter was one of the subjects discussed. I expect it will be discussed also when I am in Iran. At the conference itself the Community took the lead and was allowed to take the lead. It was acknowledged as being the leader in this preparatory conference. We are sad that there were too many differences between us about the balance in the agenda to enable us to come to an agreement over the conference itself, but I think it was a useful conference because those taking part were from a high level who have great influence with their governments. I think each person saw the other's point of view much more clearly by the time this preparatory conference was over than they did at the beginning.

And, as I said in answer to the original question, we see this not as an end but a beginning. We wish it had been possible to get a conference off the ground. It was not, but I am sure that we are working on the right lines. We must not cease to do whatever we can to try to bring about a constructive dialogue between producers and consumers in both the industrial and the

**Soames**

developing world. It will be our intention to go forward with this and not be put off in any way by the very understandable temporary difficulties that made themselves manifest during this preparatory conference.

I would like to thank Mr Van der Hek for his question which made it possible to give this rather fuller explanation to Parliament.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Espersen.

**Mr Espersen.** — (DK) I should also like to thank Sir Christopher Soames for the answers he has given us. There were, however, one or two questions put by Mr Van der Hek which were not answered, and which I will briefly restate.

First of all, I should like to say that in several spheres the Commission has taken steps to establish a European energy policy. The Commission has recommended the national governments to draw up priorities between oil, uranium, etc. The Commission has a pretty comprehensive programme for the increased use of nuclear energy, and the individual Member States are endeavouring to work out their national energy policies. But it is, of course, difficult both for the Commission and the individual states to make progress in these fields, since, it is not really possible to draw up a national or a Community energy policy before there is clarity about the international situation and about the possibilities the European countries have of obtaining supplies from the oil-producing countries.

It is, therefore, sad that the conference came to nothing, and it is important that the Commission should realize that its task should not only be to record that it came to nothing, and merely to say that the countries and diplomats involved presumably now have a better understanding of each other's points of view; it should also attempt to take fresh steps as soon as possible to arrange a similar conference. I do not believe that a national energy policy can be worked out before seeing what the outcome is of a conference like the one which has just failed. So the Commission must take a great initiative: I was a little disappointed that Sir Christopher Soames did not make any specific proposals on this subject.

I wonder whether the possibilities open to national energy policies will not depend on whether measures are taken to organize a later conference.

I was also a little concerned that Sir Christopher Soames stated that one of the cause of the failure

of the conference was that one—'one' clearly being the Commission—wished to regard it as an *ad hoc* conference. Therefore, said Sir Christopher Soames, if I understood correctly, it was not for this *ad hoc* conference to concern itself with matters falling under the jurisdiction of other international organizations. By implication, this meant that this conference should not involve itself in spheres that might be covered by the terms of reference of the European Economic Community or of other international organizations. I would like to say this: certainly, this conference is, or was, planned as an *ad hoc* conference, based, naturally, on an *ad hoc* situation: the oil crisis, the difficulties in obtaining supplies. And an *ad hoc* conference is the only accurate reflection of the special situation in which we find ourselves. But when this is the case, we have to accept the need to employ special methods, perhaps assigning to the conference powers usually reserved to other international organizations. I should like to know specifically whether or not there was a certain atmosphere of jealousy surrounding this conference and its future prospects, and whether this was one of the reasons for its failure.

Mr Van der Hek asked whether the Commission attached greater importance to the USA's point of view or that held by most European countries. Sir Christopher Soames answered that importance was attached not to the USA's point of view but to that of the entire world. But it is far from easy to define the position of the entire world, for 'the entire world' is a wide concept. I believe that Mr Van der Hek's question was intended to establish whether the Commission attached greater importance to the USA's or the European countries' points of view, which are of course different.

In conclusion, it seems to me that we have not had an answer to a further relevant question, namely the Commission's position as regards Algeria's proposal.

**President.** — I call Mr Leonardi.

**Mr Leonardi.** — (I) I shall only speak briefly in this debate to outline my thinking on this matter. There can be no doubt—as Vice-President Soames has pointed out—that the problem is one which assumes an international, indeed a world dimension, and concerns not only oil but also other primary commodities.

Now I consider that in the Community, if we are to escape from the situation facing us at present, we must take account not only of our responsibilities to the countries producing primary commodities and oil, but also to our own people who make up the region of the world which con-

**Leonardi**

sumes the largest quantities of imported oil and other imported raw materials. While we are, as it were, in a position of weakness in the world as the largest consumers of imported products, we could nevertheless succeed in achieving a position of strength if we were able to establish appropriate common policies.

While endorsing the need for a broader-based policy, we feel bound to draw attention to the Community's inability to work out common policies capable of offering an adequate contribution to the solution of the general problems. I think that the failure of the various conferences and our presence in the international energy agencies alongside a country whose interests predominate and are completely different from our own—I refer to the United States—is proof of our inability to face up to the responsibilities incumbent on us as the largest consumer.

I would repeat what I have already said on other occasions on the need for an adequate debate on energy problems, based on a Commission document on oil and other raw materials, in a manner similar to our approach to agriculture. Only in this way can we properly consider the problems which have up to now been studied in an unsatisfactory manner, and so face our responsibilities as a Community.

**President.** — I call Mr Springorum.

**Mr Springorum.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am also grateful to Sir Christopher Soames for his reply and would appreciate it too if he could reply to the other questions put subsequently. I was particularly pleased to hear him say that the Commission had to some extent taken over a leading role here. But I do not yet know in what direction that leadership is being exercised.

I have heard a whole series of press conferences on this energy conference; I am aware of the extraordinarily hard line taken by Mr Robinson and Mr Enders; I heard what the French press spokesman had to say. Unfortunately it has become apparent that the consumer countries do not have a common position vis-à-vis the producers. We have heard a great deal about a dialogue and cooperation, but I still do not know precisely what form of cooperation is intended. There is one kind of cooperation between a coachman and his horses, between a shepherd and his dogs; sometimes I have the impression that the European countries understand by cooperation a similar relationship between the producer countries and ourselves.

The spokesman for the Arab League has now said that the European countries must be willing

to take part in a new energy conference. Mr Yamani, the Saudi Arabian oil minister, said that if the European countries were not willing to do so, prices would be raised again. I do not call this cooperation, if negotiations are held under the pressure of certain demands, and I would warn against the risk of the consumer countries becoming divided. If that happens the whole circus will start again. I believe that despite the different situation prevailing in the United States and the different situation in Japan, it is essential for the consumer countries to remain united, and if the Commission wishes and is to take over a leading role it must place this unity in the forefront of its tasks.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr FitzGerald.

**Mr FitzGerald, President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities.** — Mr President, I just want to speak for a few minutes on this subject and to say first of all that the problem facing this preparatory conference was a real one. There was a real difficulty in devising a neutral agenda that would not prejudge the results of a subsequent conference.

In a case like this, when one is moving into uncharted waters, there is a natural desire by people to ensure in advance that the shape of a conference will be such as to further their interests. At this preparatory conference the real difficulty was one of devising an agenda for a main conference and it was complicated obviously by the fact that whereas this producer/consumer conference had been envisaged from the start as one dealing with energy—indeed the composition of the countries attending the conference made this clear—the question of raw materials nonetheless was brought up. This was a matter which some delegations were very concerned to see brought into consideration in the main conference. The composition of the delegations at the preparatory conference reflected the fact that energy was the original topic envisaged. If you examine the producer countries there, as distinct from the consumer countries and the developing countries, it is clear that they were selected as oil producers by the country that originally made the proposal for this conference. The preparatory conference was not therefore originally designed as one to prepare the way for a conference on oil and raw materials. The countries represented there would have been different had that been the case.

That was one difficulty. Another difficulty is the point that Sir Christopher has mentioned, namely that raw materials do come up for consideration in a number of different forums. It is

**FitzGerald**

important that we do not confuse this issue by proliferating discussions in different forums and that we devise a constructive method of discussing raw materials between the developed countries, the raw material producers and the countries which are neither industrialized nor producers of raw materials.

I would like to say two things about the way the conference went. First, the Community delegation there played a crucial and a constructive rôle throughout. The Community delegation remained united throughout the conference, it worked in close cooperation, of course, with the United States and Japan and the fact that the preparatory conference did not succeed on this occasion was certainly not attributable to any lack of goodwill or hard work or intelligence or foresight on the part of the Community delegation. I think Parliament should be assured of that.

Secondly, although the conference did not succeed, although it ended in disagreement, it is important to note that it ended in disagreement in which there was no hostility, bitterness or confrontation. The note on which it ended was one perhaps of puzzlement, because not everybody was clear as to why it was impossible to achieve agreement. Those participating went away to reflect on this encounter which was the first occasion on which there was an attempt to discuss these matters. They went away to reflect on the results and to consider what they might learn from what had happened and where they might go from here. During the weeks that have followed I think that all the delegations, certainly the Community delegations, have been reflecting on the outcome. The question of what further action, if any, should be taken is one which is present in all our minds and which in the weeks immediately ahead will, of course, have to be given further consideration.

I thought I should just inject these few remarks as President of the Council which, working closely with the Commission at this conference, did everything it could to make it a success and at any rate succeeded in minimizing and limiting the failure and ensuring that the conference ended on a note which did not lead to confrontation but left open the possibility of coming back to consider this matter further in an amicable and constructive atmosphere. That may be a limited success but it is at least better than a conference ending in division within the Community, division between the Community, the United States and Japan and confrontation between the Community and the other countries. It could have ended in that way; it did not, and the fact that it did not is, I think, due above all to the work of the Community delegation. I think Parliament

is entitled to be told that and those who worked for the Community there worked extraordinarily hard and extraordinarily well.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Mr FitzGerald, your spontaneous contribution to this debate was extremely interesting and has thrown light on the matter we have been discussing.

I call Mr Fellermaier.

**Mr Fellermaier.** — *(D)* Mr President of the Council, I think that the spontaneity with which you have taken part in this debate bodes well for still better relations between the Council and Parliament in the future. We have not previously had an opportunity to hold a topical debate after a statement by the President of the Council during Question Time. Parliament is only entitled to hold such a debate with the Commission.

The fact that the Commissioner responsible has been able to speak in this topical debate and discuss the problems of the energy conference in more detail, and the further fact that you felt it necessary to speak in the debate in your capacity as President of the Council, lead me to hope that the Council will consider in conjunction with the President of this House the possibility of a topical debate being held with the Council at the Parliament's request.

If that were the result of your spontaneity, Mr FitzGerald, the Commission, Parliament and Council would once again give an example of cooperation between the three institutions on European policy.

**President.** — I call Sir Christopher Soames.

**Sir Christopher Soames, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — I am very grateful to the President-in-Office of the Council for his contribution. This was, as he said, a Council/Commission exercise in this conference and we worked very closely together and I would say straight away to Mr Springorum that I said that it was the Community that took the lead. He seemed to think I said that the Commission took the lead in this conference. This wasn't so. What I said was that on many issues the Community took the lead.

Now in answer to the two questions raised by Mr Espersen. What about the Community energy policy? What is going to be the effect of failure of this preparatory conference on the Community energy policy? Well, of course, the Community energy policy is linked to an important extent with the Community's external relations

Soames

in terms of energy. But there are many matters of energy policy which we can proceed with internally and which have been on the table for all too long now. There is nothing that has happened that should stop progress being made within the Community towards the achievement of a common energy policy. There I would absolutely agree with Mr Espersen.

Now, on the question of the United States' attitude, which Mr Springorum also mentioned. Of course there are differences of emphasis on a number of questions between the United States on one hand and the Community on another. Where energy is concerned this happens, of course, because there is a very different degree of dependence on importation of energy in the Community on the one hand and in the United States on the other. But as Mr Springorum said, it is absolutely essential that we do not allow these differences of emphasis to undermine the solidarity, the understanding and the cooperation between the oil-consuming countries. This cooperation was manifest, I think in the conference, and long may it remain, and indeed I do not think it would be possible to have such a conference unless there was a very wide measure of understanding and agreement about where we as consuming countries wanted to go.

Now, Sir, as to the future. You will all remember that the calling of this conference was a French initiative. It was not the Commission that called the conference, that is for sure. To the extent that we feel we can cooperate in the future, that we can play a part in furthering the dialogue which is necessary to arrive at a far better degree of understanding in the world among consumers and producers, then the Commission is only too ready and willing to play its part, and it will do so in every way that it can. *(Applause)*

**President.** — The debate is closed.

I thank the representatives of the Council and the Commission for their contribution to the debate.

#### 6. *Amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the Communities for 1975*

**President.** — The next item is a debate on the supplementary report drawn up by Mr Aigner on behalf of the Committee on Budgets on the draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the European Communities for the financial year 1975 (Doc. 54/75).

I call Mr Aigner.

**Mr Aigner, rapporteur.** — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I believe that with its debate today the European Parliament will be provisionally marking the end of the difficult birth of the Regional Development Fund, if I may call it that. In my view we must, however, take this opportunity to outline briefly the development of this question up to the present time, and I trust you will bear with me, Mr President, if I cannot quite remain within the fifteen minutes allotted to me since, after the conflicting press reports, not only this House but also the general public are entitled to know exactly how the dialogue between the Council and Parliament proceeded.

In its preliminary draft general budget for 1975, the Commission of the European Communities proposed—after demands made repeatedly by Parliament over a period of years—650 m u.a. payment authorizations and 750 m u.a. commitment authorizations for the Regional Fund. It considered this expenditure to be non-compulsory. To that extent there was complete agreement between the views of the Commission and Parliament. In the course of subsequent negotiations the Council then deleted the amounts proposed by the Commission under this heading in its preliminary draft, on the grounds that there was as yet no legal basis for these entries. For the same reason the Council also refused to classify the expenditure in question. Ladies and gentlemen, you know how the rights of this Parliament differ according to the classification of the expenditure.

Subsequently, following urgent representations by a delegation from the European Parliament, which met the Council in the context of the normal contacts prior to establishment of the draft budget, the Council finally accepted—after discussion behind closed doors in Brussels—the provisional classification of this expenditure in the category of non-compulsory expenditure, in other words the Council and Parliament reached agreement on the classification of this expenditure.

At its November part-session the European Parliament showed its clear determination to lend special weight to the Regional Fund, by entering a total of 300 m u.a. for that fund. It thus confirmed also the view it had held from the start that this item represented non-compulsory expenditure. The Council, however, rejected the amendment adopted by Parliament on the grounds—already mentioned above—that there was no legal basis for it.

The Conference of Heads of State or Government meeting on 9 and 10 December 1974 in Paris decided to establish the European Regional Development Fund from 1 January 1975. On the

**Aigner**

subject of the endowment of the Fund, the final communiqué stated that the Fund would receive 300 m u.a. in 1975 and 500 m u.a. in each of the years 1976 and 1977, making a total of 1 300 m u.a. Of this total, 150 m u.a. will be financed from resources of the EAGGF which are at present unused.

Mr President, the Summit Conference made this statement acting as the Council and adopted what was tantamount to a Council decision. Thus the first constitutional question was raised for this Parliament as well. If the Heads of State act as a Council on the basis of the Rome Treaties, they clearly cannot do so outside the framework of the constitution laid down by the Treaties; in other words a summit decision cannot eliminate the budgetary rights of Parliament. In our forthcoming discussions with the Foreign Ministers or Ministers of Finance this question will certainly be a key issue—we intend of course to continue our conciliation procedure, particularly with a view to an increase in Parliament's powers.

Mr President, in view of these decisions, Parliament then withdrew its amendment at its December part-session, especially as the Commission and Council had promised to submit a supplementary budget for the Fund as soon as possible. I think it is safe to say—remembering the atmosphere in this House at the time—that adoption by the Parliament of the general budget for 1975 was based on this promise by the two institutions. It was a condition *sine qua non*, without which Parliament would not have accepted the 1975 budget.

The preliminary draft supplementary budget submitted by the Commission confirmed this view regarding the classification. However, it only contained 150 m u.a. by way of payment authorizations. In the draft supplementary budget subsequently adopted by the Council, the latter followed the Commission's financial proposals. But in regard to the classification of expenditure, the Council still maintained, on the basis of the text of the proposal for the establishment of the Regional Fund, that the expenditure involved could only be compulsory. Mr President, at its first April part-session, Parliament once again made it quite clear that it could not agree either to the financial endowment of the fund for 1975 or to the classification made by the Council. It therefore adopted an amendment which raised the financial endowment of the fund to 300 m u.a.

After the submission of the preliminary draft by the Commission there were several meetings between a delegation from the Parliament, to which I have the honour of belonging, and the Council, namely on 11 February and 15 and 22

April. In addition the Conciliation Committee met on 4 March. In other words there were four meetings with the Council. I wish to consider in particular the two last meetings of 15 and 22 April at which the Parliament really tried everything to reach agreement with the Council. I wish to put on record here my appreciation of the fact that the President-in-Office, Mr Fitzgerald did all he could to win the Council over to a position of partnership with the Parliament. The fact that this proved impossible was certainly a disappointment to him personally. We clearly recognize the fact. However, it is regrettable that no agreement was reached with the Council.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, one point must be stressed here: these two last meetings were to us a perfect example of what must not be understood by conciliation in future. The only official partner in the dialogue met by the delegation was in fact the President of the Council himself. That, ladies and gentlemen, is a step back from the form the conciliation procedure has taken up to now.

I recall another meeting—I think it was the second meeting with the Council—when the delegation requested a discussion in closed sitting, i.e. without the three hundred or so national officials and Council officials; on that occasion the President-in-Office of the Council—who was the German Foreign Minister, Mr Genscher, at the time—agreed to the Parliament's request and there was a genuine dialogue between the nine members, the nine Foreign Ministers or Finance Ministers, and the Parliament's delegation. It is therefore unacceptable, Mr President of the Council, for the dialogue to be watered down to a conversation between the Council President and the Parliament's delegation. I must, however, point out that the President of the Council has offered to discuss this question too in detail with the Parliament's delegation in the near future, and I hope we shall return to the original form of conciliation.

Because of this situation, Mr President, the members of the delegation were only able to express their own opinion or that of the Parliament at the first of these meetings without hearing the reaction of the Council members. This meeting then took place without the Council being able to make an official or even unofficial conciliation proposal to our delegation.

The outcome of this procedure was that the Council of Finance Ministers—on 15 April it had been the Foreign Ministers—presented a proposal which more or less rejected all the proposed modifications adopted here by Parliament. The Council's proposal rejected the 150 m u.a. additionally entered by Parliament and main-



**Aigner**

tained that the transfer—our second proposed modification—of 50 m u.a. from Article 833 to Article 800 could better be effected by the normal procedure for the transfer of appropriations. The most serious point, however, was that the Council, despite its original decision to the contrary, now held that these appropriations should be classified as compulsory.

Mr President, before I come to the classification, allow me to say another word about the second modification which the Council also rejected, namely the transfer of 50 m u.a. from Article 833 to Article 800. I would urge the Council to note that Article 6 of Regulation No 729 of 1970, in the version adopted after the accession of the new Member States, stipulates that the Guidance Section of the EAGGF shall receive 325 m u.a. each year. This article further stipulates that these funds shall be used as a matter of priority for common measures. Insofar as these funds cannot be used for common measures—this is the decisive point here—the available remainder must be used for projects within the meaning of Regulation No 17/64 (EEC). Now Article 6 of Regulation No 729/70 (EEC) states in principle that the annual endowment of the Guidance Section shall be effectively taken up and, to the extent that this is not possible in the context of common measures, this will be done by granting subsidies for individual projects. This is the agreement, and if the Council fails to respect it, it is acting *contra legem* and I do not believe that a Parliament can approve such conduct.

Mr President, it is clear that the 50 m u.a. entered in Article 833 of the budget for 1975 cannot be used for common measures. These funds must therefore be used for individual projects according to Article 6 of Regulation 729/70. As a general rule the common measures are implemented slowly; there are delays and fewer funds are therefore required at present than originally scheduled.

The development—I shall quote a few figures now—of the main common measures, namely the three directives on the reform of agriculture, shows this quite clearly. For 1973, 25 m u.a. were entered in the budget and expenditure was zero. For 1974, 15 m u.a. were entered in the budget and expenditure totalled 3.3 million. Mr President, these figures demonstrate that this year's estimates for the coming years will again be much too high. In a letter of 25.1.1975 the Commission therefore asked the Member States for new information on their national estimates. The information received so far, which the Commission made available to me at my request, clearly confirms the assumption I have made here. Mr President, if then the principle laid down in regulation No 729/70 is not followed

and the available resources are not used for individual projects, the promotion of structural improvements in agriculture decided on by the Council will be held up.

Mr President, we therefore request the Council with the utmost urgency—I say this on behalf not only of the delegation but also of your Committee on Budgets—after reaching a decision in a normal procedure for the transfer of appropriations, to allow the Parliament to participate and implement this procedure rapidly so that we can spend these appropriations on the intended purpose, as laid down in the Treaty.

Now, Mr President, I shall return to the proposed compromise submitted to us by the Council after the last conciliation meeting. This compromise proposed by the Council suddenly suggests that the appropriations for the Regional Fund should remain compulsory in the years 1975, 1976 and 1977 and that the Council would be willing thereafter to consider classifying them differently, i.e. considering them as non-compulsory. May I ask the Council and public what is the logic of this? The Treaty contains precisely defined principles. There must be legal positions which are not subject to random interpretation by a particular Institution. When the Council says it will be willing to classify these appropriations as non-compulsory after 1978 but not for the present, we must clearly wonder where it finds the logic for this suggestion. Let us hope it will find the logic again in 1978. But of course the whole business has nothing to do with logic.

Mr President, the delegation, following the position adopted up to now by Parliament, obviously could not accept this proposal. The delegation and your Committee on Budgets will now give you the reasons which in my view are absolutely clear and cannot be called into question by any Institution.

Firstly, the Parliament has already repeatedly confirmed, and does so again now, that it is willing to accept the financial framework of 1 300 m u.a. proposed by the Paris Summit Conference for the years 1975 to 1977. We have repeatedly stated that there is no discrepancy in the endowment of the Fund, i.e. in the financial envelope; we said that when we were considering the budget. We abide by the decisions of the Paris summit and will not increase or reduce the 1 300 m u.a. by a single unit of account. It is therefore not a financial question which divides us here but only a question of the right of Parliament.

Secondly, in the view of Parliament, expenditure effected under Article 235 of the EEC Treaty—i.e. actions not stipulated in the Treaty—can

**Aigner**

only be classified as non-compulsory expenditure; this is the meaning of the Treaty and also of the Luxembourg Treaty.

Thirdly, I have said that there is simply no logical reason why the Council wishes under the same regulation to classify the same appropriations as compulsory at one particular time and as non-compulsory later.

Fourthly, the Parliament believes that the Council cannot take decisions in 1975 which will be binding on the Council in 1978. What is the use to us of a promise that in 1978 a new Council will introduce a different classification? Nobody knows what the composition of the Council will then be and what form the Member States' cabinets will take at the time. No, we must reach our decisions now on the basis of the legal position laid down in the Treaty.

Fifthly, the reasons indicated by the Council for classifying this expenditure as obligatory cannot under any circumstances be accepted by Parliament as this regulation, Mr President of the Council, can only represent a framework within which the Commission is free, under the provisions of the regulation, to decide on the applications submitted according to the criteria laid down.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Article 2 of the regulation jointly approved by us stipulates that for the period 1975 to 1977 the Member States shall at their request receive financial allocations from the Fund under the conditions laid down in this regulation and within the framework of the following endowments. The endowments of 300 and 500 m u.a. are then indicated. If we subscribe to the Council's view that this expenditure is compulsory simply because the amounts are fixed in a regulation, then, Mr President, the Council will be at liberty to practically eliminate the Parliament's entire freedom of budgetary manoeuvre under the Luxembourg Treaty. All it needs to do is to adopt a decision on a regulation in respect of each budget item and Parliament will then have no rights whatever. I do not think that a parliamentarian, however willing he may be to enter into a compromise with the Council, can endorse such a view. What then would be the position regarding the Social Fund and the research appropriations? Here we have exactly the same criteria, in other words the whole Luxembourg Treaty would be meaningless.

One further point: the delegation noted that—as unfortunately often happens—the President of the Council could do no more than convey a Council decision to us. The resulting lack of any possibility of negotiation unfortunately confirmed the delegation's impression that there

was no conciliation in the true sense of the term, as stipulated in the Treaty.

The members of the delegation reported to the Committee on Budgets to this effect at its meeting of 23 and 24 April. The motion for a resolution unanimously adopted by the Committee on Budgets with a full knowledge of the facts takes account of these points. It stresses emphatically that the budgetary powers at present assigned to the Parliament are indispensable to the further democratic development of the Community. Any intervention by the Council to lessen these powers must be firmly rejected.

The Committee on Budgets further noted that it could not depart from its view that the expenditure on the Regional Fund constitutes non-compulsory expenditure. It also expressed its resolve for the Regional Fund to be activated as soon as possible, and therefore accepted the Council's decisions on the financial endowment for the year 1975. There is now complete agreement between the Institutions on the amounts for the year 1975, but the Parliament's view on the classification of this expenditure requires the fixing of a new rate; according to the present preliminary draft we have calculated that the new rate is 40.88%. Mr President, we shall decide on this new rate of increase here with the necessary majority.

The willingness of the Committee on Budgets or of Parliament to compromise is reflected in the fact we are thus prepared to accept in full the decisions of the Council regarding the financial framework for 1975. In our view this is as far as Parliament can go in making compromises without abandoning of its own accord the rights granted to it by the Luxembourg Treaty. Parliament and its Committee on Budgets believe that it has done its duty in this budgetary procedure and owes it to European public opinion to allow the Regional Fund to be activated by its present decision.

It should, however, be pointed out that Mr Cheysson has stated, on behalf of the Commission, that the latter is willing to implement the budget adopted in this way by Parliament. Perhaps the Commission could make it clear to the Council once again that the Commission and Parliament are acting in agreement in the classification of this expenditure.

Parliament is also willing to continue to seek a common solution with the Council. This problem will arise at the latest when the Commission presents the budget estimates for 1976 in which it is prepared to continue to show non-compulsory expenditure for the Regional Fund.

Mr President, in the discussion in the Committee on Budgets, and—as I have heard—in the politi-

**Aigner**

cal groups too, the delegation was repeatedly asked why it was not willing to engage in a full-scale confrontation with the Council.

Basically there are three reasons for this and I shall not conceal them from you. Parliament is aware that the Council too apparently requires time to learn. Parliament should not shorten the Council's learning process unless it is absolutely essential for it to do so.

Secondly, after the end of the era of absolute omnipotence of the Council in budgetary matters—which is now publicly recognized—the Parliament wanted to give evidence of its readiness to engage in partnership with the Council. I must repeat that there was no disagreement about the actual financial envelope so that there could be no question in this instance of a possible veto by a cabinet decision based on national financial policy criteria.

The third reason, Mr President, must also be mentioned: we were not entirely sure whether in this first year more than 150 m u.a. could in fact go to the Member States by way of payment authorizations. I now believe that the Member States are in fact waiting for this money, but as we are not quite sure and as the Council has undertaken if necessary to make further funds available in a supplementary budget to reach the figure of 300 m u.a. for 1975, we did not wish to enter into a full-scale confrontation with the Council for this third reason either.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, allow me to touch briefly on two further points. We repeatedly asked the President of the Council, when our delegation met him, to tell us the real reasons. They cannot be financial reasons and can therefore only be reasons touching on the rights of Parliament on the basis of the Luxembourg Treaty as such. The Council President was unable to give us an answer. Let me say to you, however,—and this is not merely my opinion as rapporteur but also the view of the entire delegation—that we suspect an attempt is being made through the hundreds—and there are hundreds—of national officials and Council officials to lessen once again by administrative means the rights of Parliament under the Luxembourg Treaty. Parliament must energetically resist any such attempt from the outset.

Perhaps there is also a second reason which the Council President did not state to us, despite the pertinent questions put to him. The second reason for the almost incomprehensibly hard attitude of the Council is no doubt the fact that if these 150 m u.a. are classified as non-compulsory expenditure they would allow us greater freedom of manoeuvre in drawing up

and adopting the budget for 1976. But, Mr President, allow me to put the question as it really is: even if for the year 1976 we obtain a statistical rate of increase of 15% or more, this would give Parliament—on the basis of the classification of this expenditure requested by us—an additional latitude of only some 10 million.

What, Mr President, are we to make of a Council which constantly repeats that Parliament should be given stronger budgetary powers and allowed to participate in the legislative process, but is at the same time afraid of giving this Parliament an additional latitude of 10 m u.a. This Parliament has demonstrated that it has at least the same responsibility as the Council and that, if you look at national groups, there is exactly the same conflict of interests as in the Council. We have demonstrated this sense of responsibility, and the sole issue was ultimately whether the Council wishes the conflict of interests to be played out in the Council alone or whether Parliament is to be involved. What are the Council's real intentions when it constantly calls for greater budgetary powers for the Parliament but then says no when a calculable risk of 10 m u.a. arises? Here again the Council clearly has a great deal to learn.

Allow me to say finally, Mr President of the Council, that Parliament is fighting for its budgetary rights and the issue is not one of being able to spend a few million units of account more or less in any particular instance. No, Mr President, the European Institutions can only move ahead towards the necessary unification of Europe if they also gradually make good the lack of democracy in this Community. We are demanding European elections and the Summit Conference and all statesmen who speak about Europe have promised that there will be European elections in 1978. But how, Mr President, can we call the people of Europe out to European elections if this Parliament does not even have the justified budgetary powers enjoyed by all parliaments in our Member States? I believe that from this angle we are obliged in the interests of the European Community to fight as hard as we can for the budgetary rights of this Parliament, and I therefore urge the House to adopt our motion for a resolution and the budget, even if it does not correspond to the views of the Council.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Kirk to speak on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee.

**Mr Kirk.** — Mr President, it is my duty this morning to give the opinion of the Political Affairs Committee on this matter and I can do

**Kirk**

it fairly briefly, largely because there is no difference of opinion between the Political Affairs Committee and the Committee on Budgets. I have the privilege of serving on both committees and, indeed, was a member of the delegation on all three occasions when it met the Council, and therefore, I think, have the unique position of knowing precisely what the position is, and the only difference I would think would be a difference of emphasis.

Mr Aigner, who has worked so tirelessly on this matter, and I know at a time of ill-health, over the last few weeks and months, has given us this morning a very thorough and real breakdown of the budgetary implications of this affair. But he could not conceal from the House, nor did he try to do so, the fact that this is as much a political as a budgetary matter—if not more so.

The emphasis that I would wish to place upon it is, of course, the political emphasis which has come through time and time again both in our discussions with the Council and with the President of the Council and in our discussions in committee.

As I see it the duty of the Political Affairs Committee in this affair is twofold. First of all it is to ensure that the Treaty is properly implemented.

Now I know that inevitably there will be disagreement from time to time between the institutions as to the exact way in which the Treaty should function. But I would say here this morning that the interpretation put upon the Treaty by the Council cannot possibly be right either in law or in logic. If what the Council is saying is correct, it means that the very careful differentiation between various forms of expenditure written into the Luxembourg Agreement in 1970 in fact can be altered from year to year, or even presumably from day to day, depending upon the political convenience of those who are carrying out the Treaty. And that must be wrong.

We have had various explanations as to why this expenditure should be obligatory now and could be, and indeed would be, non-obligatory later. We were told at one point in the discussions that this was due to the fact that the regulation has been drawn up in such a way as to make the expenditure obligatory. Again this cannot be right. It is the Treaty that lays down what expenditure is obligatory and what expenditure is not obligatory. And whether one proceeds from the wording of the Treaty, or whether one proceeds by analogy with the Social Fund, as Mr Aigner quite rightly did—and there can really be very little difference in anybody's

mind between the nature of the Social Fund and the nature of the Regional Fund—this must be regarded as non-obligatory expenditure.

I would suggest to the President of the Council that there is a second reason why one can say that the Treaty is not being applied. The Council, although towards the end of our long discussions it finally came forward with a compromise proposal, but a compromise proposal which was non-negotiable, failed to carry out the provision of the Treaty which lays upon it and upon us the obligation to agree on the classification of expenditure. If we are obliged to agree with them on the classification of expenditure, that must mean that we must discuss the matter with them, because you cannot agree on something if you do not discuss it. This surely again, in both law and logic, must be right. But there has never been any discussion; there has been a confrontation of two types of view, but never any discussion as to whether this expenditure is obligatory or non-obligatory.

And so, Sir, I would say that so far as the Political Affairs Committee's duty to ensure that the Treaty is applied effectively is concerned, I have no doubt in my mind, and nor has the committee, that the Treaty has not been applied effectively on the side of the Council. For that reason alone it is Parliament's duty to carry out its obligations under the Treaty, as we intend to do today with this resolution.

The second duty of the Political Affairs Committee in this affair is concerned with the relations between the institutions—a matter which has always very much concerned us as a committee and very much concerned me. So it was inevitable, I believe, that at some stage in a matter of this kind there would come a difference of opinion between the Council and Parliament. Where you have two bodies, both of them responsible to a greater or lesser extent for legislation within the Community, where one is so much more powerful than the other, where the other nevertheless has, or appears to have, certain powers in certain restricted fields, it was inevitable that at some stage a clash would occur. I must admit I did not expect it to come so soon and I certainly did not expect it to come on this particular subject, one on which we are all agreed, and one on which we are only too anxious to get cracking. But come it has. I think we should recognize, however, that this is not a great dramatic occasion of a kind that must be built up as a clash of fighting armies. It is a perfectly normal parliamentary process, when two bodies with differing concepts of their own powers and their own rights find themselves in a position where they cannot agree. We have heard in the press—certainly in the British press

**Kirk**

—recently great talk about a victory for Parliament. I do not regard it as a victory for Parliament, I regard it, if we proceed as I hope we will today, as a victory for the Community.

Although faced with provisions in Article 203 of the Treaty which I must admit, though we were not around at the time, could have been more precisely drawn in order to point out precisely what one should do when arriving at a situation of this kind, the Community is finding a way round.

We are told by the British press that there will be chaos, that there will be two budgets, two different concepts of how we are going to go ahead. Mr President, this cannot be true either. There will only be one budget—the budget that you will declare adopted later today. And the Commission will execute that one budget. But that there will be difficulties, that I accept. That there will be difficulties about fixing the maximum rate for next year or even perhaps agreeing the maximum rate for this year—that I accept too. But chaos, victory, defeat, surely these are the wrong words!

I am quite convinced, myself, that we had a duty as a Parliament to uphold our rights, and that the Council felt that it had a duty, for reasons that are still not clear to me, to maintain a position which was totally illogical and, I believe, totally against the Treaty. I am equally convinced that at the end of the day the Community will find a way out of this difficulty as it has found a way out of difficulties in the past.

I am convinced of it because of the goodwill which has been shown on all sides, not just by you, Sir, both as chairman of the Committee on Budgets and recently, since you became our President, as chairman of the delegation, but above all by the President of the Council who has gone out of his way to try and find a solution to this problem, and to whom I think the entire Parliament should be deeply grateful, and to the Commissioner, Mr Cheysson, whose interventions have always been logical and fair. There is a determination to find a way if we can find a way and I believe that this resolution is one that enables us to find a way. Let us adopt the budget today, let us get the Regional Fund going—that is what we all want to do—and let us sort out over the next few months the problems that will arise about the budget for next year. This surely is the logical way to proceed. This is the way I hope the Council will proceed and the Commission will proceed and for that reason I, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, strongly urge Par-

liament to vote overwhelmingly in favour of this resolution today.

(Applause)

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

**Mr Artzinger.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall take account of the pressure on our time and be correspondingly brief.

May I first express the thanks of my group to the rapporteur. I believe he has shown once again in his explanatory statement today that we could not find a speaker more committed to our rights in this house. We are grateful to him for his commitment and endorse his proposal. We endorse his proposal to adopt the supplementary budget in the terms of the motion for a resolution, i.e. with all the reservations contained in that resolution. We do so simply because we do not wish to lengthen still further the *via dolorosa* of the Regional Fund—that is the implication of point 5 of the resolution, as the rapporteur has so clearly explained. We want this Fund to be activated now and therefore—and only for this reason—approve this supplementary budget.

I said we endorse all the reservations contained in the resolution but in view of the observations of the previous speaker I would point out that this resolution was adopted unanimously by the Committee on Budgets. It is wrong to imply that a few experts in financial policy and nothing else are simply adopting a position motivated by financial policy considerations; we naturally take political considerations into account even without the help of the Political Affairs Committee.

That is why this motion for a resolution was adopted unanimously with all the reservations we must put forward in the present situation. I shall not repeat again in detail all the reservations emphasized so strongly by the rapporteur.

I shall simply stress two points. First the procedural question: if we ever thought that a dialogue was possible—a dialogue between equals—that possibility was soon dispelled. The rapporteur has said that things were satisfactory on one occasion. But we now see the Council reverting to its previous procedure of speaking to us only through its President. I would stress that we are not criticizing the Council President; on the contrary we are grateful to him for his efforts in our various discussions. But we cannot accept that the Council should restrict the dialogue to an exchange of views. That cannot work, as the dialogue basically consists then of nothing more than the Parliament making its

**Artzinger**

views known. That is not what we want or need and it is not what was planned and agreed.

Secondly, the well-worn question of classification: again I do not wish to repeat all that the rapporteur has already said. We believe it is quite impossible for expenditure to be compulsory for three years and then to be reclassified as non-compulsory. This can really only be described by the Latin saying: *sit pro ratione voluntas*—the Council wants it that way—*sic volo, sic jubeo*—and we must accept it. It is utterly misleading to describe this as a compromise. It is a rejection of the position of our House, and even if an attempt is made to paper over the reality it is still a rejection.

That is why the members of our group do not believe that this Parliament has won a victory with the Netherlands compromise, if I may call it that. We believe—and this point came in for much controversy yesterday afternoon—that we must examine whether this is acceptable. But we do accept it now and I admit that we are certainly not making our attitude of rejection any stronger by so doing. This is not an attitude which will win public support, it is not a statement by this House in support of its rights, but merely a *protestatio facto contraria*, an attitude which contradicts the true position.

Nevertheless we believe that this attitude has its reasons and is justified by the views we have held for many years on the Regional Fund; that is why we can take the course advocated by the rapporteur.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this attitude should be backed by strong words. I do not view disappointment as a political attitude. We must look upon our experience with the Council as a political challenge and consider—if we do not want a confrontation now—when and where we must take that confrontation through to the bitter end. We cannot always be forced to say yes for supposedly higher, political reasons. On the contrary we shall have to seek and find a point at which this confrontation must be played out with all its consequences and I believe we should adopt this supplementary budget today with that resolve in mind. And the resolve will remain.

(Applause)

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

**Mr Lange.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is a little difficult for me to speak today solely on behalf of the Socialist Group, as I am also familiar with the matter in my capacity as chairman of the Committee on

Budgets and used to be concerned with regional policy and the Regional Fund as former chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, which tried in the early seventies to get this policy moving in agreement with the Committee on Budgets at the time when our present President was chairman of that Committee. We therefore have a few common points of contact and a few common experiences.

I should like, however, to say at the outset that the Socialist Group supports this resolution drawn up by the Committee on Budgets, even if one or other of our colleagues may subsequently make different observations on it. I think, however, that we should not enter into a controversy here over the particular positions adopted by any individual delegation in the Council. It seems to me that we must make it quite clear that we have no further objections on account of the Regional Fund to the financial framework set by the Council for the year 1975. We should also stress again, as I wish to do on behalf of the Socialist Group, that we still feel obliged not to change the earlier decisions of the House, namely the framework of 1 300 m u.a. for three years. I would make one thing plain again today to the President of the Council, referring to his question of Tuesday, 15 April to the representatives of Parliament: we do not consider the right to raise expenditure as the essential concept of democracy. I would assure the President of the Council that there might also be a time when we may have to take restrictive measures in finalizing the budget if the Council's expenditure seems too great—in that case we should make expenditure cuts.

Expenditure is one thing and revenue is another, and if the Council members constantly regret the fact that we are repeatedly having to deal with supplementary budgets, the Council itself should create the conditions for strengthening the Community's own resources and in this way pursuing a more reasonable budgetary policy.

A further point, Mr President: I think it is worth putting on record that the Council is not the master of the Treaties. It cannot do as it pleases with the Treaties. The Council cannot seek to manipulate the Treaties according to political situations as they appear to a majority or minority of its members. Mr President of the Council, agreement is necessary between all three Institutions on the application of the Treaties and their provisions.

At the present time we note that the Council is overriding specific provisions of the Treaty on the budgetary powers of Parliament. We cannot under any circumstances accept unilateral suspension by the Council of rights of this Parliament. That does not accord with the

Lange

Treaties and we cannot tolerate it, ladies and gentlemen, because we should ourselves lose credibility in regard to the democratic development of the European Communities.

This means, Mr President of the Council, that we may have to talk about the matter which has to be decided by agreement between the Council and Parliament, namely the classification of expenditure, outside the context of a topical debate. I should be grateful if you could consider such a meeting and discuss the matter with your colleagues in the Council, because it seems to me that we must talk about Article 235, its application and the consequences of decisions arising from Article 235, including decisions having financial implications. I believe that this discussion should not be confined to the Parliament and Council; we should also include the Commission in it. A triangular discussion of this matter is necessary. I believe this would help a whole series of conflicts which now seem to be brewing and will remain until the 1976 budget is discussed, to be removed or lessened.

But let me stress once again that the Council and Parliament must decide by joint agreement on two matters—that is what the Treaty says and that is how Parliament interprets its wording: firstly, on the classification of expenditure and secondly, when additional non-compulsory expenditure is fixed, on the statistical rate of increase. Both these decisions must be taken by joint agreement. These questions will remain open despite the adoption of supplementary budget No 1 under the conditions described here. Since if the Commission publicly declares—and perhaps Mr Cheysson can do so again in order to make the Commission's attitude quite clear to the President of the Council—that it is willing to take over the budget as adopted by Parliament, that means firstly the expenditure in question is classified as non-compulsory—and this does not involve any legal claims by third parties on the Community, that is an important point—and secondly that the maximum rate has not been fixed by joint agreement but only by Parliament, and the Commission must take this maximum rate into account in fixing the 1976 rate. If that happens then we shall simply have a budget which corresponds to the Council's ideas as far as the figures and financial machinery are concerned but cannot be reconciled with the basic principles which must be agreed by discussion between the Council and Parliament.

I would therefore ask the President-in-Office of the Council, and also the Commission, to consider once again whether this discussion between the three Institutions on these matters

cannot be arranged in the foreseeable future without us having to talk about a supplementary budget or the 1976 budget at the same time. I would be grateful if this could be done. And I think, Mr President of the Council, that if this Parliament is to remain true to its own ideas and retain its public credibility, it must not accept a compromise which some British newspapers suggest would be a great victory for Parliament if it were accepted. This position is not tolerable to Parliament. Once again, ladies and gentlemen, we cannot accept the Council's ideas on this matter. We must maintain our own positions and urge the Council to enter into a genuine discussion with the Parliament, including the Commission as well.

There is a further point to consider here. If we accept the Council's interpretation of Article 235 and the consequent decisions, everything done by the Council on the basis—as the Council maintains—of Article 235 will escape the possible intervention of Parliament. But the Council members all subscribe to the idea of full democratic and parliamentary rights; all of them have been or are parliamentarians—if I consider the provisions in certain member countries where members of the government who are appointed Ministers must leave their parliament. I wonder then why they want to take away or temporarily suspend these rights of the European Parliamentary Assembly. I cannot understand their reasoning. As to the specific question at issue, namely the classification of the Regional Fund expenditure, there can be no reason whatever for classifying this expenditure as compulsory up to 1977 inclusive, and then suddenly treating it as non-compulsory. Even if we could see what the Council is driving at, there could be no understandable reasons for this arrangement. We cannot see such reasons and the Council has not yet explained itself in such a way that we could see any understandable reasons for its position.

Once again, there is no need for us to seek at all costs what our colleague, Mr Artzinger, calls an absolute confrontation. For the next few weeks and months, I recommend basically the avoidance of such a confrontation and instead joint efforts to promote the democratic development of the Institutions of the Community and hence of the Community itself. That is why we must all work together; for us in Parliament, this means that the rights of the European Parliament must be maintained and not only maintained but also extended, so that in 1978 we are able to offer our citizens elections to a body which deserves to be called a Parliament. We must then be a Parliament with legislative and controlling powers and these must grow out of our budgetary powers.

**Lange**

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr President, I have made these remarks on behalf of the Socialist Group. I trust you will take the matter as seriously as it deserves to be taken. We are not set on an inevitable collision course but, Mr President of the Council, we are willing to defend this position of Parliament resolutely and, if necessary, with great hardness if the Council should really prove unwilling to work towards greater powers for this Parliament or even to safeguard the rights already laid down in the Treaties. Under these conditions, and subject, if you like, to these reservations, we shall vote in favour of supplementary budget No 1, and of the Committee on Budgets' motion for a resolution which clearly shows that the conversations between the Institutions of these European Communities must be continued in the interests of the development of the Community—in other words in the interests of the people of this Community.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Shaw to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

**Mr Shaw.** — Mr President, I want to be very brief because I believe too that the case has been very well put already. I agree with Mr Lange that we must be seen to be moving forwards. But what we have got to make quite sure about is that we all move forward together and I believe that Mr Aigner, whom I am very glad to see back in his usual robust health, has put the case in a way that we must all applaud because he has stood up for the very proper and fundamental rights of this Parliament.

When we vote for the resolution this afternoon I hope that we will all have read every part of his report, because the reasons as to why we are voting the way we are as important as the result itself. We have doubts and worries, but we have in our minds the supreme importance of the task that we want to set on foot. Once we have got that task moving, we have given notice that we believe that it is absolutely essential that we remain firm to what we believe are our rights. Whether it takes one, two or three years, we are determined to uphold them and to develop them in cooperation with the other institutions—not to allow them to develop their rights at the expense of our own.

I should like too, Mr President, to congratulate my honourable friend Mr Kirk on what I believe to be an outstanding contribution to this debate, on putting so clearly our views and saying where we stand on this matter. So I would just like to leave this whole question of whether it is a

political or a practical decision that we are taking by saying that in my view it is a political decision. It is also a decision of convenience not for this Parliament but for the Council, because I believe that it allows the Council to paper over the differences that exist within the Council itself. In any case, I believe that we have shown quite clearly our own determination to stand up for the rights of this Parliament.

May I in a few remaining minutes, Mr President, say why I believe that we are right to, if you like, compromise in the way that we have done. We, as the European Conservative Group, believe that the Regional Fund is one of the most important matters that have been tackled by the Community. It is a clear, important and practical expression of the true purpose of the EEC. The Fund shows that whatever the differences that may exist between our countries, there are overriding Community interests. It expresses practically the feeling we have that those parts of the Community that through geography, through history or through any other cause should be helped, must be helped by the Community as a whole. That feeling has been accepted nationally and particularly in our country for a long time. Here we are showing that what has been accepted nationally is now being accepted in the Community as whole.

Those parts, for example, of my own country in the north-east, the north-west, Scotland and Wales, those parts of the country that have been helped to restructure themselves and to regain prosperity by our own country through national effort, will be further assisted by the united help of the Community as a whole. I believe that this is a landmark showing the true purpose of Community endeavour. I believe that this can give to those who may be wondering where their future may lie a positive assurance that the Community cares for all parts, not just for certain more prosperous parts.

How well indeed that concept fits in with our own concept in the United Kingdom! The United Kingdom has over the last hundred years or so based its role on the concept of a family—the family of the Commonwealth. That family has now grown up and we must seek a new role, and that role is not to stand alone but to stand within the Community and work within the Community, and where more natural than in the Community of Europe?

So I believe that our task now is to support this Regional Fund, to get it going as quickly as it can, so that we can build on it for all sections of the Community, including those sections that are already being assisted by the national governments. Here we have a purpose transcending nations but helping all nations, and I believe that



**Shaw**

we must put that concern first and we must see that there is no delay. It is for that reason that I believe we should, if you like, compromise on the decision we take today. We reserve our rights clearly and firmly, as Mr Aigner has said, but nonetheless in taking the action that we are taking today we are ensuring that the purpose that we all have in mind makes progress.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — I call Mr Johnston to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group.

**Mr Johnston.** — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the argument is, I believe, clear and compelling and has already been very effectively set out by Mr Aigner and by others. Therefore, it is fortunately not really necessary for me to do much more than state the support of the Liberal Group for the recommendations of the Committee on Budgets.

The problem here is basically, as I think Mr Kirk said, a political matter rather than a budgetary matter. Parliament must assert its Treaty-based rights and must reject a situation where discussion with the Council becomes dictation by the Council. There is a conflict in fact and we cannot disregard the conflict, but we should not over-dramatize it either.

It is perhaps, strange and in a way especially regrettable that the conflict should come over the Regional Fund. The previous speaker Mr Shaw, on behalf of the Conservative Group, has said the Fund is something which has united the whole of Parliament in the desire to see it implemented as quickly as possible and financed as reasonably and as effectively as possible. By its nature the Regional Fund, like the Social Fund, as Mr Aigner said, is non-compulsory expenditure according to any reasonable definition and therefore the contradictory approach adopted by the Council cannot really be defended. Indeed, as Mr Aigner remarked, as we approach direct elections—and I hope that they are not too far off now—it is sad that the Council should be taking up this sort of position. There is no doubt that we would betray the democratic function which it is our responsibility to exercise if we did not take the stand that I know we will take and express the view that I know we will express this afternoon. We will not do so by any flamboyant gesture or anything of that nature, as both Mr Aigner and Mr Kirk put it, but by a firm, quiet but very determined statement of our position. On behalf of the Liberal Group I am very happy to support what the Committee on Budgets proposed and I would compliment Mr Aigner on his work, and indeed yourself Mr President.

**President.** — I call Mr Cointat to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

**Mr Cointat.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I agree fully with Mr Aigner's observations; with his usual commitment to the cause he has presented this problem to us with remarkable clarity. I shall therefore confine myself to two observations concerning the amount of the appropriations for the Regional Fund, and the classification of this expenditure.

The Regional Fund has at last been established after years of effort and a constant struggle by our Assembly. We should therefore be delighted. But we are saddened by our disappointed hopes.

Hardly has this fund been set up than it resembles a shrunken shadow of itself. We wanted a solid, powerful regional fund and our Group had been calling for an appropriation of 600 m u.a. for the financial year 1975. The Paris summit decided on a fund of 1 300 m u.a. over 3 years, 300 million this year and 500 million for the two following years.

That then was a first failure. In addition, I must stress that the conference of Heads of State or Government very strangely took the place of the Community budgetary authorities. Today the ministers—I understand their point of view—are standing behind the decision of their Heads of State or Government like disciplined and respectful servants so as not to modify or discuss the figures announced. However, let us admit that the failure was not over-serious and we should have been satisfied with 300 m u.a.

But that is not all: the Council and Commission, with great skill, went on to use the distinction between commitment authorizations and payment authorizations to undermine the position of the European Parliament. These 300 m u.a. were then to be considered as commitment authorizations and only 150 m u.a. would be entered by way of payment authorizations in the budget since, we are told, it is impossible to spend all the commitment appropriations in a single year. It is true that activation of the Fund requires a running-in period and that its effectiveness cannot be immediate; that is why we accepted the arguments of the Commission and Council and agreed to review our position. Our Assembly then voted an amendment which distributed 150 million of the 300 m u.a. on the real budgetary line and 150 million to chapter 98 as a reserve. Unfortunately the Council did not accept this procedure which seemed both logical and reasonable. Supplementary budget No 1 for the Regional Fund comprises only 150 m u.a., no more no less, and the original 300

**Cointat**

million, which had been decided on, are no longer to be found.

We cannot accept without regret and surprise a decision which consists in announcing 300 million by way of commitment authorizations, in not entering these 300 million in the budget, and in only officially retaining the payment authorizations of 150 million. You will admit, Mr President, that this is to say the least a curious and unusual budgetary procedure which represents a dubious innovation. Of course the Council has undertaken to review the amount if it proves insufficient—here we are in agreement—but I do not believe in the virtue of repeated supplementary budgets. I think then that I am entitled to describe the transition from our hope of 600 m u.a. for 1975 to a summit decision of 300 million and finally a real budget of 150 million, as the very image of the famous asses' skin which was always shrinking.

But let us be philosophical about it, trust in the future and say that this failure regarding the amount of the Regional Fund is not the most serious. To my mind the disagreement on the classification which should be determined by an accord between the budgetary authorities is more serious still. The Council, against the wishes of the European Parliament and against the Commission's opinion, unilaterally decided that the Regional Fund would represent compulsory expenditure for three years. In addition, the Council went back on the definition it had itself given of compulsory expenditure. Once again it has hidden behind the decision of the Heads of State or Government to prevent their decision from being called into question again. This amounts quite simply to the arbitrary suspension of the powers of our Assembly. All this is very curious, unorthodox, unconfomist and to put it bluntly, not very honest. What is the point of giving budgetary powers to the European Parliament if the right to exercise those powers is to be accorded or withheld depending on the particular instance, the wishes of the Council or the state of mind of some of its members?

However, it is better not to look too closely at the reasons for entering and classifying these 150 m u.a. appropriations. As we have seen, these 150 m u.a. represent payment authorizations; now it is true that payment authorizations are always compulsory. It is the commitment authorizations of the Regional Fund which constitute non-compulsory expenditure, as these commitment authorizations must determine the nature of the expenditure and the policy to be followed. But these commitment authorizations had to be entered in the budget, which I think was a political measure.

After those bitter remarks, Mr President, let us not dwell on the problems; realism is called for now. Above all it is essential and urgently necessary for the Regional Fund to function. So that the Fund can be activated in 1975, the Group of European Progressive Democrats which is one of its keenest proponents, will therefore vote in favour of this motion for a resolution even if it considers that it is not by juggling with principles and performing a balancing act that the conflict between the Parliament and Council on the general issue of the classification of expenditure can be settled.

*(Applause)*

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

**Mr Fabbrini.** — *(I)* Mr President, my group has already repeatedly expressed its reservations and criticism, not only of the amount of the Fund, but also of the procedure followed, outside the Community Institutions, to set it up. Our criticisms are well-founded and have found other supporters, even in today's debate; the latest of them was Mr Cointat who spoke of an asses' skin, referring above all to the Commission's original proposal.

I do not wish to repeat what we have already said in previous debates: I shall look mainly at the political aspect of the problem which, once again, is that of the budgetary powers of the European Parliament. It is an old problem which has sometimes seemed to be moving towards a solution but in fact, as our debate today has shown, is now becoming increasingly complex, because of the attitude adopted by the Council which I have no hesitation in defining as politically absurd. I shall therefore confine myself to looking primarily at this aspect of the problem, and I support in part what the rapporteur himself has said.

I would draw your attention first and foremost to the Council's letter, and in particular to the last part of the second paragraph of point 1 of this letter which seems to me extremely serious politically. These lines amount to no less than an attempt to blackmail our Parliament, since the Council says that it will be willing to classify expenditure for the Regional Fund as non-compulsory from 1978, provided that Parliament agrees to treat that expenditure as compulsory until 1978.

I believe that a qualified Assembly such as ours must reject blackmail of this kind with great firmness. I would add that I agree fully with those of you who have described the compromise proposed by the Council as illogical. There is in fact no logic in the proposal from the Council

**Fabbrini**

which is saying that if you accept to treat as compulsory expenditure the appropriations entered for the Regional Fund until 1978, we shall agree to enter as non-compulsory appropriations for subsequent financial years. There is no logic here because at the level of principle and legal provisions, what is valid today should remain valid tomorrow, unless there are changes in the Treaties, and it is accordingly impossible to understand how expenditure can be compulsory until 1978 and non-compulsory thereafter. The proposal is without logic and unfounded and contains a contradiction in terms which I consider quite blatant; I therefore agree with the observations of other speakers, including the rapporteur, on this point.

But basically it is the political aspect which interests us today and on which we must express our opinion. In this connection I must say that I agree with the spirit of the resolution in that it tends to defend the budgetary powers of the European Parliament with the prospect of a future increase in these powers. I agree then with the spirit of the resolution which is expressed very clearly in paragraph 1. However, while accepting the spirit, I cannot accept the resolution as a whole because, if we are today in this difficult and complex situation, the responsibility lies in large measure with the positions previously adopted by a majority of Members of this Parliament which has given in to the Council of Ministers' efforts to centralize power, thus preventing progress from being made on this important issue of powers.

My group will therefore abstain, although differing points of view have been expressed within it. It will abstain, but let me stress once again that we accept the spirit of the resolution. Our abstention therefore has the specific purpose of repeating our criticism of the limited amount of the Fund and a certain weakness shown by a majority of Members of this Parliament on several occasions.

**President.** — I call Mr Brugger.

**Mr Brugger.** — (D) Mr President, first of all I wish to thank the rapporteur for the clarity of his observations and in particular for highlighting the defects of this procedure. We are certainly witnessing a regression from the declarations made in connection with our efforts to bring about European Union. I have very little time and shall not attempt to explain the reasons for this. Let me just make one point clear. We have frequently referred to Article 235 as a possible means of increasing the powers of the European Communities. This article gives the Community the possibility of going beyond the limits set on its economic activities by the

Treaties. The regulation on the Regional Fund is based on this article.

If now, on the basis of the repeatedly emphasized conduct of the Council in interpreting the limit between compulsory and non-compulsory expenditure, the budgetary powers of Parliament are to be weakened, then this Article 235 has lost much of its value to the Parliament.

Allow me, however, to revert briefly to Article 203 and draw attention to the legal error which the Council seems to me to be making when it states that the expenditure under consideration here is compulsory because it arises from a legal act adopted on the basis of the Treaty. Article 203 (4) second paragraph, states that the Assembly is entitled to amend the draft budget by a majority of its members, and to propose modifications to the Council, acting by an absolute majority of the votes cast, in respect of expenditure necessarily resulting from the Treaty or from acts adopted in accordance therewith. The Council is invoking this latter provision in seeking to make this expenditure compulsory. But if this phrase is to be interpreted as the Council is now trying to do, why are the first words 'necessarily resulting from the Treaty' required? They could quite simply be deleted. But if the second part of the sentence means something other than what the Council is claiming as its meaning, then this second part must be seen in conjunction with the first. In that case this second part of the sentence refers to acts adopted in the execution of expenditure necessarily resulting from the Treaty.

I thought it appropriate to make this point briefly today because I assume that in the debate on the 1976 budget we shall have to look very closely at the whole matter. I can only hope that the Council will by then have undertaken a different definition and classification of compulsory and non-compulsory expenditure.

I personally consider today's debate as essentially positive; because it has shown that Parliament is keeping a vigilant watch on attempts by the Council to override—that is what is happening—the incipient sovereignty of our Assembly. Let us not forget the fine declarations which we made in the debate on the achievement of European Union at the earliest possible date. Let us remember that we shall have direct elections to this Parliament in just over two years' time. If now our rightful powers are to be intentionally taken away from us again, do you think there are many electors who will want to vote for a European Parliament? But if the participation is poor, we shall probably not be able to make much progress in the future with the Community.

**President.** — I call Mr Albertsen.

**Mr Albertsen.** — (DK) Mr President, I should first like to thank my colleagues in the Socialist Group for giving me the opportunity to state certain views that diverge from those stated by our spokesman on behalf of the great majority of the group.

What we are concerned with here, i.e. supplementary budget No 1 for 1975, does not really touch on the manner in which the budget should be drawn up. The heart of the matter is essentially more a question of principle, as Parliament will today adopt a position on two general and crucial issues. The first is how Parliament's enlarged budgetary powers, as set out in the so-called Luxembourg Agreement, should be defined. The second is whether the Assembly feels that this is a situation justifying an institutional dispute between the Council and Parliament.

When we last dealt with this matter in Parliament, we were confronted with a situation in which the Council had decided that appropriations to the Regional Fund, in the absence of extenuating circumstances, should be classified as compulsory, with the result that Parliament would have no say in the matter. I was on that occasion one of those who voted that Parliament should not accept this position of the Council. But during the talks which, in my opinion, were conducted in an excellent way, between a delegation from the Assembly and the Council, it proved possible to change the Council's position, although for certain Member States it was not a very easy change. The basis of the Council's new position is the fact, which is also acknowledged in the motion for a resolution presented by the rapporteur, Mr Aigner, that the size of the Regional Fund for the first three years has been established by the Heads of State or Government at the Summit Conference in Paris in December. I therefore feel able to support whole-heartedly the reference in the motion for a resolution regarding Parliament's acceptance of the financial limits as laid down by the Summit Conference and later confirmed by the Council. But in its new attitude the Council goes beyond this basic assumption, on which we are all agreed, and accepts the obligation to classify, after the first three years the expenditure of the Regional Fund as non-compulsory, thereby incorporating it in that part of the budget over which Parliament exercises a decisive influence. I, and those who share my opinion, feel that the Council has been most obliging in the matter of Parliament's wishes. In our opinion, it has really stretched out a hand to us, which we should accept.

As for the answer to the first question concerning the definition of Parliament's powers, I

believe it can be answered that the Council has, within the limits of Article 203 of the Treaty, shown the greatest possible degree of accommodation towards Parliament.

As regards the second question, whether there is cause for sparking off a real dispute between the two institutions, I consider that, even if the Council had been less accommodating, this Assembly would have had to consider very carefully whether it was reasonable at this particular moment to provoke a constitutional crisis within the Communities. Given the Council's outstretched hand, it seems quite evident that this is no time for such a dispute. Parliament has emphasized, not least through our excellent rapporteur on this subject, Mr Aigner, that the most important thing is to establish a reasonable degree of cooperation between the Council and Parliament, cooperation which, in a spirit of mutual understanding, can solve the problems raised by the awkward wording of Article 203. To adopt this motion for a resolution and so to reject the Council's compromise proposal would be to break with the policy we have followed so far.

Further, if the motion for a resolution were adopted, we should find ourselves in a situation where I myself and those who share my opinion would not feel satisfied that the budget adopted by Parliament enjoyed full legality.

With this in view, I would like to ask my colleagues to consider the matter once again. This is, I believe, a milestone in the activities of Parliament, and I feel that we in this Assembly should be the first to show a feeling of responsibility and a will to cooperate.

I therefore request that this motion for a resolution be rejected, thus opening the way to acceptance of the Council's compromise proposal. (Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Maigaard.

**Mr Maigaard.** — (DK) I should like to outline my views briefly on this subject. I agree with Mr Aigner at least on the fact that we are confronted with a political issue—not an issue about finance but an issue concerning the division of powers among institutions, in other words an issue about the nature of cooperation between the countries of the European Community.

Briefly, I should like to say that I wish to see a strong Council of Ministers, since it is in the Council of Ministers that the nations have the opportunity to exercise the right of veto so as to ensure that cooperation is not pushed forward in certain directions or at a certain speed without the consent of the citizens of all

**Maigaard**

member countries. That is the reason why, generally speaking, I wish to limit non-compulsory expenditure as far as possible, and that is why I welcome the fact that all the Danish parties—I say again: all the Danish parties—have supported the position taken by our government on this matter.

Mr Peter Kirk feels that, if Parliament adopts the budget here this afternoon, it will be a single budget, namely Parliament's, and that is what we should be working for. I do not agree with Mr Kirk, and I feel that my eminent friend and colleague, Mr Albertsen, got much nearer the point when he emphasized the practical difficulties which would arise if Parliament adopted a budget other than that drawn up by the Council of Ministers. In my opinion the situation would be chaotic, for if there are two supplementary budgets—Parliament's and the Council of Ministers'—then there is no supplementary budget at all. Having two budgets means that we have no budget at all, and we would therefore be confronted by a chaotic situation, if we adopted the Committee on Budgets' majority recommendation. I personally, in any case, would be against the Danish Government paying out the Danish contribution to the Regional Fund against the background of the formal situation that would exist between Parliament and the Council of Ministers. This should only be paid by the Danish Treasury when the legal basis is clear and unambiguous—which is not the case here. Finally, I must, in all respect, it only for good order's sake, point out to Mr Aigner, who mentioned direct elections to the European Parliament in 1978, that the Danish and British Governments expressed reservations on the subject of direct elections in 1978 at the Summit Conference in Paris.

**President.** — I call Mr Bersani.

**Mr Bersani.** — (1) Mr President, I shall speak very briefly in order to state that I, too, am in agreement with the presentation of the problem that my colleague Mr Aigner has given in such excellent fashion, my agreement extending to the substance, the spirit—as has been said—and the content of the motion for a resolution tabled by the Committee on Budgets.

The problem that is once again before us has various aspects. A first aspect relates to the Regional Fund as such. Although I note with satisfaction that this highly significant and important instrument of Community policy has finally been set in motion, I still have my reservations regarding the manner in which the available financial resources have come to be so heavily cut (from 600 to 300 and then finally 150 m u.a.) and regarding the clouds which are

again gathering over those parts of the budget that are already committed in order to finance individual structural projects in agriculture. For these I feel I must reiterate my wholehearted conviction that they should remain intact if we wish to launch an action in favour of these regions most in need of help, since otherwise we would be weakening precisely those measures that are most capable of being quickly introduced in regions for which the planned regional policy actions are primarily intended.

There is a second, and more definitely political, aspect. We are faced with a compromise which compels us to enter the most forceful and definite reservations. The decisions of the Council have brought about an impasse in the dialogue of political cooperation between the Institutions; they affect, in other words, the fundamental aspect of the life of the Community. It is for this reason, over and above the regional problem itself, that there arises a question of fundamental principle—as many of you have rightly remarked—which directly affects Parliament's powers in budgetary matters. I, too, believe that, if Parliament speaks up unanimously, in a firm and clear voice, in the defence of what are not only its rights but also the objective preservation of a proper, democratic and balanced relationship between the Institutions, it will be making responsible use of this opportunity to perform one of its duties that coincide with the vital interests of the Community. I am therefore in agreement as to the substance of the problem.

These reservations having been made, and these rights having been firmly and definitely reiterated on behalf of Parliament, I consider that it is possible to give our agreement and our vote to the resolution which, aside from these difficulties, enables us to set in motion one of the most important and most significant aspects of Community policy.

Our struggle for an effective regional policy, that has been going on for so many years, has reached a stage where there are still clouds to be dispelled but also where major positive developments are possible. The struggle will continue because regional policy—and this is our firm belief—is one of the most outstanding and convincing expressions of that policy of integration and cooperative development on which the future of our Community and its ability to be an instrument of justice and international peace in the world are based.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr McDonald.

**Mr McDonald.** — Mr President, speaking as chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy and Transport, I should like at the outset to express my full support for this report and to compliment Mr Aigner on the tremendous amount of work he has put into its presentation.

We know that the overall amount of money for the first three years of the Regional Development Fund has already been determined by the Heads of State, determined I might say outside the framework of the Community's institutions, and I think that we must reluctantly recognize that the possibility of increasing this money for the first 3-year period will, in practice, be remote.

I do not think that this is the moment for me to repeat the disappointment the Committee on Regional Policy and Transport felt (a) about the small size of the Fund and (b) about its distribution. The committee has already gone on record concerning these two points. Mr President, what we are being asked to do today in approving this motion for a resolution is to assert an important point of principle. Parliament, and indeed the Commission, have both consistently expressed the view that the Regional Fund expenditure is of non-compulsory nature. I do not think it would be either honourable or logical for us to depart from this position now. Were Parliament being asked today to take a course of action which could delay the setting up of the Regional Development Fund, I would find myself in an awkward position because I feel very strongly that after all the shilly-shallying, bargaining and compromise of the last two years, the time has come to get the Fund going even if it is not on the basis on which we would all like to see it started. Luckily, however, we are not today doing anything which will delay the setting up of the Fund. On the contrary, paragraph 5 of the motion stresses our determination that it should be activated as soon as possible.

In view of the undertaking given by the Council in the President's letter of 22 April to review the position in regard to the 150 million u.a. should these appropriations be insufficient, I think that the Committee on Budgets is right in deciding not to re-submit its former amendments and that as far as the Parliament is concerned we have done all we can to enable the Fund to be set up. Speaking on behalf of my committee, I would conclude by saying that we will continue to follow the evolution of the Community's regional policy with the greatest attention and we will do everything in our power to ensure that a just and equitable Fund emerges in the future.

(Applause)

## IN THE CHAIR: Mr BERSANI

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Aigner.

**Mr Aigner, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, I should like to thank all speakers and the Groups very much for their clear support for the Committee on Budgets' resolution. However, I asked to speak again because of what Mr Maigaard said. When the decision about the Regional Fund was taken in Paris on 9 and 10 December 1974, all the Heads of Government also affirmed their intention to introduce European elections as soon as possible, i.e. by 1978 at the latest. That was also stated at the Summit Conference. The British Government merely noted that it was in favour in principle, but could not enter into a commitment before the referendum, and the Danish Government—possibly in support of the British statement—expressed virtually no opinion either for or against. That was quite clear from the Summit Conference; I wanted to make that correction.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this discussion of course reflects the situation before the referendum in Great Britain. Speaking personally, and not as rapporteur, I believe that nothing is more important than to reveal to the British elector what the face of Europe is to look like tomorrow. It is simply not true that the British people, with their long parliamentary tradition, want a Parliament which can be described as a talking shop. The British people also want to preserve their identity as a national state, as we all do, but where it is not possible to maintain and preserve our national identity, we want a strong European Government. This strong European Government should be supervised, however, by a strong European Parliament and a strong Chamber of Nationalities. That is the vision we all support here and the British elector ought to be aware of this before the referendum, since the British people fear nothing as much as decisions being taken behind the anonymity of the Council, as is the case at present. If such decisions are to be made really open decisions at European level, and strong Parliamentary control is to be clearly apparent, so that the people can call their Members of Parliament to account, the face of Europe will have a different appearance from that which it has today. The people want a clear picture of this Europe, and so do the electors in Great Britain, and we ought to make our position clear before the referendum.

Mr President, I had to make these comments because I wanted to dispute the statement that

**Aigner**

the Summit Conference had not expressed a commitment to European elections.

**President.** — I call Mr Maigaard.

**Mr Maigaard.** — (DK) I should simply like to say to Mr Aigner that we are bound by the Treaty of Rome to hold direct elections to the European Parliament, there is no doubt about this; but the Treaty also states that there should be unanimous agreement on when to introduce the elections, and I believe that Mr Aigner is perfectly well aware that the reservations expressed by the Danish Government, which are not felt any less strongly since the change of government in January, are earnest. It is not right, when two governments have expressed reservations about direct elections in 1978, to act as if those reservations do not exist. It is not particularly European to ignore the views of two new member countries on a subject as important as this.

I feel that Mr Aigner should respect the fact that other opinions exist in the European Community besides his own. The views of the Danish Government, for example, are perfectly clear and explicit, if one reads the communiqué of the Summit Conference. The Danish Government does not advocate direct elections in 1978, and is supported on this attitude by the political parties.

**President.** — I call Mr Cheysson.

**Mr Cheysson, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (F) Mr President, the Commission deplores the fact that there is a dispute between the Council and Parliament; it was not the Commission's fault that no formula was found. I would like to point out that on 15 April the Commission tabled a proposal for a compromise which recognized the principle of the non-compulsory character of the expenditure. Unfortunately that proposal was not accepted. We would have liked there to be agreement between Parliament and the Council on this matter. As has been rightly stressed, this is not a matter of a budgetary conflict, since there is no disagreement on the figures and since even Parliament, through the words of its rapporteur the other day, had offered to commit itself with regard to the 1976 and 1977 figures.

As regards the figures there is no longer any disagreement since Parliament is not proceeding with the two proposals that it made the other day and on this point I would like merely to recall the commitment entered into by the Commission. This 150 million u.a. that you wished to enter under Chapter 98 will not be missing,

I assure you; we shall launch or carry out operations up to the total of 300 million u.a. decided by the Summit and provided for in the regulation that you have adopted.

We have entered a commitment appropriation in the draft budget and I take this opportunity to correct what Mr Cointat has just said on this subject. Similarly we shall be tabling, during the next few days, the proposal for the transfer from Article 833 to Article 800 which will be approved in accordance with the usual procedure.

There is therefore no dispute about the figures, there is no budgetary dispute. Unfortunately there is a dispute of a basically political nature, a dispute of principle. On the reason for this dispute, the position of the Commission has been clear from the start and I thank the speakers and authors of the motion for a resolution for having recognized this. Like you we feel that Regional Development Fund expenditure must be non-compulsory.

On this point I would like to tell Mr Aigner that the Commission does not think that any operation resulting from the application of Article 235 automatically falls under the heading of non-compulsory expenditure. There may be some that qualify as compulsory expenditure. In the present case this is not so.

Admittedly the definition of compulsory expenditure and non-compulsory expenditure can give rise to ambiguity and on this point I, personally, find very attractive the proposal made by Mr Lange to the effect that there should be—to use a new expression invented by our interpreter—a 'trialogue', a three-cornered discussion between the Council, Parliament and the Commission in an attempt to clarify the not very clear provisions of Article 203 of the Treaty. On this specific point the Commission has always maintained that this expenditure should be regarded as non-compulsory. The Commission, consistent in its position from the start and with due respect for the decisions of Parliament, will therefore carry out the budget in the form in which you approve it, if it is adopted in the conditions recommended by the Committee on Budgets and the Political Affairs Committee. It will apply the budget immediately as adopted and will draw the relevant conclusions in preparing the preliminary draft budget for 1976. Our reply is perfectly clear.

Mr Kirk would appear to be right in saying that this type of dispute is normal between two institutions, particularly when they are gradually finding their position. It is a normal dispute but it is one of very considerable importance; its nature is fundamentally political and the Commission, for its part, is fully aware of this. Are

**Cheysson**

we a Community or are we merely a Common Market? This is what the argument is about. For the Commission, as the Rome Treaty intended, as this Parliament has always intended and as the Council of Ministers and the European Council have expressed hope for on many occasions, we are a Community. This Community is resolutely democratic as we have seen in many ways, in our attitude towards other countries, for example. And in our democratic Community, Parliament must gradually take its rightful place. That place includes respect of what the Treaties recognise to be its rights and which now must be applied. On this point, the Commission's mind is made up.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr FitzGerald.

**Mr FitzGerald, President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities.** — In other circumstances, Mr President, I should have been happy to have replied to a number of points in the debate which I feel are matters of argument. I feel, however, that on this occasion I should confine myself to saying that, without prejudice to the position of the Council on this matter, I have listened with close attention to this debate and that I shall report fully to the Council on it. I should add that I note that the Commission has stated that, following the adoption of the resolution by Parliament, it intends to implement the budget and commence payments from the Fund.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Aigner.

**Mr Aigner, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, I should like to thank the President of the Council very much for this last announcement.

**President.** — The general debate is closed.

I would remind you that the vote on the draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 will take place this afternoon at 3 p.m.

The sitting is suspended.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.45 p.m. and resumed at 3.15 p.m.)

**IN THE CHAIR: Mr SPÉNALE**

*President*

**President.** — The sitting is resumed.

**7. Request for debate by urgent procedure and inclusion in the agenda**

**President.** — I have received from Mr Cointat and others, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, a request for a debate by urgent procedure, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on beef imports. This document has been printed and distributed under No 67/75.

Are there any objections to the request for urgent procedure?

The adoption of urgent procedure is agreed.

I propose that this debate be placed at the end of tomorrow's agenda.

Are there any objections?

I call Mr Liogier.

**Mr Liogier.** — (F) Mr President, urgency having been decided with regard to the debate on imports of beef and veal as requested by our Group, Rule 14(3) of the Rules of Procedure gives this debate absolute priority on the agenda. Admittedly, in view of Mr Lardinois' absence this afternoon, the debate cannot begin immediately but we request that it should be put down as the first item on our order of business for tomorrow morning.

(Applause from the benches of the Group of European Progressive Democrats)

**President.** — I call Mr Deschamps.

**Mr Deschamps.** — (F) Mr President, I am sorry that I am unable to accept the proposal that has just been made and in doing so I think that I speak in the name of all those who are concerned by the development problem. The first item on tomorrow morning's agenda is the debate on Mr Bersani's report on the problem the Community's overall development cooperation policy. Our discussions on this have gone on far too long; we have been waiting far too long to be able to put this problem before the Assembly—which only too often tends to defer development questions to the end of a part-session so that we should then accept their postponement, whereas now we have an occasion to have a satisfactory debate on this important problem. I hope that the Assembly will support me in this view.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Fellermaier.

**Mr Fellermaier.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, urgency procedure must have a high rating and considerable political importance. In



**Fellermaier**

questions of this kind there must be some doubt as to whether they are so urgent that they must be dealt with tomorrow afternoon. In my view, since Parliament meets again in two weeks' time in Strasbourg, the Group which has requested a debate by urgent procedure can then raise this matter in the form of a normal oral question with debate. I would like to state that I cannot give the agreement of my Group to a debate by urgent procedure, particularly if development policy questions, for example, had to be deferred because of this urgency. If the matter is really urgent, this will still be the case in two weeks' time.

**President.** — I call Mr Gibbons.

**Mr Gibbons.** — Mr President, I would urge you to accept the proposal that has just been made by my colleague Mr Liogier. The House will be well aware of the fact that it was not possible to treat this matter in any other way than that which we have adopted, because the decisions that we wish to discuss as a matter of urgency were reached by the Council of Ministers only a matter of hours ago—or a couple of days ago, at any rate. It is a matter of the most vital importance for the cattle-producers especially of my own country but also of the Community as a whole. I would ask you, Sir, to remember that it is in accordance with the Rules of Procedure of the House that it be taken as soon as possible once the urgency of the matter has been determined; and so I would ask my colleagues and you, Sir, to accede to our request to have it taken in the morning.

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, I would first of all remind Mr Fellermaier that the adoption of urgent procedure has been agreed, and secondly I would say to Mr Cointat, Mr Liogier and Mr Gibbons that when we drew up the agenda the items we included were also included for reasons of urgency, since the next part-session will be taking place in a fortnight's time. The use of the urgent procedure provided for in the Rules of Procedure should not result in disruption of our proceedings.

There is one other practical detail, namely, that if we took this matter at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting, Mr Lardinois would not be present and we could not discuss the matter properly with the Commission.

For all these reasons I propose that, urgent procedure having been adopted, we should debate this item at the end of tomorrow's sitting, as I originally proposed.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

**8. Amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the Communities for 1975 (vote)**

**President.** — The next item is the vote on the motion for a resolution contained in the supplementary report drawn up by Mr Aigner on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the draft amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the European Communities for the financial year 1975 (Doc. 54/75).

On the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 6 I have no amendments or speakers listed.

I put these texts to the vote.

The preamble and paragraphs 1 to 6 are adopted.

On paragraph 7 I have a request for a vote by roll call pursuant to Rule 35(3) of the Rules of Procedure.

The roll call will begin with Mr Artzinger, whose name has been drawn by lot.

The vote may commence.

I ask the Secretary-General to call the roll.

*(The roll call was taken)*

Does anyone else wish to vote?

The ballot is closed.

Here is the result of the vote.

Number of Members voting: 137

For: 127

Against: 4

Abstentions: 6

The following voted in favour:

Mr Adams, Mr Aigner, Mr Albers, Mr Andreotti, Mr Antoniozzi, Mr Ariosto, Mr Artzinger, Mr Bangemann, Mr Behrendt, Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Bermanni, Mr Bersani, Mr Alfred Bertrand, Lord Bessborough, Lord Bethell, Mr Boano, Mr Brégégère, Mr Broeksz, Mr de Broglie, Mr Brugger, Mr Burgbacher, Mr Carpentier, Mr Cifarelli, Mr Cointat, Mr Concas, Mr Corona, Mr Corrie, Mr Corterier, Mr Covelli, Mr Creed, Mr De Clercq, Mr De Keersmaecker, Mr Della Briotta, Mr Delmotte, Mr De Sanctis, Mr Deschamps, Mr Dondelinger, Mr Dunne, Mr Durand, Mr Durieux, Mr Duval, Mr Dykes, Lady Elles, Mr Fellermaier, Mr Flämig, Miss Flesch, Mr Frehsee, Mr Früh, Mr Gerlach, Mr Geurtsen, Mr Gibbons, Mr Giraud, Mr Glinne, Mr Guldberg, Mr Van der Gun, Mr Hansen, Mr Härzschel, Mr Van der Hek, Mr Herbert, Mr Howell, Mr Hunault, Mr Jahn, Mr Johnston, Mr Kasperit, Mr Kavanagh, Mrs Kellett-Bowman, Mr Kirk, Mr De Koning, Mr Krall, Mr Laban, Mr Lagorce, Mr Lange, Mr Laudrin, Mr Lautenschlager, Mr Leenhardt, Mr Lenihan, Mr Ligios, Mr Liogier, Lord Lothian, Mr Lückner, Mr McDonald, Mr Martens, Mr Meintz, Mr Memmel, Mr Emile Muller, Mr Mursch, Mr Brøndlund Nielsen, Mr Noé, Mr Nolan, Mr Normanton, Mr Notenboom, Mr Nyborg, Mrs Orth, Mr Osborn, Mr

**President**

Patijn, Mr Pêtre, Mr Pianta, Mr Pintat, Mr Premoli, Mr Radoux, Lord Reay, Sir Brandon Rhys-Williams, Mr Rivierez, Mr Romualdi, Lord St. Oswald, Mr Santer, Mr Scelba, Mr Scholten, Mr Schuijt, Mr Schwabe, Mr Schwörer, Mr Scott-Hopkins, Mr Seefeld, Mr Shaw, Mr Spénale, Mr Spicer, Mr Springorum, Mr Suck, Mr Terrenoire, Mr Thomsen, Mr Thornley, Mr Vandewiele, Mr Vernaschi, Mr Vetrone, Mrs Walz, Mr Yeats and Mr Zeller.

The following voted against:

Mr Albertsen, Mr Espersen, Mr Maigaard and Mr Knud Nielsen.

The following abstained:

Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, Mr Fabbrini, Mrs Iotti, Mr Leonardi, Mr Marras and Mr Sandri.

As the required majority of 92 has been attained, paragraph 7 is adopted.

*(Applause)*

Before proceeding with the next vote, I should like to emphasize the significance of this vote, for the benefit of the President-in-Office of the Council. Although this Assembly operates under difficult circumstances—its Members come from fifteen different assemblies, today many of our French colleagues are having to attend funerals in France, we have no electronic or other easy means of voting etc.—it is always amply represented when called upon to vote on a fundamental matter. I would ask you, Mr President of the Council, to inform your colleagues of the firmness of our views.

*(Loud applause)*

On paragraphs 8 to 10 I have no amendments or speakers listed.

I put these texts to the vote.

Paragraphs 8 to 10 are adopted.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

I declare that the procedure provided for under Article 203 of the EEC Treaty, Article 177 of the EAEC Treaty and Article 78 of the ECSC Treaty is complete and that the amending and supplementary budget No 1 of the Communities for 1975 has been finally adopted at 152 129 416 u.a. This supplementary budget will be published in the Official Journal of the European Communities.

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 111 of 20. 5. 1975.

### 9. Supplementary budget No 2 of the Communities for 1975 (vote)

**President.** — The next item is the vote on supplementary budget No 2 of the European Communities for the financial year 1975 and on the motion for a resolution contained in the report drawn up on this matter by Mr Aigner, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets (Doc. 55/75).

I call Mr FitzGerald.

**Mr FitzGerald, President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities.** — In accordance with the agreement between our two institutions governing budgetary procedure, it is customary for the President-in-Office of the Council to be present at the debate and vote on draft budgets in plenary session. I very much regret that, because I had been given to understand while arranging for my presence at this part-session that the debate on draft supplementary budget No 2 relating to the Cheysson Fund would take place this morning, I was unable to attend your sitting yesterday evening, when you had your discussion on the draft supplementary budget. If I had been here, I should, of course, have presented the draft budget to you in a formal way and would have outlined the Council's position in some detail. But now the Parliament has already had its discussion, it would seem out of place for me to enter into any technical details on the supplementary budget.

Having said that, Mr President, may I conclude by thanking you for putting this draft supplementary budget on your agenda despite the very short period of time which has elapsed since the Council established it.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr FitzGerald, for those comments and the desire you expressed to be present when we debate the budget. The difficulties involved in drawing up the agenda for such a short part-session as this obliged us to consider this budget yesterday evening and, while we are sorry we had to forgo the benefit of your presence as a result, our main reason was that we had postponed to a later date the fundamental and more difficult questions which this budget might raise, deciding that these would form the subject of a consultation between the Council and a delegation from this Parliament.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 111 of 20. 5. 1975.

**President**

I declare that the procedure provided for under Article 203 of the EEC Treaty, Article 177 of the EAEC Treaty, Article 78 of the ECSC Treaty is complete and that the supplementary budget No 2 of the European Communities for the financial year 1975 has been finally adopted at 84 178 277 u.a. This supplementary budget will be published in the Official Journal of the European Communities.

10. *Oral question with debate: Humanitarian aid to Cyprus*

**President.** — The next item is the oral question with debate by Mr Scott-Hopkins to the Commission of the European Communities on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee on humanitarian aid to Cyprus (Doc. 41/75).

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — Mr President, we now turn to something which is perhaps not quite as exciting as the vote we have just had on the budget; nevertheless, it is something which is of importance to this House and, indeed, to many people elsewhere as well.

I do not think there is anybody in the House who would not want to subscribe to the idea that we must as a Parliament here and, indeed, as a Community, give aid to those who are in need of it, and particularly food aid, and this particular case of aid to Cyprus is a very worthy one indeed.

But what everybody always asks himself in cases like this is whether or not the aid which is being given generously by a body such as the Community is, in point of fact, getting to those people who are in need of it. We all know—and I will not dwell on the matter—what people we are talking about in the Republic of Cyprus. After the difficult times experienced during this last year of 1974, there are many sad cases in that country and there is great need for humanitarian aid, particularly food aid, to the refugees and those who have been caught in the fighting or have been caught away from their homes for this or for that reason.

The amount of aid that the Community has given is quite considerable, amounting to three thousand tons of wheat, two hundred tons of milk powder, two hundred tons of butteroil. In monetary terms that is a fairly considerable amount—it is 745 000 u.a. That particular aid was distributed—so we are told—by the United Nations Organization. At the same time, fifty tons of milk powder, or 41 000 u.a., are being or have been distributed through the Red Cross,

and, as this House will know, we have further plans for five thousand tons of wheat, another three hundred tons of butteroil to go to Cyprus to the people we wish to help.

As the House will see, we are using two organizations, the United Nations and the International Red Cross, for the handling of these supplies, and indeed other methods of aid as well. What I am asking the Commission, is quite simply this: are they satisfied that these two organizations are in a position to see that all those in need in Cyprus do, in point of fact, receive the food aid, particularly what is being sent from Europe?

I do not need to go into the details of what has happened in the past in other disaster areas where there have been refugees. We all know that there have been cases—regrettable, but there have been such cases—where aid has not, in point of fact, got to the people concerned, but has—if I may so put it lightly—stuck en route somewhere and therefore has not achieved the object universally desired.

Now, I am not casting any aspersions on the United Nations or on the International Red Cross; but I wonder how those organizations are arranging that the aid should get to both parts of the island, because there are those in need in both north and south, both Turkish and Greek areas, of Cyprus. I want to know what the Commission itself is doing.

Have they established an office out there to ensure that this aid is being properly conveyed to the people in need? If they have not, will they do so with the utmost expediency? And what is the method of transport? Who are the people who are handling that? And when the supplies are in Cyprus, what are the means of getting them from the dock to those people who are actually wanting them? Is there any supervision by the Community in any form whatever to see that this is really going to those in need?

Now, I do not intend to take up the time of the House any more. Those are the questions one wants to have answered. Eight thousand tons of wheat and something like five hundred tons of butteroil and skimmed milk powder—these are sizeable quantities, and if they are going to the right people, nobody will be more delighted than I am: if the Commissioner can say with certainty that he is satisfied with the arrangements, that will obviously satisfy me. But there are problems, and I hope that the Commission will be able to satisfy not only myself but other honourable gentlemen in the House that this is being properly handled. Otherwise, we must really review our arrangements before any further aid of this type—not only to Cyprus but elsewhere—is dispensed from the Community. We have a

**Scott-Hopkins**

big programme, which we are just beginning to talk about, of special food aid and so on, which we are going to build up in the Community for future areas that need help; and this is really a test case to see that the aid is properly administered and really gets to those who need it most. That is why I am asking these questions of the Commission, and I shall listen with interest to what the Commissioner has to say to the House.

**IN THE CHAIR: Mr MARTENS**

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Cheysson.

**Mr Cheysson, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (F) Mr President, in normal times and before the tragic events that have befallen the Cypriots, Cyprus was already one of the beneficiaries of our regular aid programmes. I would recall that, for 1974, the regular programme covered consignments, under the usual conditions (i.e. FOB European ports) of 5 000 tonnes of wheat and 250 tonnes of butter-oil to a value of 945 000 units of account, which were to be distributed under the responsibility of the legal government.

The tragic events that have befallen Cyprus naturally led the Commission to make further proposals which Mr Scott-Hopkins has just explained. In September 1974, for example, the Community decided to give emergency assistance with free distribution to all the populations affected regardless of ethnic origin or the area in which they lived.

In order to carry out this distribution in the various parts of the island, the Commission abandoned the routing of this aid via the legal government of Cyprus and decided to avail itself of the services of the International Red Cross Committee for the distribution of 50 tonnes of powdered milk, and those of the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, assisted by the World Food Programme, for the distribution of 200 tonnes of milk, 200 tonnes of butter-oil and 3 000 tonnes of wheat, to a total value of 786 000 u.a.

The Red Cross has reported to the Commission on the conditions in which this aid was distributed and has said that 14 000 persons in 20 refugee camps had received it.

The information given by the United Nations High Commissioner indicates that the aid has been distributed among displaced persons according to their needs and without distinction as to ethnic group or geographical location.

During March 1975, on the proposal of the Commission, the Council decided to give further emergency aid, to which the honorable member has also just referred, i.e. 5 000 tonnes of wheat and 300 tonnes of butter-oil totalling 1 million u.a. Distributed on the same principles as before, this aid is intended for people of all races—those that are worst hit. It is again supplied CIF and is to be issued free of charge. This time we are hoping to have the office of the United Nations High Commissioner take on the task of distribution.

Emergency aid therefore totals 1 786 000 u.a., covering 8 000 tonnes of wheat, 250 tonnes of powdered milk and 550 tonnes of butter-oil, and this is on top of the regular aid that is given.

As the honourable Member has said, these figures are high. But it also needs to be said that there is great distress in Cyprus and that the flood of political refugees caused by the events with which we are all familiar, calls for the greatest attention on the part of the Community.

We wished to entrust the distribution of aid to international organizations whose guiding principle is neutrality in the distribution of assistance. The International Red Cross and the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees appear to us, in this connection, to provide the necessary guarantees. The Commission therefore considers that the necessary precautions have been taken in order that this assistance should benefit all those in need in Cyprus, as the honourable Member, quite rightly, would like.

Could we have acted differently? I do not think so, Mr President. It seems to me that a distribution agency of the Community itself, set up rather late in the day, would have given very poor results and would have been very costly. It would have been scandalous to add the cost of that operation on to transport costs, thus reducing the quantities of food supplied. I do not think that any other scheme could have been envisaged and neither do I think that it is right for the Community Institutions to cast doubt upon the action of the International Red Cross and the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The action taken by these two bodies does not appear to me to deserve such criticism.

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

**Mr Fellermaier.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I believe, Mr Cheysson, that if doubts are felt, this is justified because the news from Cyprus in recent months has, to say the least,

**Fellermaier**

been contradictory, with the result that no one knew whether the humanitarian aid that has been granted has in fact achieved full effectiveness and whether bureaucratic obstacles on the island, as a result of its division, are not preventing the aid supplies from going freely in those directions in which we believe they should in fact go.

If you could assure this House that the EEC Commission could itself—not merely with the aid of data from third parties—investigate how effective the European Community aid has been, whether it has been sufficient, whether it would not have been necessary to give more, or whether in the future still more should be given, if you were in a position to tell us all this out of your own personal conviction, then you will remove the last vestige of doubt.

We would also be interested in knowing what share the European Community has provided out of all the aid given to the population of Cyprus, for in my view, because of the special relationship with the island of Cyprus, as one of the countries associated with the EEC, we should do considerably more than other organizations in the world at large are doing to alleviate want and distress as a result of belligerent action. I believe, Mr Cheysson, that the European Community should make it its business not merely to relieve immediate need but to reflect how it may be able to help this island to continue to be able to live in the future, how to find solutions for not only the economic but also all the other questions such as schools for children, where we could make a useful contribution. For it is precisely in such situations that I believe that the Community should prove its worth.

In this House, in the Council and with you in the Commission there is much talk of an active Mediterranean policy. In my opinion it could serve as an example for the whole Mediterranean area if we showed that, for us, aid to Cyprus was not just a matter of contributing so many tonnes of butter-oil or so many tonnes of grain. This is in fact the fuller background to the question tabled by Mr Scott-Hopkins for all Groups of this House and for this reason I would be grateful to you, Mr Cheysson, if you could say something more, on behalf of the Commission, in answer to these aspects.

**President.** — I call Mr Bethell.

**Lord Bethell.** — Mr President, last month I was in Cyprus and I had the chance to inspect some of the refugee camps, particularly those in the Athna Forest and in Larnaca, where Greek Cypriots are living in difficult but just about

tolerable conditions, thanks to the aid which they receive from the United Nations, and the International Red Cross, part of which comes from the European Community. I wish first of all to make the point that the aid which the Community has provided is extremely necessary and because of the general aid situation, to which we as a Community are contributing, I can say that there is no serious malnutrition in these camps. One must not forget that these refugees make up a huge proportion of the Greek population of Cyprus, approaching 40%, and while the diet they receive is extremely boring and turgid it is adequate to support life and I think we can be proud that we have contributed to this achievement.

I also went to the north of the island and there the situation is much more difficult, of course, because the Red Cross is very restricted and so is the United Nations. There are certain pockets in the north where Greeks are living in their villages from which they have not been driven out. They are not allowed to leave their villages, in some cases hardly allowed to go more than a few yards from their houses. They are under curfew and they have no means of earning any money and no means of buying anything because they cannot even go into the nearest town to do their shopping, and they are fed by regular convoys from the United Nations and the International Red Cross to which we are contributing. Now, I share the anxiety of Mr Scott-Hopkins and the others who have spoken, that any aid that we have given should go to the right people, but I do want to make the point that this aid is absolutely vital and if only we could afford more I am sure that this would be an extremely good cause.

The other final point I will make very briefly is that the aid that we give is inefficient in that it cannot be coordinated between the two parts of the island. The only aid that seems to be reaching the Turks is channelled through Turkey and the Turks are at the moment not particularly anxious to let in national organizations to wander around their part of the island. This means of course that certain things that are provided, like medical facilities, cannot be properly utilized. For instance, it is impossible for a cancer patient or a patient suffering from a kidney disease in the north of the island to be properly treated, because the only facilities for the treatment of such diseases are in the south. It is impossible to go across the line. Likewise any malaria that may come to Cyprus from the Turkish mainland—and one must see this as a possibility because of the large numbers of people who have moved to and from Cyprus and Turkey—cannot be checked because of a lack of coordination between the two parts of

**Lord Bethell**

the island. The same would apply to animal diseases which are seen as a great danger. The problem is of course much wider than has been mentioned today and would need a long debate to go into thoroughly, but all one can hope is that talks which began yesterday in Vienna will do something to enable aid to be coordinated between the two parts of the island and eventually some system worked out so that the aid can be efficiently used and eventually, we hope, be no longer necessary.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Cheysson.

**Mr Cheysson, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — *(F)* Mr President, I am very grateful to the Assembly for this debate because it has furnished additional material of considerable interest.

Firstly it shows the Commission that the action that it has taken and that it recommended to the Community is approved by this Assembly and that the opinion of the honourable Members who have spoken is that this aid should perhaps be increased. On this point I would like to remind the Assembly that the Commission's policy is to reserve the food aid it gives to the poorest countries and to the populations that are hardest hit. It is clear that the Cypriots, unfortunately, fall into this category and that therefore they should have absolute priority in the allocation of our aid.

What channels are used for this aid? This was Mr Scott-Hopkins' initial question and it seems to me that Lord Bethell has given the best possible answer. He has seen himself—and he is a direct witness since he has just returned from Cyprus—that there have been considerable administrative complications in view of the *de facto* or legal authorities now controlling the island. Thus it is certainly not by creating a new distribution system that we shall obtain better results, but by using what is already existing on the spot: the United Nations High Commission and the Red Cross. The Assembly would like us to increase our aid and this is a point to which we shall give absolute priority; the honourable Members who have spoken have my assurance on this.

Secondly, the conclusion that we all have arrived at is that we must make the best possible use of the organizations recognized in the island in conditions which very often require a pragmatic approach on our part.

Thirdly, what I have now heard convinces me that we should very quickly have one of our officials undertake an enquiry with the distri-

buting organizations on the spot, as Lord Bethell has done. These, therefore, are the instructions that I shall give in the next few days and a report will be sent to this House, and in particular to the Members concerned, as soon as this fact-finding mission returns.

**President.** — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — I have listened with interest to what the Commissioner has said, and in his concluding remarks he has satisfied me. There is no doubt that the aid we are giving—and I am delighted my noble friend has been able to confirm this—is of great use to the refugees of Cyprus. I think there are indeed problems, and if the Commissioner is going to be in a position to give us a report in this House of the way the aid is being applied by the international organizations, as I said when speaking earlier, I should be satisfied.

I never had any doubts, Sir, that the aid was necessary; I never had any doubt that it was right not to set up our own organization but to use existing organizations. The doubt in my mind was whether they were efficient enough to do the job properly, and the only way one can find that out is by having someone there to report to the Commissioner and to us. The Commissioner has accepted that this will be done and we can find out from whoever he sends and from him himself when he reports to the House that the considerable quantities which have been channelled into Cyprus have been used properly.

I myself am well satisfied with the way this short debate has gone. I think it has been a useful one, not only for, I hope, the Commissioner but for the House as well.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I have no motion for a resolution on this debate.

The debate is closed.

#### 11. *Directive on equality of treatment between men and women workers*

**President.** — The next item is the debate on the report drawn up by Lady Elles on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on equality of treatment between men and women workers (access to employment, to vocational training, to promotion and with regard to working conditions) (Doc. 24/75).

I call Lady Elles.

**Lady Elles, rapporteur.** — Mr President, I present this motion for a resolution on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

All Members of this Parliament who have consistently supported the promotion of human rights, including the removal of discrimination, will certainly welcome wholeheartedly the advance made by the draft directive proposed by the Commission on equality of treatment between men and women workers, a measure originally proposed in the Social Action Programme of January 1974. Opinion, feeling, prejudice, long usage and possibly, Mr President, the fact that about 90 per cent of the members of all our national parliaments are men, have hitherto prevented women from playing a full role in the economic, social and political life of our countries.—This despite a series of standard-setting declarations adopted since the Second World War, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women and, of course, some of the post-war constitutions which contain provisions in the Member States guaranteeing equality for all their citizens.

The object of the proposed directive is clear: to remove all forms of discrimination based on sex in the field of employment. It will therefore affect both men and women. The legislative measures proposed will include provision for the possibility for men and women to enter any job, career or profession so long as they have the requisite qualifications. Legislation on its own, however, is inadequate. The equal pay acts in force in many of our Member States for some years are proof of this statement. In the United Kingdom, according to figures of February 1975, the non-manual male worker earns £1.38 p. an hour, while a woman non-manual worker earns 76 p. an hour—just over half; and in Germany, the skilled male worker at the end of 1973 was earning 7.74 marks an hour while the equivalent woman worker was earning 5.48 marks an hour. Administrative measures will therefore be necessary as well as sanctions for failure to implement the measures envisaged. Member States will be responsible for providing much-needed information services, both to workers in order that they may know their rights and to employers in private and public sectors in order that they may be aware of their obligations. Guidance will be needed for all sectors of employment, including trade-unions, to ensure maximum cooperation and the minimum of friction. Opportunities for training and re-training, not only in specialist fields but in responsibility, in administration and in business methods, will also be necessary.

The Committee on Social Affairs and Employment has proposed certain amendments to the draft directive, and I draw the attention of Parliament to those of main concern. Article 2 refers to the measures to be taken by Member States to implement the principle of equal treatment. With regard to access to all jobs, the Committee considered that all laws, regulations and agreements drawn up for the protection of workers which are no longer justified should be annulled or amended, and not only those which are no longer justified owing to technical progress. Measures regarding the safety and health of all workers, both men and women, are still necessary. Indeed, they are more necessary in the light of scientific and technological progress, taking into account the increasing numbers of industrial accidents. But provisions in certain agreements, such as the ILO Convention No 41 on night work, which protected women, may be an obstacle to their being employed in certain jobs and being able to earn at the higher rates available for night-shifts. After all, Mr President, certain forms of night-work, including nursing, have never been protected. Why should others? The terms of the Convention allow for a certain flexibility, and will still be urgently needed in those parts of the world where women are exploited in both rural and urban areas. And since denunciation is possible every tenth year from the date the Convention came into force, Member States are free to denounce it in 1976. Similarly, the Convention Regulating Underground Work, No 45, which came into force in May 1937 can be denounced in 1977 by those Member States who ratified it.

Article 5, concerning equality of treatment in working conditions and social security provisions, had omitted to make special reference to maternity benefits. Now, whatever systems of social security are available—and they themselves will need review—it is essential that such benefits should be available without distinction to all women workers who bear children, and also that they have the possibility of recovering their health before having to return to work. A society is judged by the health of its people, and it is for Member States to ensure that the health of both the mothers and the children is protected.

Finally, in Article 9, following on from my earlier comments as to the inadequacy of legislation without back-up measures, our amendment proposes that Member States should establish control procedures which contain both preventive and a posteriori measures so facilitating and ensuring continued implementation of the directive, and we earnestly hope that the Commission will accept our amendment.

**Lady Elles**

Turning now to the motion for a resolution, we draw attention to the urgent necessity for the directive. Women comprise over 50% of the Community's population and over one-third of the labour force, varying from 25% in the Netherlands to over 40% in France and Germany. The economic prosperity of the Community depends, therefore, very considerably, if numbers of the labour force are the criterion, on the contribution made by women. Yet despite universal and free education available in all our Member States to both sexes, women are not given the jobs commensurate with their ability. They are guided into a narrow range of careers, and many professions in which they would undoubtedly succeed are virtually closed to them. If we take United Kingdom figures for 1972 we find that of over 52 000 chartered accountants, only 1.6% are women; of 26 000 members of the Royal Institute of Chemists, only 3.8% are women; and of nearly 3 000 barristers, only 6.4% are women. The great majority of female workers are concentrated into a limited number of occupations. Taking United Kingdom figures again, we find that 60% of all female workers are connected with occupations where more than 75% of all employees are female. But discrimination can also operate in other ways: restrictions imposed by parents; by educational authorities who offer more places to boys than to girls; careers guidance which directs girls into stereotyped or restricted types of work; no release opportunities for apprenticeship schemes or further training during employment; the impossibility of attending training courses because the hours or the age-limit for entry are incompatible with family responsibilities; segregation into work classified as low-earning in cases where the criterion chosen is physical strength. On the other hand, there are impediments to promotion to jobs where the criterion is no longer physical strength but frequently that of being 'on the old-boy network'. Demographic and social changes have occurred which have not been reflected in improvements in the field of employment. Earlier marriages, fewer children and longer expectation of life result in more years as a natural or potential member of the labour force. Married women are now entering employment in increasing numbers, for both economic and social reasons; and a heavy increase in the number of families where women are the breadwinners is evident throughout the community. This is shown by the figures for one-parent families. Of course these figures include cases where the parent happens to be a father as opposed to a mother, but they constitute about 9% of all families, and that women work for nothing in the home is no reason for their not being adequately paid when they work outside.

There is not only discrimination but also prejudice on the part both of employers and of the public, which must be removed by adequate and relevant information and by a new awareness of the problems involved. Very little information about the position of women is easily available at present throughout Member States, and a centre to collate and provide such information will be necessary.

Three prejudices in particular persist and need to be dispelled. The first is that girls do not stay in one job but change more frequently than boys. On analysis it can be shown quite clearly that any employee, male or female, will move from one job to another more readily if it is badly paid, with poor working conditions and no prospect of upgrading or promotion. The second is that women are more frequently absent than men, using the family as the main excuse. In the most recent figures published in the United Kingdom, yesterday, by the Office of Health Economics, we see that of days lost per person, on average in 1972, men lost 9.3 days whereas women lost 7. The third prejudice against the employment of women is that women will leave to have a family. Of course, a woman must be free to have and to raise a family; but this does not detract from her ability as a woman member of the labour force—quite the contrary. Men now change jobs with far greater frequency than before; or they are sent on long-term courses to improve their abilities and knowledge; and many take sabbatical years. The fact is that a woman who has raised a family and then returns to work has gained greater human experience, greater tolerance, patience, comprehension and judgment.—And I am sure all married members of this Assembly will agree that these are all invaluable qualities in positions of responsibility which cannot be learnt merely by remaining as a typist in an office. And, of course, we are only too well aware that whether in private or in public life, if a man makes a mistake he, as an individual, is blamed, but if a woman makes a mistake, women collectively are condemned.

Attention is drawn, as I have done before in this Parliament, to the few women who have positions worthy of their ability and in particular in the European Institutions. In 1972, of 32 functionaries in grade A1 in the Commission, there was not one woman. In grade A2, of 112 functionaries, there was one woman. In grade A3, of 299 functionaries, there were 3 women, but in category C, on the other hand, we find 81% are women. Perhaps the Commission will be able to give us the latest figures for these categories of work, and we may monitor them for the future. The pattern of the Communities reflects the pattern of the Commission. What more fitting way to recognize the importance of



Lady Elles

this directive than by giving promotion to women, both in the Commission and in the other Institutions of the European Community?

To ensure a progressive improvement in the training and employment of women in the Community, our committee proposes that continued monitoring should be undertaken by the Commission so that encouragement, stimulus and guidance can be given when and where necessary.

In conclusion, tribute must be paid to organizations such as the United Nations, ILO and the Council of Europe and to those individuals who have for so long fought for the rights of women in Western Europe. In particular, since we are meeting in Luxembourg, I would ask that tribute should be paid to Miss Astrid Lulling, a Member of the Luxembourg Parliament, for all the valuable work that she did while she was a Member of the European Parliament.

We are grateful to the Commission for their initiative in proposing this directive. The removal of discrimination envisaged will be a major contribution to the present and future economic and social development of the European Community as well as of those countries contemplating application for membership. A woman, Mr President, has many roles—as wife, mother, homemaker, employee or employer, and she must be able in a free society to accomplish these tasks without continued obstacles, prejudicial attitudes and discriminatory legislation. The American Declaration of Independence affirmed the right to life, liberty and happiness. With goodwill and cooperation between employers, employees and unions, women will be able to come closer to realizing their rights and aspirations, to choose between family and career or to choose both in full freedom. It is up to us as Members of the European Parliament to ensure that all forms of economic and social injustice are removed and that these rights are safeguarded, not only for this, but for future generations.

(Applause)

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

**Mr Härzschel.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Christian-Democratic Group welcomes the report of the Commission to the Council and the draft directive on equality of treatment between men and women workers in implementation of the principle of equal pay for men and women set out in article 119 of the EEC Treaty. We are also fundamentally in agreement with the objective—namely the

removal of all discrimination against women in working life, vocational training and promotion (and we consider the central points of the directive to be precisely in these areas), the removal of legal and practical limitations on access to employment, the improvement of training and further training conditions and equality of opportunity in vocational training—in the same way as we also welcome the improvement in promotion opportunities.

In the report and the directive the problems are set out and solutions proposed. How necessary these improvements are is clear from the present situation in which women are particularly hard hit by unemployment. No doubt the reasons for this lie mainly in the lower level of training, but they also derive from the fact that man, as the provider of the family, is, *de facto*, given more protection in the event of dismissals. For this reason it would be wrong to raise excessive hopes with regard to a speedy improvement in the situation, because the realization of these objectives and principles can be but a gradual process. The fact is that these principles are, in the main, already enshrined in the constitutions of most Member States without this having produced any great change in practical terms. Lastly, these objectives will not be attained until a new attitude prevails towards working women and their problems.

The problem of wage equality between men and women also shows, for example, that formally decreeing equality has in no way resolved the problems and wage discrimination. The fact is that, apart from training and development problems, the question of the revaluation of women's work has still not been solved and this is where there is the greatest discrimination against women. It is because of this that the vast majority of women are employed in the lowest wage groups.

In its report, the committee also refers, and rightly, to the problem of the twofold burden on women caused by their job and the family. Everything, therefore, depends on whether we are successful in bringing family duties and job interests into harmony. It is therefore regrettable that the Commission has excluded precisely these family aspects. In our opinion this is a limited representation of the situation of women and it is therefore questionable whether the objective that is aimed at can be attained. The significance of the problem is underlined by the fact that we have about 35 million working women in the Community. Equal treatment for men and women in the field of access to employment should therefore not be allowed to remain purely a formal expression.

**Härzschel**

But we also hold—and this reflects our conception of the dignity of women—that they must be free to choose whether they wish to devote themselves to the family alone or take up a job.

This basic choice also implies the need for fresh thinking about the position of the housewife and mother. The choice will certainly also depend upon whether we can guarantee the social security of families; but we must also recognize the time spent on bringing up children as a contribution to society. This means that a woman's security must be guaranteed for such time as she is fulfilling her family functions. The fact is that a large number of women derive their social security solely from their husband's title to it and this calls urgently for a solution. It could be solved by long and patient efforts to give women an independent right to social security. Women's occupations today are mainly concentrated in specific sectors, generally those calling for a low level of professional skill and therefore, in many cases, paid at low rates. Here, too, opportunities for promotion are extremely small. A priority task, therefore, is to improve the level of training of women and to extend women's training facilities, for which it will be necessary to do away with the division of school systems and training structures by sex, for it is at this level that the points on the lines to the future labour market and discriminate selection are set.

In my view it is educational policy that holds the key to the attainment of equality of opportunity in working life. In addition, better retraining facilities must be created in order to give access to skills to those women who are now doing unskilled jobs and have passed the age at which they could attend school.

Marriage and motherhood problems are specially important. We hold that working women must have the possibility of devoting themselves to bringing up their children, particularly in the first three years, if they so wish. For those who want or need to go on working, nurseries and crèches must be provided so that the children can be looked after and the mother continue in her job. Women of today are very often faced with conflicting objectives: on the one hand they would like to devote themselves to bringing up their children but on the other the necessary income to sustain the family is often lacking. For this reason it is essential, if we are to tackle this problem and solve it for the future, to include family questions.

This is not to say that we are blind to the difficulties that can arise in enterprises if a given job has to be socially secured or kept open for a specific period. Interruptions like this could, in

certain circumstances, create a difficulty in that firms might refrain from taking on women for specific jobs. This could interfere with the occupational development of women. For this reason consideration should also be given to the problem of what further training facilities exist for working women during the time they are bringing up children. Social security during the period of motherhood should be supplemented but, in this connection, the question should be investigated of whether these social costs should not be borne by society as a whole in order to prevent adverse effects on recruitment. Costs that arise in connection with motherhood, therefore, should, in principle, be borne by the state.

In this context it should also be noted that women also make a considerable contribution to gross national product and to the tax yield.

Whilst we welcome the lifting of limitations on access to individual occupations, this does not mean that we disregard the physical difference between men and women. We do not overlook this problem and even after full equality is attained, women are unlikely to work in the mines or in jobs where particularly severe physical effort is required. Equality does not involve an obligation to work in a specific job, it is purely and simply a question of eliminating discrimination and restrictions on access. The present situation with the majority of women working in so-called 'women's jobs' is unsatisfactory and must be changed.

We realize that these changes cannot be achieved overnight because recruitment in private enterprise is in the firms' hands and is largely uninfluenced by the state. For this reason studies should be made on the extent to which a certain risk of absence in the case of women, because of family burdens, is an obstacle to recruitment and promotion. In this connection the state and public services should serve as a model and the government should give good example in their areas of responsibility. This applies particularly to promotion, because the percentage of women in the top positions in the public services is just as small as it is in private enterprise. Incidentally, this also applies to the organs of the European Communities and we therefore request the Commission to report to Parliament and to the responsible committee as soon as possible on the underlying reasons for this situation, in the same way as we would like, in general, to have information from time to time on the implementation of this Directive so that we may form a picture of what has in fact happened in the Community Member States. The Commission's proposal, however, lacks credibility if we do not begin to put these principles in practice in our own House. We are well aware that the solution

**Härzschel**

of this problem will be a persistent task for a long time. It will be finally solved only by strengthening the social status of women in general and implanting recognition of the fact that this equality can in fact be achieved not only in theory but also in practice.

The Christian-Democratic Group therefore agrees with the Directive and the motion for a resolution and will actively cooperate in executing this task.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

**Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli.** — *(I)* Mr President, I would first like to thank my colleagues in the Socialist Group and in particular Mr Glinne for having allowed me to speak in his place, the point being that I am forced to leave for compelling duty reasons. But I would like to thank him in particular for the reason he gave for his courteous gesture which was that he wished in this way to pay tribute in some measure to Women's Year.

Mr President, we are now considering a directive proposed by the Commission which our Communist and Allies Group considers to be good, just as it considers the report, which concurs with the fundamental points of the Commission's document, to be good as well. And since I would like to be fairly brief, yet very sincere, I will say at once that the preceding speech has caused me some concern, for it seems to me that the document of the Commission is strictly focussed on a number of basic points and even, in reality, transcends the system of adjustments and conciliatory measures which, in our view, is not the one that should be followed. In fact, in the Commission's document, two fundamental points emerge around which, in our belief, all questions concerning women's work should revolve.

The first point—I agree with Lady Elles—is the basic point of the right to work. This is dealt with in paragraph 18 of the communication where access to employment is referred to. Let us speak frankly, and forgive me if I am extremely brief. Women's right to work is today recognized in Member States only in a theoretical way, only on paper, or—as the Commission's document rightly says—in a purely formal manner. In reality this right to work is still being debated because the basic conviction of public opinion is that women's work is, if anything, an option—not the rule; and since it is a matter of an option, this implies that women

are hypothetically—I repeat hypothetically—free to exercise the right or not. Since therefore—though the conviction is false—women are free to exercise it or not, their work can be underpaid and it is therefore permissible to do nothing to facilitate its exercise through a series of social measures (the social services about which so much has been said). In fact, today women's work is still considered to be an alternative or to supplement men's work and it is obvious that if there is no work and if unemployment ensues, women are automatically the first to lose their jobs. Compulsory work for women exists—housework, unpaid or almost unpaid—and this again is well expressed in the Commission's document. The other kind of work—outside the home—does become compulsory, true, but only in certain cases, cases of emergency and this is perhaps the reason why the equality of women is recognized only in periods of crisis: wartime, periods of high political tension, and so on. Once these periods are over, women are asked to go back home and—I would add—do so with a considerable degree of resignation. This is the first point then: the right to work. The second point, which is more difficult and more complicated and which today is the subject of great discussion in sociological research, is the problem relating to the social conception of the function of maternity. For this reason we should have the courage to say this as well, and not to close our eyes to reality: maternity, today, is objectively a factor of alienation for women. Skills and careers are denied to women on the explicit or implicit grounds that women will sooner or later be married, and then sooner or later be mothers, and therefore will often be absent from work—work will cease to be their main concern. And here we are back with the old notion of casual work. For equal qualifications and jobs, young women, for example, are always given lower pay because sooner or later they will get married, have children and think about other things.

I must say that the Union of Italian Women in my country is working hard on this new concept of maternity. In our view a veritable revolution in the notion of maternity is essential to the extent that it can no longer be regarded as a phenomenon which concerns the woman alone and therefore implies that woman alone should bear the burden, before, during and after. Instead, maternity is to be regarded as a basic event which concerns society as a whole because the fact that citizens are being born unquestionably concerns society and therefore society should shoulder the burden of maternity not so much as an aid to the mother but rather—and this is the new conception—from the more general viewpoint of human solidarity.

**Carettoni Romagnoli**

Obviously the future of society is inconceivable without the birth of new members of that society. But I do not see why the greatest burden of this necessity should fall, even in moral terms, yes, gentlemen, on the female half of humanity.

In its proposal, the Commission says that it does not wish, in this context, to tackle the problem of family policy. I must say that I find it impossible to draw a clearcut distinction between women's right to work and family policy. Rather, I feel that the two problems have to be tackled together, particularly since an approach in this sense should be made very quickly, apart from anything else, to reframe the general picture—I was about to say the ideological basis—for these problems. In addition I believe that this modern conception, to which I have very briefly and certainly imperfectly referred, should and can come to be gradually adopted and shared by the European Economic Community if we aspire to a better and juster model for living; I consider that the document contains important steps towards this process, steps that should be developed and in no small measure. The directive we are considering is undoubtedly a step forward but it needs to be seen in a more general framework and I would say that it would be wrong to regard this directive, however broad it may be, as a standard in itself. In our view it is a basis for discussion. Moreover it seems to me that Lady Elles, our rapporteur, takes the same line where, in paragraph 9 of the explanatory statement, she insists on the principle of equal access to employment. These observations, in my view, fall or could fall into this formula.

In paragraph 8, however, Lady Elles, I would have liked to see some reference to the need to overcome the fact of the objective alienation caused by maternity. It is possibly too early to solve the problem but, in my view, the fact that maternity is seen as an obstacle to the full development of the personality of women, in the world of work as well as elsewhere, calls for deeper consideration and more detailed discussion.

In the same way, Mr President, the Commission will, on some occasion and at some time or other, have to take up a position on the problems stemming from the need for maternity to be free and responsible and therefore on family planning. I do not of course ask for a directive on the subject of birth-control practices or on family planning, but there is no doubt that this problem should find its place in a directive on family policy and should be included in a policy in favour of women's work.

We agree with the argument on the need for equality in training. In actual fact the male and female roles are imposed on a girl from the moment of birth, through the upbringing that she receives. In fact, babies are born into a society that has already decided for them, and when they reach the age of choice the die is already cast. That is what Simone de Beauvoir means when she says 'Women are made, not born' and I would go further and say that you are compelled to become a certain type of woman to a pattern already decided by the social structures and type of upbringing.

A few more marginal comments and I shall have finished. Firstly about part-time work. I come from a country, ladies and gentlemen, where employment is a very serious and worrying problem and I would like to draw the attention of the European Parliament once again to the fact that part-time work in countries with a high or substantial level of unemployment is very dangerous because it can easily become an instrument of exploitation and injustice. Of this we have had first-hand experience, but in periods of crisis—which I do not wish upon anyone—the same experience could befall any other country that may have been in better conditions up to that time, and I agree with the rapporteur's very outspoken and uninhibited criticisms of the absenteeism argument, for I do not believe that up to now any reliable statistics, by categories and skills, have yet been collected.

We should bear in mind that, in general, the very low-paid jobs are always associated with high absenteeism rates and are in general the jobs done by women. Moreover, it is not easy to collect such statistics because certain monotonous and frustrating jobs involving little responsibility are given only to women and then you have the statistics proving the fact of women's absenteeism. But it escapes notice that this finding purely expresses the percentage of absenteeism in a specific category. Responsibility, like democracy, grows with use and it is difficult to expect any rapid development of conscientiousness and exercise of responsibility from workers relegated to dehumanizing jobs devoid of any responsibility. In such types of employment you cannot ask a worker to become personally involved and it is obvious that if you cannot expect involvement in the work it then becomes difficult to ask for full involvement as regards attendance.

Overall, therefore, we are in agreement with the Commission's document and we agree with the report produced by Lady Elles and with the amendments that are proposed. We do, however, consider that the subject has hardly been broached for not only do we consider it necessary, gentlemen of the Commission, for an effort

**Careffoni Romagnoli**

to be made to put into effect policies and directives designed to improve the situation of women but we are also convinced that in this sector a considerable operation of ideological rethinking is essential. Someone has said that it is primarily a matter of convincing people, but in order to convince people it is first necessary to establish a number of principles to believe in and then to begin to put them into practice because it is only in the presence of actual reality that people become convinced and that attitudes change.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Dykes to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

**Mr Dykes.** — Mr President, it gives me great pleasure, on behalf of my Conservative colleagues, to express our warm feelings of support for both the draft directive and the excellent report and document prepared by the rapporteur, Lady Elles. I think that our congratulations to Lady Elles must be that much greater because, as she quite rightly pointed out in the explanatory memorandum but not, I think, with any spirit of churlishness, the time originally allowed for the consideration of the Commission's proposals was rather limited, and I think to that extent we are all especially grateful that Lady Elles has produced such an excellent work on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

This has been an energetic and a positive debate. It does seem to me that there is, with some exceptions as to marginal details, a very strong and united feeling in this Parliament in favour of these proposals. This feeling of unity is partly due, I think, to the gratification that we should all experience, both this Parliament and the other institutions of the Community which are involved—and I hope that the Commissioner, when he comes to wind up the debate officially on behalf of the Commission, will bear this out—a sense of gratification that the European Community, and this Assembly, is giving a decisive and positive lead in this matter in comparison with other political institutions in the world and, indeed, in the Member States themselves. As has been discussed amply already in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, there have been, and still are, tremendous variations in the action the Member States have taken in this whole field of discrimination against women and there are tremendous variations in their procedural proposals for dealing with these matters. As we know, this is a draft Council directive and therefore it will be up to the Member States to implement their own legislation. As far as the United Kingdom is

concerned, it is already proceeding with legislation that was originally a private member's bill which has been officially adopted by the government with all-party support.

This leads me to a very striking political point, and I will undoubtedly be accused of being biased in making it. I have always found it extremely depressing that those societies in the world which are characterized above all by their collective institutions and the collective nature of their political structures have been the ones to give the lead in abolishing and reducing discrimination against women through institutional political means. I visited China at the end of 1973, the country that has done most to eliminate, or at least, substantially reduce, real on-going discrimination against women in all aspects of society. As the representative of the Conservative Group in this debate, I reject absolutely the notion that it is only collectivist societies that can achieve these targets. I believe it is incumbent on all modern civilized societies to achieve these targets, and that is why I wholeheartedly welcome the initiative of the Commission in putting forward these proposals to the Council, and I very much hope that there will be no substantial delays in taking this draft directive further.

I do not need to go into details of the amendments proposed by Lady Elles on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, partly because she did it more than adequately anyway, but secondly because I, on behalf of the Conservative Group, accept all those suggested changes. Words have been added, for example, to Article 5, to include the possibility of amendments as well as annulments, and there are one or two other minor changes to cover the differences in the legislation in the Member States as well as for the other reasons which Lady Elles has explained. I particularly welcome the changes to Article 5. It is logical and indeed essential, if these proposals are to reach their final conclusions, for maternity benefit to be excluded from those conditions relating to social security provisions. The amendment to Article 9 underlining the need for control procedures must be particularly welcome, I would have thought to all Members of this Parliament.

I would like to add one or two general points to illustrate the Conservative Group's views of these measures and these proposals. Firstly the general point that these proposals are long overdue. As a mere male I have, like other male Members of this Parliament, repeatedly witnessed those grotesque cases of discrimination against women in all walks of life but above all in the kind of employment to which women are unfortunately denied full access, that is the more

**Dykes**

intellectual kinds of jobs, as a previous speaker and Lady Elles have said. At those particularly crucial points in their career either before marriage or during marriage, women are often denied those opportunities which should be theirs as of right. If it is necessary to establish this right in the Member States through legislation rather than merely exhortation and encouragement, then that is what should be done.

Lady Elles mentioned the figures for the different percentages of the female population in the working population in different countries. The variations are enormous for all sorts of social, historical and political reasons. I think the figure for the Netherlands is 25%, for the United Kingdom it is 36% and in Germany 40%. When one considers what proportion of the population is represented by women then these figures are inadequate and unsatisfactory and should be changed as fast as possible.

I think it is also very important for us all to support that particular part of the explanatory statement which refers to the need for change and the changing attitudes of young married women about job functions. The information and advice they should be given before they leave school is extremely important.

Female absenteeism has been referred to as well and I entirely agree that statistics have always been used by men to perpetuate the myth that women were in some sense unreliable, relatively feckless and could not be relied on in the same way as men in employment. Nothing is, statistically or in real terms, further from the truth.

I do think it is important also for Parliament to do more than pay lip service to the need for proper equalization of social security provisions which is referred to in paragraph 7. I would in fact go further than the proposals in this document and I am only expressing a personal view on this. I think it is high time for us to establish the concept of the legal and equal age of retirement. It seems to me totally absurd and indefensible that by and large men still retire at the age of say 65, as in the United Kingdom and I think the Republic of Ireland, but women are entitled to do so at 60. Equality and the absence of discrimination, as far as we can achieve it in real life, should apply to both sexes and be absolutely comprehensive.

Then there is the important question of maternity and child-bearing. I hope that we can go beyond this document in the longer-term future to a position where all corporate enterprises above a certain size are obliged to fill that gap in society which the state does not, and

provide nurses and crèches so that women find the minimum impediment to working when they are married and have young children. Once again it is a matter of regret and depression to me that it is the People's Republic of China that provides such facilities and not the free western world or indeed the European Community as yet, but I believe now there is more sympathy growing up in the Community for this kind of idea.

There are one or two final points I would like to make very quickly Mr President. In paragraph 10 of the explanatory statement Lady Elles has pointed out that the directive is in fact not as substantial as it could be about the question of enforcement machinery. It will be very important to see how this machinery operates in all the different Member States. In the United Kingdom the proposal for the anti-discrimination board has many lacunae, many gaps in respect of the way in which this board is to be set up, its terms of reference etc.

I referred a short while ago to the need for women to accept the counter-obligations that will come eventually from a full and comprehensive removal of discrimination. I am thinking of the real effects on, for example, the gross national product. As our colleague from the Christian-Democratic Group said, the gross national product of the Community countries will be substantially and materially enhanced as a result of the full and complete incorporation of all women who wish to work under equal conditions in the Community countries.

I look beyond this document to that longer-term future to which we should all aim, and which to my mind can be spelled out in 3 or 4 concepts. One of these is the possibility that a formal domestic wage would actually be paid to the wife by her husband, although it would be extremely difficult to implement such an idea, very difficult for institutions and the law to intervene in the private arrangements of a family. But even if that is not possible at present, I hope all Members of this Assembly will consider such ideas in the future. We should concerted and consciously aim, for instance, at a society where virtually all women are working most of the time, a society where there is compulsory provision of nursery facilities either by the state, local authorities or commercial enterprises, a society with an equal age of retirement, and equal access to work. I hope that there will really be equal access to all jobs in the future, and that includes women being miners or even Presidents of the European Parliament if they so wish.

*(Applause)*

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

**Mr Glinne.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Socialist Group has noted with great satisfaction the recent adoption by the Council of the directive aimed at guaranteeing equality of pay as provided for in Article 119 of the Treaty. We are gratified to note that the framework of Article 119 itself has been advantageously enlarged since the notion of work of equal value has taken the place of that of equal work.

But we also felt, here and now, that this step forward, though necessary, was insufficient. This is why today we welcome with very keen satisfaction the proposal formulated by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. The truth is that to look for more dynamic action in relation to Article 119 of the Rome Treaty as regards equal pay for work of equal value is not enough; it is absolutely essential to go much further and to explore everything that can be done in favour of effective equality in working conditions. We know very well that in many Member States and in many firms, through a kind of coincidence that is the more curious for being so prevalent, large numbers of women find themselves in the lowest-paid jobs whereas very few of them are in the relatively well-paid ones. And you hear it said that no discrimination is intended. I think it is absolutely essential to institute a system enabling job classifications to be revised. To do this we do not think that applying the principle of work of equal value is sufficient. In this connection I would, if I may be permitted without self-flattery, refer you to a bill that I had the honour of tabling in the Belgian Chamber of Representatives on 17 July 1974 the purpose of which, in a system very similar to that adopted by the Commission, is precisely to have job classifications verified.

Absenteeism has just been mentioned. I would like to inform this Assembly that the Belgian Minister for Employment and Labour has just made public statistics arising out of a survey that has been going on for certainly eighteen months and perhaps even two years; the figures were published in the Chamber's Bulletin of questions and answers following a written question from Madame Nelly Maes, a member of Parliament. The statistics show that, contrary to a too widely held and false opinion, the level of female absenteeism is not higher than that of male absenteeism whether in full- or part-time jobs. On the contrary, objectively—and I am purely stating facts—it is lower. Women seem to be absent less often than men. The statistics I am referring to were established by age groups,

workers in both sexes being split up into five-year brackets, by specific analysis groups.

Moreover, society being for the moment what it is, many women are obliged, as the result of a natural reaction from husband and wife together, to stay at home whilst the husband works if a child happens to fall ill. Consequently, female absenteeism, already lower than male absenteeism, has an excuse in the fact that it is partly justified by family duties.

I propose that a documentation and information centre be set up to collect and distribute information regarding the rights of women at work. I would also like to state that, as the result of a proposal made to the Council of Ministers in October 1973, the Belgian Government set up an ad hoc committee on women at work at the beginning of this year. The work to be carried out by this body will certainly be useful but what is more important still is the inspection of working conditions and equality of working conditions as between male and female workers. In this connection I would like to say briefly how very pleased we are that paragraphs 12 and 13 of the resolution should stress the importance not only of legislative but also of administrative and procedural measures and sanctions. If no sanctions are provided, wishful thinking is all that will ensue and results will be neither practical nor effective. These measures, including sanctions, are absolutely essential as is the system of continuous monitoring referred to in paragraph 13, which will enable the Commission to keep effective watch on Member States.

Mr President, whilst we are very satisfied at the content of these two paragraphs, I would like to stress the importance of an amendment tabled to article 9 of the proposal of the Commission, in the formulation of which we were very actively involved. I even think I remember that some members of our Group initiated it. I refer to the new second paragraph in article 9 which, unlike the original text drafted by the Commission, says that Member States shall set up control procedures embodying preventive and a posteriori measures to ensure the implementation of the objectives of the directive. We believe this to be really crucial. If this second paragraph of article 9 were not applied, the system itself could well lose a very large part of its meaning.

We therefore believe that it is by control procedures, legislative and administrative measures, sanctions and the system of monitoring, together with the institution of public facilities enabling married people to reconcile more easily the family and occupational responsibilities of husband and wife, that real progress may be made.

**Glinne**

I would like to make a very important comment regarding part-time work and a discrepancy in wording. I was, in fact, about to table an amendment to paragraph 10 of the motion for a resolution because the French text referring to part-time work and flexible-time working hours says that account should be taken of the responsibilities, availability and convenience of women workers. I remember very clearly having objected in Committee to this wording. It is not a question of women workers, it is a question of all workers regardless of sex. Moreover, if you consult the documents in other languages such as German and Dutch you will see that there is no specific reference to women workers. This is therefore a mistake in translation.

I would strongly urge that the French text be made to agree with the other versions. If this were not to be done, we would be obliged to table a proposal for an amendment because it would be dangerous to promote work to which women would have access, by means of flexible working hours and part-time work specifically designed for women. Part-time work does not bring promotion and does not help towards integration in trade unions nor participation in their efforts to gain improvement. For us, therefore, it is of the utmost importance to have it made absolutely clear that part-time working and flexible working hours should be accessible to workers of both sexes.

This non-discrimination in access to these forms of employment is all the more essential because co-education has given rise to certain advances that have recently been made in the field of women's emancipation.

In this connection, I would like to suggest to the Commission that it continue its efforts and its work of information in the sector of technical education designed specifically for female pupils such as is still practised in many Member States. This form of education is still being used in many cases to give a cut-price training which is inadequate from the career standpoint. In this area there is still much to be done.

I would also like to invite the Commission of the Communities through the agency of the information and documentation centre that is to be set up and any other suitable method, to make a sort of census, of the paradoxical situations prevailing in our various Member States to the detriment of women. I will quote a few from memory: in one Member State, a female hairdresser, at the start of her career, is paid 20% less than the unemployment pay to which a girl trained in a hairdressing school is entitled. Here are some

other examples: in some Member States female pupils are admitted to schools of navigation, but once they have passed their examinations candidates of this sex are not allowed to take up duties for which their training has prepared them. In some Member States, the unemployment benefit—this is an objective fact and not a value judgment—paid to a woman is such that, in view of the tax that would be payable on her earnings on top of those of her husband because the two are added together, there is absolutely no point in her looking for work—which sometimes gives an undesirable reputation to a woman who has become unemployed and continues to look for a job.

Lastly, and above all, it would be important to collect all data available concerning night work and the 'protection' of women. In some of our Member States, if it is not possible to become a member of the management staff because that might possibly, in some firms, mean having to work at night, a woman may be employed as a general cleaner or be put to a variety of subordinate tasks. The ban on night work for women is a way of barring them from access to a number of management jobs. I know that there is an I.L.O. convention on this subject which can be repudiated only every ten years—the Netherlands, for example, repudiated it at the last occasion the chance was offered them. But since there are European regional I.L.O. conferences from time to time, it would be a good thing for the Member States of the E.E.C. to consult together in order to adjust their line of conduct in this area, at some suitable time and in a harmonious manner.

I shall conclude, Mr President, by expressing a wish. There have been many references to the People's Republic of China. I shall not mention Hong Kong, which is very close to it and would perhaps suffer by comparison and I shall not take sides as regards ideological and political systems. But one need, which could be agreed upon by the various political groups beyond the divisions that separate them, seems to me evident—it is the need to make society more human and to do so in the very near future so that work may be organized in terms of the men and women who do it and so that human beings cease to be valued less than the services required of them.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I should like to point out to Mr Glinne that while the French text refers to 'travail des femmes', the other texts refer simply to 'workers'; obviously, this is just a question of the wording used and there is no need for an amendment.



**President**

I call Mrs Orth, who will also speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mrs Orth.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, whenever discussion turns to the different situation of men and women, regardless of what sphere or who the speakers are, I always feel somewhat uneasy, for common sense and objectiveness both go by the board and emotion takes over. I am thankful that today's debate on this subject has been conducted with such objectivity.

In the end, everyone thinks he is justified and called upon to be able to speak as a specialist on these subjects because we all naturally belong to one or other side of the population. What is more, everyone is confronted with the problems that arise from this situation, day in day out, without ever becoming aware of them in detail since it is not easy for most of us—and I shall now use for once that slightly disreputable word—to emancipate ourselves. What is emancipation? Emancipation is purely and simply freeing oneself from inherited tradition and outworn laws. But the prejudices and preconceived ideas that men and women have about their different roles, some of which are centuries old, are by no means uprooted. It is still the man—and not only in the male view, but also in the eyes of women, who is the superior and the one whose opinion co-decides the opinion of women. There is still a large number of women who submit to this concept of the two roles and—this is the dangerous thing—pass it on to sons and daughters. It is out of this that grows, for example, the idea that for the man to have a job is to be taken for granted and that his earnings are his main contribution to household and family duties whereas for women to work is regarded as discriminating, even, to some extent, by women themselves. Most men are still proud to claim that their wives do not have to work because they bring in enough themselves to maintain the family and, conversely, women say with pride that their husband earns enough for them not to be forced to go out to work. As long as such ideas are not eradicated we shall find it difficult to do anything to alter the present situation. In the German Civil Code, paragraph 1356 states clearly that a woman may only go out to work if this is compatible with her duties in the family and in the house. In the last resort, therefore, a husband can take his wife to court if she takes a job against his wishes and thereby, in his view, neglects her family and household duties. We are in process of making far-reaching changes to this paragraph in the Federal Republic so that both can work and must themselves agree on the division of their household and family duties.

But until it has become the understood thing for men to give up their job and take over the duties of looking after the house and children because the wife finds greater satisfaction in a skilled job than in house and home, women will continue to have to bear the twofold burden of doing a job and looking after the family. And I would go so far as to say that all the Commission's proposals, however well meant (and in any case they cover only a few of the discriminations against women), will remain empty words if we do not finally learn to change our ideas, free ourselves from these—certainly often comfortable—habits of thinking and tackle these problems together. Our preparedness for this must be intensified. This must be in the foreground of all our deliberations on these questions.

The Commission's proposal attempts to indicate ways of improving equal treatment for men and women in working life, but legislation in individual Member States is still so different in various areas that even in this women are again at a disadvantage in certain Member States by comparison with others. I will quote the question of maternity welfare as an example. The regulations on this are very different from one Member State to another and I would put the question: does the Commission intend to urge that efforts be made to harmonize this matter within the Community in such a way that at least the regulation of the most progressive Member States are taken as the starting point?

With regard to the question of unequal payment for work of equal value by men and women: Frau Annemarie Renger, President of the German Bundestag has repeatedly and for years, one may say, offered to finance a test case for any woman complaining that she does not receive an equal wage for work of equal value. Up to now no-one has come forward. One reason why an employee may be reluctant to complain about the firm that employs her is the fear that this would create difficulties for her. Undoubtedly another reason is that the case can only be conducted as a test case and can therefore be successful only for the employee concerned herself, in other words, it only creates a precedent; any other woman would have to go to court herself in order to ensure that she gets better paid. Probably, too, every firm would produce evidence that the woman has been properly paid in accordance with her job assessment. I am therefore somewhat sceptical about the Commission's proposal that checks should be carried out which would actually produce results possibly leading to the submission of new proposals, and about whether penalties would actually be imposed if there were infringements of the instructions.

**Orth**

I also doubt whether the Commission's proposal can be implemented to the extent that would be desirable. Nevertheless, personally and in the name of my Group, I welcome the proposal since it is an attempt to take us one step further along this necessary but very, very difficult road.

I should also like to thank the rapporteur for the way she has called a spade a spade. I have, however, just one reservation and that is that I prefer the original text—and here I am speaking on behalf of my Group—in the case of the amendments proposed by the committee. It is, of course, possible that the contents may be somewhat differently phrased in the German language from what was initially intended in the original language. In any case my Group agrees with this proposal.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Cifarelli.

**Mr Cifarelli.** — *(I)* Mr President, I am speaking on my own behalf on this vast and complex subject in which I believe it is most important to avoid falling either in to the rhetoric of conformism or the rhetoric of negation. In that sense, I would like to express my special thanks to Lady Elles.

Here we are faced with one of the major problems of contemporary society, or rather—in my view—with a revolution in our society. We have only to look around to realize that in the industrial world, in the world of social relations, in this world in which we are living, a world of participation and protest, the female revolution—let it be said free of any undertone of condemnation—is and can be, if not properly faced, one of the causes of the destruction of the civil society in which we live.

I take as my starting point the view that equality is truly something fundamental for the very attainment of freedom. Real freedom is possible only if it is a freedom between equals. But equality means neither uniformity, nor disregard for basic differences. On that basis, what a woman does as a mother and as a wife in the development of family life is work. It is work in terms of its economic value, work in terms of providing, work in terms of the rights that should stem from it in legislation, and work, let me add, in terms of vocational training because it is important that a woman, too, should be given a technical and vocational education.

A little time ago Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, quoting Simone de Beauvoir, said 'Women are not born, but made', because society would have it thus. I would add that men are not born but made, because this principle applies exactly, in the opposite sense, as regards the male sex. The

point is that all training, instruction and education of the young should take account of this equalitarian revolution and that two results need to be achieved: the addition of the technical dimension to women's work and, above all, equality of work for both sexes. In your report—allow me this point Lady Elles—you say that we should take steps to provide women with suitable vocational training so that they may be able to participate fully in every type of activity in society. I agree on this point. But the report does not bring out sufficiently clearly the fact that, precisely because of this, it is necessary for all activities to be interchangeable and that there should no longer be activities reserved exclusively to women. In other words it is necessary for the youth of both sexes to be capable of coping with all the activities that life involves. This, in my view, is very important and needs to be stressed.

As regards the need, referred to under paragraph 10 of the resolution, to encourage firms to institute part-time and flexible time working systems, I do not take a critical attitude. The removal of obstacles to performing work, consistent with the special position of both women and men, seems to me to be not only a concrete fact but a matter of justice provided it does not affect remuneration. The battle to be won is to prevent that, for equal training and equal work, pay should be unequal, and to prevent the possibility of part-time and flexible-time working leading to the depreciation or down-grading of work done by women.

My third comment relates to social requirements. If we really want maternity and any participation in the activity of the family not to be detrimental to women from the work standpoint, then this burden, which represents a fundamental social function (that of the survival of the species and of life), must be wholly borne by society. In my country, for example, where we have very advanced legislation allowing long absences from work for maternity, child care, etc., we find that private firms tend, for economic reasons, to reduce their female workforce. In government service, on the other hand, either because public bodies are not permitted to exercise discrimination or because it is the taxpayer who ultimately pays and the constraints of private profit or the economic stability of a firm do not exist, there is no such reduction. For this reason, in my view, it is necessary that, both in public service and in private enterprise, that which the law defines strictly as the burden corresponding to the particular conditions of the development of a woman's life, should be borne by society because it relates to a fundamental requirement of life, a fundamental social requirement. In my country

**Cifarelli**

much progress has undoubtedly been made. We have a new family code of law, but it is clear that legislation unaccompanied by the necessary practical structures will end up, as we say in our country, by being devoid of content. Hence the need to take full account of everything that makes up job environment, particularly in relation to early childhood and adolescence. From this viewpoint the old should be considered as well, because, in contemporary society, family structures tend to be increasingly inadequate particularly with regard to the situation of old people. Very often it is precisely the women who suffer most from this situation because they have on their hands not only the family they have created themselves but also the family they come from. Aid to the old eventually becomes—at least in my country—a very heavy burden in the time it takes and the work it requires from the female side of society.

Another important point, Mr President, is paragraph 13 of the resolution which concerns the establishment of a system of continuous monitoring of progress. This is perhaps a field in which the directive has considerable significance because what is involved is not merely the effects on a vast spectrum of national legislations, but also the maximum enforcement of this control of society.

Laws are important, but public opinion and social convention also exercise a powerful influence. If there is a revolution in progress then conventions in Europe will have to change extremely quickly. My vote is given in that sense, without rhetorical exaggeration and in an endeavour to take objective account of a social reality that daily exhibits changes that may, as of now, be a cause for serious concern. *(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Bertrand.

**Mr Bertrand, chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I asked to speak as chairman of the committee because I consider it my duty, on the occasion of this debate, to say a word of thanks first of all to the European Commission for its dynamism and action in submitting concrete proposals for the implementation of the Social Action Programme adopted by the Council on 21 January 1974.

Some speakers in the debate have repeatedly pointed out that the report we are debating today, and this directive, only cover a small part of the problem to be tackled. Well, judging by the communication submitted to the Council on 12 February 1975 on equality of treatment between men and women—to which I would

draw your attention—the Commission has in fact looked at the whole problem.

The emphasis here is on women, but men also need some protection at the present time in view of current developments in society. The question therefore is one of equality of treatment of men and women at work. The Committee on Social Affairs and Employment has stated clearly, however, that it would only deal with a part of this communication, and decided that Lady Ellès should only draw up a report on the directive which actually deals with the legal aspects of equality in regard to access to employment, vocational training, promotion and working conditions.

A full programme is, however, contained in the communication to the Council, on which the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment will be submitting a special report in the course of the next few months, in the hope that we can debate it in June or July. I am drawing attention to this because it is important.

We should not forget, ladies and gentlemen, that Article 119 was incorporated in the Treaty of Rome in March 1958 and that, since 1961, this Parliament has made various attempts to bring about the application of article 119 in the matter of equal pay for equal work for men and women. We have not always been successful in implementing this principle in the Member States. Last year the Commission itself submitted a new proposal for a regulation to the Council, which was adopted by the Council on 16 December 1974, and which gave women the opportunity to obtain redress at law if they do not receive the remuneration to which they are entitled for equal work. This was the second step taken by the Commission and accepted by the Council.

We are now faced with the third step: a proposal for a directive on equality of treatment in access to employment, vocational training, promotion and working conditions. I agree with those who have said today that they are sceptical—I am sceptical myself—but I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment for the care they have taken in studying this directive. They have looked at it from all sides, because they feel that we are faced here with a revolutionary step in a society which is in a state of change. This change in society can only be fully realized if the citizens of this society—and that means both men and women—are able to extend this change through the coming decades on a basis of equality. We recognize that the legal treatment of such problems is important, but feel that matters will

**Bertrand**

only come right when we undergo the necessary change in attitude.

As chairman of the committee, I would like to thank the rapporteur, Lady Elles, most sincerely for her great efforts in drawing up such a clear report giving an accurate picture of the social policy which is being applied in this International Women's Year to eliminate discrimination against women. I believe she has been fantastically successful in this. However, everything depends on a fundamental change in attitude in our society, a society established by men, and a change in the whole legislation and structure of present-day society—both marriage property law and conjugal rights law—which date from the time when man was the king of creation to whom all other creatures bowed down.

A change has now taken place. Man is now beginning to recognize and accept that woman is an equal and that she can claim equal rights in this male society. However, if there is no change in attitude, this process will take so long that I would ask the ladies present here today to persuade women of the need to take action into their own hands to promote their own interests. If they rely too much on the good will of men, and no pressure is put on the men by really substantial women's movements, it will be a long time, Lady Elles, before men will respond to your justified demands.

Until now it has been a small group of progressive women who have given expression to these. It is mainly the younger women who, as a result of education—they can all now follow a course of education to the age of 18 and many of them now acquire University degrees—are beginning to feel that they are not attaining their full rights in this male society. But it is still only a small minority of young women who are aware of this and hence I appeal to men to keep an open mind on this problem.

Mrs Orth said just now that she was glad this problem was being dealt with so objectively and calmly here, but she herself has departed slightly from this calm approach. She should not take it amiss of me if I say that she spoke somewhat passionately about these matters. We must try to remain objective to bring home the need for women to be offered the same opportunities for access to employment. What will happen if men continue to believe in Simone de Beauvoir's view that women are not born but made? We must be realistic and that means that a twelve-year old girl must be given career guidance, on the basis of which she can see what real opportunities there are for her as a woman for access to employment. This means that all technical education, vocational training for

women must be organized differently than it has been hitherto, and she is no longer directed merely towards domestic science or dress-making, commercial correspondence, office work or secretarial work—occupations which take up more than 85% of our girls in the Member States—but is given the opportunity to train as a fitter, a turner, in short for a variety of occupations which do not involve severe physical exertion but which require vocational training. The problem arises very clearly in connection with present legislation.

Prospects of promotion are a similar problem and I fully support what Mr Glinne said, namely that part-time work is a necessity for all workers in present-day society in which men and women both want to work.

There is one other point to which I would draw special attention as chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. In promoting equal opportunities for men and women in the various sectors there is one problem of vital importance, namely the safeguarding of and respect for woman's right to a free choice.

Woman must be free to choose when to become a mother. Then she must be free to choose between staying at home to deal with the upbringing of her young children, which is a vital social function in our Community, or not to interrupt her career and remain at work.

She does not have this choice in our present society. Another example: two young people enter into matrimony. For the first three years they decide not to have any children and to continue working. They have two incomes and they adapt their living standards to that situation. After three years the first child arrives. And then the problem arises. If the other stays at home to look after the child, half of their income disappears and the young family has to adapt its whole standard of living again because a child has arrived, because the woman decides that she ought to spend at least the first two years at home with the child because this is the pattern for a normal upbringing. This woman does not have a free choice and this is an aspect to which I wanted to draw attention. If she wants to stay at home to bring up her children to the age of two or three, she should receive reimbursement for this in line with her economic contribution in undertaking this task. But she must have a free choice.

Paragraph 6 of the motion for a resolution in Lady Elles' report gives rise to confusion in this connection. It says that the choice of a return to work by women with young children should be made more widely available. This applies to women who want to stay at home for some time

**Bertrand**

to bring up their children. These women must then be given the opportunity to make a normal return to work without any detrimental consequences on their pay, prospects of promotion and years of service. Revolutionary reforms are needed in this area. The whole social security system must be revised to include these women in a fair and appropriate pension scheme. I have emphasized this in passing so that you will know that the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment has considered this problem in depth and that we are aware that this is only a first stage which must be followed by further initiatives on the part of the Commission, and I would also call upon Mr Hillery, who has set these operations in motion, to take new initiatives as soon as possible to supplement this first step in the field of the general relations in this society between men and women, who are after all ordinary human beings with a claim to the same rights, the same appreciation and the same opportunities.

**President.** — I call Mr Hillery.

**Mr Hillery, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I have listened to the debate with great satisfaction; the Commission will be very encouraged by the debate and by the report on the draft directive which Lady Elles has prepared on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. I have read this report with great care, and would like to compliment Lady Elles on a most useful document. The report recognizes the difficulty of legislation effectively in a field in which legislation can provide only the foundation upon which major shifts of attitude can be built. It makes very useful suggestions for the improvement of the draft directive and to her I am very much obliged indeed.

In the annual statement on the social situation which I made to Parliament on 18 February, I set out the circumstances which led the Commission to propose this directive. It is one of the activities given priority in the resolution on the Social Action Programme adopted by the Council of Ministers in January 1974, and it complements the directive on equal pay for men and women which was adopted by the Council in December 1974.

The measures proposed in this directive deal only with certain essential aspects of discrimination which are the direct responsibility of public authorities. In order to be fully effective, they need to be reinforced by more extensive measures oriented towards the implementation of the principle of equality, and these are refer-

red to in the communication to which Mr Bertrand has referred, the communication on the achievement of equality between men and women at work, on which I understand your Committee on Social Affairs and Employment may wish to submit a further report. Many of the very interesting points made in today's debate are already dealt within in the communication, and the occasion of a parliamentary debate on the communication will enable us to go into those points more fully. I hope also, as mentioned in the communication, that, from time to time the Commission will come forward with initiatives for legislation, recommendations and so on, and so focus attention again on certain aspects of women's employment which require fuller debate and stronger action.

Now I should like to discuss, with your permission, the draft directive.

Article 1 of the draft directive is aimed at defining the scope of the instrument and identifying the areas which it covers—access to employment, access to vocational training, promotion and working conditions.

Equality of treatment in respect of access to employment entails the elimination of discrimination arising from any legal provisions which prevent access of women to all forms of employment, as regards either the type of activity they wish to exercise or the positions to which their qualifications entitle them. And that is Article 2.

At present, although the range of jobs for women is increasing, certain jobs remain closed to them, owing either to convention or legislation. These restrictions arose from a desire to protect women, and may no longer be justifiable. There are also discriminatory provisions based on marital status, which prevent the recruitment of married women; other provisions such as the maximum age-limit for recruitment put at a disadvantage women seeking employment later on in life; and, finally, individual contracts of employment frequently contain discriminatory clauses leading in particular to the grading of women at a lower level than their qualifications warrant. Without questioning the general freedom of both sides of industry to negotiate contracts, it is clear that any provision of a contract or agreement which is at variance with the principle of equality of treatment must be rendered void.

As regards equality of access to vocational training, the directive aims at eliminating such discrimination against women as persists in education, vocational guidance, and initial and advanced vocational training. That is Article 3 of the draft.

**Hillery**

Equal opportunity in employment is dependent on equal opportunity in training. In practice this necessitates a comparable general education for both sexes, with comparable educational and vocational guidance, and equal opportunity in access to initial and advanced vocational training and retraining.

As regards promotion, the fact that a worker is female and consequently either married or likely to be married with family responsibilities, often weighs against her, irrespective of her qualities. Equality of treatment consists in ensuring that advancement within the career structure is based on qualifications, ability and competence on the job, experience and any other objective criteria connected with the post in question. And that is Article 4.

To pursue the aim of equality in employment, the directive aims to eliminate differences in treatment which exist in working conditions. Dismissals are an example, since in practice firms in difficulty have a tendency to dismiss women before men.

As regards the question raised about the effect of the crisis on employment, while the number of women in unemployment before the crisis began was higher than the proportion in the workforce, the figures which we have for the after-crisis period show that in some countries the average of women losing their employment is higher while in others it is lower than the average for men. There is no clear indication that there is any discrimination on a basis of sex in the present crisis. The loss of jobs is related to the type of employment in the sectors concerned.

Discrimination in the social-security field also prevents the achievement of economic and social equality between the sexes. Discrimination is found in sickness and family benefits, which are generally bound up with the concept of head of household, who is assumed to be a male. Unemployment benefits are often related to marital status, and retirement pensions are provided by both general and supplementary schemes which do not provide the same terms for men and for women. Mrs Orth's suggestion is more fully developed in the guidelines on page 23 of the communication; and we hope that these guidelines and the recommendations therein will encourage Member States to raise the level of their provisions to that of the highest level in the Community.

Since there is no law without sanctions, the draft directive provides persons who consider themselves prejudiced with the possibility of having recourse to law in order to enforce their right to equal treatment under Article 6. Since fear

of dismissal is generally one of the major obstacles to individual action to affirm equal rights, it is necessary to guard against dismissal or other serious prejudicial acts such as downgrading or other coercive measures which may arise from action, and this is done under Article 7.

Finally, Article 8 provides for the dissemination of information on women's rights. Surveys have shown that women are insufficiently informed of those rights. Mr Glinne's comment on the work of the documentation centre and his proposal for an inventory of discriminatory practices in the Member States is a very useful one and will be borne in mind by the Commission when developing that idea.

Mr President, I welcome the general support for the Commission's proposals displayed in the report of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and in the line taken by most of the amendments.

I was glad to note that the motion for a resolution put forward by the committee drew attention to the fact that the European Institutions themselves have not made enough effort to ensure that women obtain jobs at all levels commensurate with their abilities. Lady Elles asked me if the figures are the same: I'm afraid they are, they are the same now in general structure as they were at the time to which her data apply. For its part, the Commission has now recognized that it must practise what it preaches, and it is examining what needs to be done on an inter-service basis and in consultation with the staff. How more equitable a distribution of posts will be achieved I find it hard to visualize; but we have started on the road.

Thank you, Mr President.

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

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

*12. Oral question with debate: Community initiatives following on the National Conference on Emigration*

**President.** — The next item is the oral question with debate by Mr Andreotti and others to the Commission of the European Communities (Doc. 32/75).

The question is worded as follows:

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 111 of 20. 5. 1975.

**President**

*Subject:* Community initiatives following on the National Conference on Emigration

The National Conference on Emigration was held in Rome recently and representatives of the Commission of the European Communities and of the European Parliament were among those taking part.

The migrant workers and the representatives of the various groups who spoke in the debate in plenary sitting and in committee put forward many proposals, some of the most important being those to be implemented at Community level, requiring practical steps to be taken as soon as possible by the Commission.

Among the most important requests, particular stress was laid on the following:

- achieving real equality of treatment between Community migrant workers and nationals in the field of social security, eliminating the delays, gaps and discrimination which still exist;
- harmonizing national social security arrangements and the various bilateral agreements governing this sector;
- improving information for migrants, through the various existing channels;
- increasing their participation in the life of the host country at all levels;
- adopting urgent measures to protect migrant workers from the effects of the economic crisis and unemployment;
- granting the Social Fund adequate means to allow it to take more effective measures to help migrant workers, especially in teaching the language of the host country and in vocational training;
- allocating Community funds to housing for this category of worker;
- adopting as soon as possible a European Statute for the migrant worker;
- improving and updating Community rules on free circulation;
- creating new jobs in areas of high emigration, through an effective regional policy, so as to abolish forced emigration.

What has been the Commission's reaction to these and the many other requests put forward by migrant workers during the Conference?

What practical steps is the Commission taking to meet these requests?

I call Mr Andreotti.

**Mr Andreotti.** — (I) Mr President, I should like to make a suggestion. I submitted this question two months ago both to underline our appreciation for the fact that qualified representatives from the Community, from Parliament, the Commission and the Council of Ministers, took part in the conference on emigration held in Rome, and to stimulate the Commission into a series of initiatives highlighted during this conference.

In the meantime, however, the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment had adopted the report by Mr Albers on a more systematic action programme in favour of migrant workers and their families. I therefore think it would be better to hold a joint debate on the question of emigration as a whole, and this could take place in one of the forthcoming part-sessions of Parliament, perhaps the next one.

However, in the meantime, I should like the Commission to arrange for a census of the housing conditions of migrant workers, for which we need not delay our debate, and to give a full report, when we have the debate, on the effects which the recession had had on migrant workers in many countries.

In submitting this proposal for a postponement and a joint debate, I should like to stress that the more sensitive we are to the problems of migrant workers in the Community, the more we shall demonstrate that the European Community is not just a rich man's club—as has been claimed recently. It must therefore be a Europe for the workers, a Europe for everyone.  
(Applause from the centre)

**President.** — Mr Andreotti therefore proposes that this item be removed from the agenda.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

### 13. Directive on the classification, packaging and labelling of pesticides

**President.** — The next item is the debate on the report drawn up by Mr Della Briotta on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on the approximation of the laws of Member States relating to the classification, packaging and labelling of pesticides (Doc. 16/75).

I call Mr Della Briotta.

**Mr Della Briotta, rapporteur.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the proposal for a directive submitted for our consideration concerns the sale of preparations containing one or more substances dangerous to human life. With regard to this regulation, the Council had given an undertaking at the time, that is now being implemented, albeit with some delay.

Apart from its technical content, this directive tackles a highly important problem, because pesticides are widely used today in agriculture

**Della Briotta**

for the direct protection of crops or, indirectly, for the protection of animals. I will go further: these are essential products, at least until science and industry are successful in finding others that are harmless to man.

The Committee on Public Health and the Environment is therefore pleased at this initiative but regrets the delay with which the undertaking given as long ago as 1967 is now being implemented. We agree with the Commission that these rules should be conceived with a view to complete harmonization, in other words that they should replace all national rules that are not consistent with the Community provisions. This has always been the opinion of the Parliament which may be suitably reiterated on this occasion as well.

We feel that the benefits of harmonizing the standards of packaging and presentation of these products extend also to the economic sector. Standardization of these requirements could result in cost reductions. In principle we agree with the standards that have been laid down and the objectives proposed which—it should be clearly understood—concern solely the marketing of pesticides. We hope that the Commission will also be submitting proposals concerning standards for the authorization, distribution and use of pesticides, with particular reference to storage conditions, in order to ensure that such products are kept separate from others. It is common knowledge that such products are mainly used in rural areas where the level of education is what it is and where, among other things, the risk of confusion between these and other products could have very grave consequences.

An important fact is the Commission's invocation of Article 100 of the Treaty. The point is that national provisions, both legislative and administrative, show marked differences. I would not wish to call the Assembly's attention at further length to other problems. I shall simply say that we have submitted a number of amendments aimed at greater strictness and greater precision. Containers, for example, should bear a legible and indelible warning against re-use. Since these products can cause poisoning, death and accident, the specific or general antidote to be used should be indicated on the packaging. We must always remember that they are used in rural areas where chemists, doctors and health workers are not always available. We are also asking that instructions for use should be given in the language or languages of the importing country. This is a rule that this Parliament has always called for on other occasions as well and which is justified, above all when human health is involved.

This having been said, the Committee on Public Health and the Environment has voted in favour of this directive, whose purpose is to strengthen the protection of public health and in particular that of the workers who use these products and at the same time to safeguard the interests of agriculture. Obviously if the directive were not concerned with protecting human health these rules could have a limitative effect on distribution with possibly serious consequences for agriculture.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — Mr President, I would like to congratulate the rapporteur on the report, particularly the explanatory statement which goes into details and is very clearly written. As he said, this problem is only a part of one of the more important aspects of pesticides.

Ever since I have been concerned with agriculture, there has been controversy over the use of pesticides and their control. I do not think that the Commission have really gone as far as they would like to go in the control of pesticides or, indeed, the harmonization of the laws controlling the levels and the limits of pesticides which can be used. One of the questions I would ask the Commission is what research is going on into the level of pesticide residue in the fatty tissues, for instance, of the human body, which is taking in minute portions of this or that type of pesticide which has been sprayed onto things like apples and other crops. There is a lot of research, I know, being carried out in the Member States of the Community, and I was wondering what efforts the Commission is making to collate the vast amount of experience from these research establishments on this particular issue of residues in the human tissue. I understand fully, of course, that this is not particularly relevant to the regulation with which the report of Mr Della Briotta is dealing, and yet it is relevant to the extent that in Annex III there is a list of dangerous substances. This list merely indicates the dangerous products and states what needs to be done as far as their labelling is concerned.

I was wondering how far the Commission are prepared to go in extending this list, and whether they are prepared to put on tolerance limits and whether these tolerance limits should be added onto the label or not. This cannot be done, obviously, without consulting the trade or without consulting the Member States of the Community. But at some time in the future, Mr President, we are going to have to agree at Council of Ministers level on the permitted toxic



**Scott-Hopkins**

tolerance level of any particular dangerous substance used as a pesticide, either as a prophylactic or indeed as a curative substance.

There is one other small point on which I would like to question the Commission and that is the fact that they have excluded narcotics in this particular directive. I am wondering whether nicotine comes under this particular heading. It is widely used, or I should say, it was widely used, in the horticultural industry. It is as you know, Mr President, an extremely toxic substance. Indeed, I know a horticulturalist whose young child died after sucking a small crystal of nicotine which had lodged under his fingernail and had come from an old bottle which had contained this nicotine, which was used for spraying in greenhouses. I would have thought that it should have been contained in the list of dangerous substances in Annex III, but apparently it does not appear under the heading of 'Narcotics and Radioactive Substances'. I was wondering if the Commission would have a second look at that and perhaps change their mind.

Other than that, Mr President, I welcome Mr Della Briotta's report and, with those limitations, I am more than prepared to support his recommendations.

**President.** — I call Mr Spicer.

**Mr Spicer.** — Mr President, may I speak very briefly indeed in support of Mr Della Briotta's report? I would accept, as all the members of our delegation would, that this proposal for a directive represents an example of the way in which harmonization can be to the improvement of safety standards for all users, and that must be very welcome indeed. Of course, each Member State has its own safety regulations with regard to pesticides, but once such products are exported to other Member States, there is an obvious danger of their being misused, because toxicity, safety instructions and labelling vary. This can, and does, cause confusion, and in my view the sooner that confusion is eliminated, the better. I would particularly point to the conclusions of Mr Della Briotta's report. It seems to me that, in this, the sooner we can move towards harmonization and deal with the much wider implications, the better it will be for everyone.

May I make two final points as a farmer myself? The first one concerns the proposal that there should be labelling to indicate a specific or general antidote. Now I believe that this may and would cause confusion on many farms: if we are considering that such a notice should be included on a label, it must be in the very

simplest terms, and the most important thing of all is that it should deal with first aid and nothing else and state that thereafter consultation with a medical practitioner is of the greatest possible importance. It is a small point, I know, but many of us farmers are fairly simple people. If we go out into a field, get a long way away from home, and then suddenly something ghastly happens, it is quite on the cards that we shouldn't be able to read the label anyway and if we did we would misread it. It should be couched in very general terms indeed and not written in such a way that any farmworker using this material could in any way misinterpret it and do the wrong thing.

The second point is a much more general one. As all of us will know, when one is using any form of agricultural produce like this for agricultural purposes, there is a definite possibility of stocks being held by a wholesaler or retailer for a year or perhaps even two years, and I should very much like to hear what proposals the Commission would put forward for the elimination of those stocks if and when such re-labelling came into use; because quite obviously it might involve the person who is selling those stocks in a considerable loss of money if they had to be withdrawn, sent back and then possibly failed to come back, having been re-labelled.

Those are two very small points. In the main, of course, I support the chairman of my committee, Mr Della Briotta.

**President.** — I call Mr Hillery.

**Mr Hillery, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — Mr President, first of all let me take the opportunity to thank the rapporteur, Mr Della Briotta, and the Committee on Public Health and the Environment for the very positive and thorough report on the Commission's proposals for a directive concerning pesticides.

I do not need to go into detail on the content of the proposal; this has been done with admirable clarity by Mr Della Briotta in his report; I would therefore limit myself to some comments on the amendments proposed by the committee.

In Article 5, Mr Della Briotta proposes a requirement that the package must contain a warning against re-use. The Commission, of course, accepts this amendment, although it feels that the requirement should be limited to those pesticides or the containers of pesticides which are classified as harmful or toxic. With regard to the labelling, it is suggested that labels should

**Hillery**

contain an indication of a specific or general antidote. In this I see a proposal of great merit which has disadvantages too, because certain Member States maintain—and maintain for good reason—a ban against giving medical advice on labels, so there would be a conflict. It was discussed in the preparatory group of national experts, and the final conclusion was not to introduce it into this draft.

The question of the language or languages to be used on labels on containers is one which has been discussed on numerous occasions in this Parliament, and the position of the Commission on this is well known. I shall therefore merely state that the Commission has not changed its point of view.

On the question of a warning against the harmfulness of a pesticide to bees, fish, birds and so on, the Commission agrees with the rapporteur. However, I would find it more appropriate if such a compulsory provision were inserted in the directive on the 'homologation des pesticides', a proposal which is under preparation and which will be forwarded to the Council before the end of the year. I think that further actions suggested or queried by Mr Scott-Hopkins will be seen to be dealt with under that draft directive on the authorization, distribution and use of pesticides.

Finally, may I say that nicotine is included, even though narcotics are excluded: my excellent assistant here found it while Mr Scott-Hopkins was asking me. It is included in the Annex.

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

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

**14. Agenda for next sitting**

**President.** — The next sitting will be held tomorrow, Wednesday 30 April, at 9.30 a.m. and 3 p.m. with the following agenda:

- Report by Mr Bersani on the Community's overall development cooperation policy;
- Report by Mr Brøndlund Nielsen on the general rules for the supply of skimmed milk powder as food aid;
- Report by Mr Ney on the procedures for the Standing Veterinary Committee;
- Report by Mr Liogier on olive oil prices for 1975/1976;
- Report by Mr Frehsee on the trade arrangements for certain goods processed from agricultural products;
- Report by Mr Hansen on the suspension of customs duties on certain agricultural products;
- Report by Mr Baas on Community tariff quotas for bulls, cows and heifers;
- Oral question with debate on the fishing sector;
- Report by Mr Premoli on the reduction of water pollution by wood pulp mills;
- Debate on beet imports.

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 6.30 p.m.)*

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 111 of 20. 5. 1975.

**ANNEX**

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

*Question by Mr Marras to the Council of the European Communities*

*Subject: Measures to guarantee Italian migrant workers the right to take part in the elections to be held on 15 June 1975*

Does the Council feel that it should take action—and, if so, by what means—

- (a) to ensure that the greatest possible number of Italian citizens employed in other Community countries are able to take part in the regional, provincial and municipal elections to be held in Italy on 15 June 1975, and
- (b) to guarantee that migrants will not run the risk of losing their jobs by exercising their right to vote?

*Answer*

The rights of workers who are nationals of Member States and are employed in the territory of another Member State are laid down in the Treaties and in the various acts adopted pursuant to the provisions of the latter, such as the regulations on the freedom of movement of workers and on the social security of migrant workers.

The problem raised by the honourable Member is not governed by the regulation on the freedom of movement of workers. The Council has so far not had to deal with this problem.

*Question by Mr Nolan to the Commission of the European Communities*

*Subject: Dumping of radioactive waste in the eastern Atlantic*

Considering the dangers to fish and the marine environment by the dumping of radioactive waste in deep-water dumps in the eastern Atlantic, what control does the Commission exercise over such dumping by Member States?

*Answer*

The Commission does not at present exercise any direct control over the dumping by Member States of radioactive waste in the high seas. As regards European Countries, the OECD's Nuclear Energy Agency has since 1967 organized several international operations for dumping low radioactive waste in the sea and eight European countries have taken part in these. The latest operation was in 1974.

These operations were carried out under the responsibility of the NEA with the help of a group of specialists on the packaging of radioactive waste, set up by the NEA in 1966.

The Nuclear Energy Agency's Committee on Radiological Protection and Public Health was consulted on the dumping of radioactive waste in the Atlantic Ocean and felt that there were no objections from a health point of view to the methods to be used for the dumping.

In view of the description of the measures taken and the bodies assuming responsibility, there is no reason to believe that this operation involves greater risks than previous ones.

On a more general level, as regards the dumping of toxic waste in the sea, the Oslo Convention does not specifically mention radioactive pollution and the London Convention prohibits the dumping of highly radioactive waste.

The Commission will strive to ensure the harmonized application of these Conventions in the Member States.

*Question by Mr Gibbons to the Commission of the European Communities*

*Subject: Aids for casein*

As the amount of aid for skimmed milk processed into casein is determined by the price for skimmed milk powder in the Community and for caseins in international trade, and considering that the world market price for casein has fallen considerably in recent months does the Commission intend to increase the amount of aid granted to casein production to compensate for this fall in world prices?

*Answer*

As required by the Council Regulation, the aid for casein has to be so fixed that the return on skimmed milk processed into casein or caseinated is equivalent to that on skimmed milk processed into skimmed milk powder. In accordance with the same regulation, the parameters for determining the level of the aid are twofold:

- firstly, the intervention price for skimmed milk powder, and
- secondly, the world market price for casein or caseinates of first quality.

Taking into account:

- the latest increase of the intervention price for skimmed milk powder,
- the decreasing prices of casein on the world market, and
- the unfavourable forecasts on a middle and long term for the prices of casein on the world market,

the Commission adopted a regulation according to which the aid for 100 kg liquid skimmed milk delivered for the manufacturing of casein and caseinates was increased from 3.20 u.a. up to 4.00, that is to say 25%. It has to be underlined that the new intervention price for skimmed milk powder corresponds to an increase of less than 7% in comparison with the previous price.

The Commission is well informed about the difficult situation existing at the present, particularly of industrial casein on the world market. Over the last few months the demand has been very weak and even non-existent, the market of casein being closely connected with the general economic situation (recession in the building sector as well as for certain luxury foods).

The Commission is convinced that such a situation in the market of casein could not be improved by any modification of the present level of the aid.

## SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 30 APRIL 1975

### Contents

<p>1. Approval of minutes ..... 76</p> <p>2. Documents received ..... 76</p> <p>3. The Community's overall development cooperation policy — debate on a report drawn up by Mr Bersani on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation (Doc. 42/75):</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Mr Bersani, rapporteur ..... 77</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Mr Deschamps, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group; Mr Broeksz, on behalf of the Socialist Group .... 80</p> <p>4. Welcome to Mrs Thatcher ..... 84</p> <p>5. The Community's overall development cooperation policy (cont.): Miss Flesch, on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group; Lord Reay, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Kaspereit, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Sandri, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Cheysson, member of the Commission of the European Communities ..... 84</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Adoption of the resolution ..... 93</p> <p>6. Membership of committees ..... 93</p> <p>7. Regulation on the supply of skimmed milk powder as food aid — debate on a report drawn up by Mr Brøndlund Nielsen on behalf of the Committee on Cooperation and Development (Doc. 50/75):</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Mr Brøndlund Nielsen, rapporteur .. 94</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Mr Laban, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Lord Reay, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Cheysson, member of the Commission of the European Communities ..... 94</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Adoption of the resolution ..... 97</p>	<p>8. Directive and decision on the procedures of the Standing Veterinary Committee — debate on a report drawn up by Mr Ney on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment (Doc. 47/75):</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Mr Noè, deputizing for the rapporteur Mr Frehsee, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Lardinois, member of the Commission of the European Communities ..... 97</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Adoption of the resolution ..... 98</p> <p>9. Regulation fixing the market target price and the intervention price for olive oil for 1975/1976 — debate on a report drawn up by Mr Liogier on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 57/75):</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Mr Liogier, rapporteur ..... 99</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Mr Frehsee, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Scott-Hopkins, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Cipolla, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Cifarelli; Mr Lardinois, member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Cipolla; Mr Lardinois; Mr Cipolla; Mr Lardinois ..... 99</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Adoption of the resolution ..... 105</p> <p>10. Regulation laying down the trade arrangements applicable to certain goods processed from agricultural products — debate on a report drawn up by Mr Frehsee on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 44/75):</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Mr Frehsee, rapporteur ..... 106</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Mr Lardinois, member of the Commission of the European Communities .. 107</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">Adoption of the resolution ..... 107</p> <p>11. Regulation temporarily suspending the autonomous customs duties on certain</p>
---	--

<i>agricultural products — debate on a report drawn up by Mr Hansen on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 56/75):</i>	
<i>Mr Hansen, rapporteur</i> .....	107
<i>Mr Lardinois, member of the Commission of the European Communities</i> ..	107
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> .....	107
12. <i>Regulations on Community tariff quotas for bulls, cows and heifers of certain mountain breeds — report drawn up by Mr Baas on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations (Doc. 6/75):</i>	
<i>Procedural motion: Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Lardinois, member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Laban; Mr Lardinois; Mr Premoli</i> .....	108
<i>Rejection of the motion for a resolution</i> .....	109
<i>Explanation of vote: Mr Scott-Hopkins</i>	109
<i>Procedural motion: Mr Laban</i> .....	109
13. <i>Oral Question with debate: Fishing sector (Doc. 64/75):</i>	
<i>Mr Corrie, author of the question</i> ....	109
<i>Mr Spicer, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Lardinois, member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Shaw; Mr Bersani; Mr Laban; Mr Lardinois</i> ....	110
14. <i>Directive on the reduction of water pollution caused by wood pulp mills — debate on a report drawn up by Mr Premoli on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment (Doc. 28/75):</i>	
<i>Mr Premoli, rapporteur</i> .....	114
<i>Lord Bethell, on behalf of the European Conservative Group; Mr Scarscia Mugnozza, vice-president of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Premoli</i> .....	115
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> .....	117
15. <i>Beef imports — debate, by urgent procedure, requested by Mr Cointat and others, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats (Doc. 67/75):</i>	
<i>Mr Lardinois, member of the Commission of the European Communities; Mr Laban, on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Premoli, on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Liogier, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mr Cipolla, on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group; Mr Lardinois</i> .....	117
16. <i>Date and agenda for next part-session</i>	124
17. <i>Adjournment of session</i> .....	125
18. <i>Approval of minutes</i> .....	126

#### IN THE CHAIR: MR SPÉNALE

*President*

*(The sitting was opened at 9.40 a.m.)*

**President.** — The sitting is open.

##### 1. *Approval of minutes*

**President.** — The minutes of proceedings of yesterday's sitting have been distributed. Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

##### 2. *Documents received*

**President.** — I have received the following documents:

— Oral question with debate by Mr Jahn, Mr Aigner, Mr Burgbacher, Mr Früh, Mr Klepsch, Mr Mursch and Mr Schulz to the Commission of the European Communities on the composition of the Consumers' Consultative Committee (Doc. 68/75);

— Oral question with debate by Mr Jahn, Mr Aigner, Mr Burgbacher, Mr Früh, Mr Klepsch, Mr Mursch and Mr Schulz to the Council of the European Communities on the composition of the Consumers' Consultative Committee (Doc. 69/75);

— Oral question with debate pursuant to Paragraph 4, second subparagraph of the Communiqué of the Summit Conference of 9/10 December 1974 by Mr Kirk on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee to the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Member States of the European Communities on the

**President**

general situation in the Mediterranean and the Middle East (Doc. 70/75);

- Oral question with debate by Mr Fellermaier, Mr Albertsen, Mr Broeks, Mr Dondelinger and Mr Giraud on behalf of the Socialist Group to the Commission of the European Communities on the economic discrimination against the EEC nationals and firms by the countries of the Arab League and the companies and firms established in those countries (Doc. 71/75);
- Oral question with debate by Mr Amendola, Mr Ansart, Mr Bordu and Mr Leonardi on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group to the Commission of the European Communities on the restructuring programme for the motor vehicle production sector (Doc. 72/75).

### 3. *The Community's overall development cooperation policy*

**President.** — The next item is a debate on the report drawn up by Mr Bersani on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation on the Community's overall development cooperation policy (Doc. 42/75).

I call Mr Bersani.

**Mr Bersani, rapporteur.** — (1) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the topic on today's agenda which I am about to discuss is being given the prominent place which is its rightful due at this part-session of our Parliament.

In a world torn by deep divisions and saddened by tragic and bloody events that will undoubtedly go down in history, we look forward today to a vast global programme of actions governed by the inexorable logic of international solidarity. At a time when for reasons largely outside our control, unemployment is rampant in our countries and when economic and social difficulties are pushing inflation to the highest rates known since the last war, the Community is redoubling its efforts to increase its own technical and economic cooperation and its financial aid to less privileged peoples or peoples in the developing countries. While alongside undoubted processes of political liberation we see nowadays some countries following the old line of imperialistic ambitions sustained by force of arms and other countries succumbing to the temptations of isolationism, the Community, which has already increased from 19 to 46 the number of countries with which it has special privileged relations, and has also increased the number of its agreements

with these countries on technical and trade cooperation, sees its cooperation policy vis-à-vis the less privileged areas as an overall, world policy. At one of the most difficult moments in the entire process of internal integration in the EEC at political and institutional level — we have only to think of the British referendum, which prompts the oftenheard observation, which is indeed largely true, that the EEC is an economic giant with feet of clay — the Community is nevertheless facing up to one of the major challenges of our time, that posed by the gulf between the industrialized countries and the developing countries, between the northern and the southern hemispheres. It is taking its courage and its resolve in both hands and endeavouring to breathe new life in to a complex of relationships and partnerships, which up to now had been bedevilled not only by a serious shortage of financial resources but also by the haunting spectres of the past and by an inadequate appraisal of the human and political factors involved.

It will be said, and it is partly true, that the resources at our disposal, the structure set up and also the methods being followed are so disproportionate to the goals being aimed at that they merely serve for the present to show our good intentions. There are some facts however which cannot be denied. Firstly, there is the marked change, not only in terms of quantity but also in terms of quality, in the commitment being undertaken today by the EEC. Secondly, there is the fact that the countries concerned, up to now largely simple beneficiaries of the development process, but now being increasingly called upon to become partners in it, are increasingly happy with the forums of cooperation being proposed, as is shown by the new agreements, that of Lomé and many others besides, requested by various countries which are quite clearly impressed by the contents of our cooperation policy. There has been a consistent pattern of development from the very beginning, when development policy was enshrined in Part IV of the Treaty of Rome as if to show once and for all that it was an essential part of the very life of the Community, and this has meant that a policy of restricted regional agreements has given way to increasingly broader conventions and that yesterday's regionally based policy has given way to the overall policy of today, which affords such valuable prospects for reconciliation between the conflicting strains of regionalism and globalism.

Having thus sketched in broad outline the political importance of the Commission proposals, I should now like to explain briefly the posi-

**Bersani**

tions on which our Committee on Development and Cooperation, after many debates, finally found itself in unanimous agreement. The main features of Community policy in this area are well known to all of you, and I shall only recall them in a very rapid summary fashion.

For a period of about 10 years, from 1957 to 1968, the EEC, for geographical, historical and political reasons, concentrated its efforts mainly on its relations with the Associated African States and Madagascar, working out in collaboration with these states what has been described as a model of cooperation between industrialized states and developing countries, a model not only in its contents, its financial resources and its technical machinery, but above all in the general methods and the joint institutions which lay behind them.

There was also the fact that the Treaty of Rome did not lay down any overall policy on a world-wide scale in the matter of cooperation and in addition the natural reluctance on the part of the Foreign Ministers of Member States to change the nature of their ties with traditional partners.

While the first Yaoundé Agreement was being implemented and preparations were being made for the second, what I would call the second phase of our policy in this field was being launched. This was a period characterized by a series of new factors amongst which I would particularly like to refer to the first agreements with English-speaking African countries, the suspension or improvement of customs tariffs, the commitments entered into in successive meetings of UNCTAD, including the introduction of generalized preferences, the notable development in our food aid policy to many countries, the international agreements on certain basic products, our involvement in the special campaign by the UN in favour of the countries hardest hit by the recent increase in prices on world markets, the multiplication of vertical agreements with Mediterranean countries and so on.

All these factors, taken together with the Community's new awareness of its responsibilities in the international community, gradually evolved the outlines of a new political idea, broader in extent than the regional type of policy hitherto pursued and latent in the African agreements, with which it was not in conflict but rather ran parallel. This was what later came to be called the overall policy of development cooperation. The publication by the Commission of a first memorandum on this new policy in July 1971, the programme submitted in February 1972 outlining an initial series of actions,

and the initial decisions taken by the Council of Ministers for Development Cooperation, who met for the first time in the Community's history in September 1972, were followed in October of that same year by the communiqué from the first Paris Summit, and this concluded the second phase of our involvement in an overall policy. Moving on past these transitional stages we came now to the third stage in which the purely pragmatic approach of the initial stages was transcended and the fundamental principles of comprehensive action on a world-wide scale were laid down.

It was in this phase also that the three principal areas in which this broader and more consistent political conception would be pursued were defined. The first area was that of the countries hitherto covered in the Yaoundé, Lagos and Lomé agreements, the overseas territories and so on. The second area was that involving countries with conventional or special agreements, including especially the Mediterranean countries and some of the Latin American countries. The third area was that in which other countries throughout the entire world were situated, with an obvious preference for some more needy countries, such as India, Pakistan etc.

In the final communiqué from the Paris Summit we read: 'the Heads of State or Government' are convinced that the Community must, without detracting from the advantages enjoyed by countries with which it has special relations, respond even more than in the past to the expectations of all the developing countries'.

After the communiqué of October 1972, the Commission successively drafted a communication on development aid, a new memorandum on the form this might take and on the costs it would involve, a new communication which will shortly be coming before Parliament on the harmonization and coordination of development cooperation policies within the EEC, while the Council also concerned itself more closely with these problems in 1973 and 1974.

The European Parliament in turn has set up a special working party on development cooperation within the Committee on Development and Cooperation, and it is intended that this group should work along the lines of a similar group set up by the Commission. The results achieved by this working party of ours have formed the basis of the resolution drawn up by the parliamentary committee. In particular the motion for a resolution is designed to make a contribution, an original one in some respects, to the by no means easy task of establishing the criteria that must govern this policy, which



**Bersani**

encompasses such a broad scope and must moreover be carried out, as I have said, with resources and methods that are not at all adequate to the task in hand.

One of the first problems awaiting solution is that of the relation between regional policy, which had been greatly expanded up to the time of the Lomé Convention, which with its 55 countries unites more than half of the member states of the UN, and the new policy on a worldwide scale. The EEC has undertaken precise commitments to maintain, within the framework of this broader overall policy, what has always been called the *acquis communautaire*, in other words, the gains achieved, in its relations with the Associated States. This commitment is all the more important in that, as stated in paragraph 20 of the motion for a resolution, it concerns a certain number of countries which are amongst the poorest in the world. This commitment, however, does not exclude the extension of this type of convention to countries enjoying comparable economic and geological conditions to our own, and above all it constitutes no obstacles to the overall developments we have been referring to. Indeed, experience has shown that the EEC has always been faithful to its commitment not to allow new agreements to be the means of putting the results already achieved by the Associated States in jeopardy.

A second complex of problems concerns the coordination and harmonization at Community level of national and Community cooperation policies, both in the drafting phase and in the implementing phase. At the present time, about 80 per cent of all aid is given on a bilateral level and only 20 per cent on a Community basis. There is therefore not only an urgent problem of harmonizing and coordinating these actions, but also a problem which centres around the need to upgrade the relations already referred to and gradually strengthen the Community aspect without prejudice to the effectiveness of actions carried out on the bilateral level, and this holds true also for actions at government level. In addition, we should mention here once again how important our committee felt it to be that appropriations should be provided in the budget for non-governmental initiatives, which would complement the implementation of projects by the European Development Fund.

A third group of problems concerns the priorities to be observed in allocating aid, especially in view of the considerable inadequacy of the funds available at the present time. This question, which has already caused much ink to flow in international journalistic circles, has given rise to many debates in our committee. The

formula proposed in paragraph 3, which starts out from the stated need to avoid in all cases any interference in the internal political affairs of target countries, sets out three main criteria—firstly, the capacity to make effective use of increased aid; secondly, the efforts which the recipient country can make to enable these aids to reach all strata of the population and not only the rich; thirdly, consideration of the amount of aid being received by these countries from other sources. High marks would also be given for any form of regionalized cooperation, which would enable the funds to be filtered down to more organic projects, as is certainly coming to be more and more the case in Mediterranean and Latin American policy.

A further group of problems concerns the repercussions of development policy on those regions and economic sectors of the EEC affected by the development cooperation measures. In paragraph 5, we find stated for the first time the wisdom of taking compensatory measures to counteract these repercussions. The formula proposed by our committee sets out, as I say for the first time in a Community document, the principle of equality which has been insisted upon over and over again in parliamentary debates and on which, I feel, there is a very high degree of agreement in the House. Your rapporteur has had occasion to refer to this matter also on the occasion of recent debates on agricultural questions.

As of the present time there exists only one precedent in the matter of compensatory measures, but this refers to a very limited case—indeed it was recalled yesterday by Commissioner Cheysson during the debate on Cyprus — which cannot be quoted in this context as a valid precedent. We are opening a new chapter therefore, and it must lead, in accordance with the general guidelines of Community policy, to practical and substantial measures.

A fifth group of problems concerns the matter of informing and arousing public opinion, a matter which we all feel to have been greatly neglected hitherto, and we must do this in order to have the most widespread and wholehearted support for this policy which will call for increasingly generous sacrifices and contributions. In this context the need is also apparent for special consultations with workers' representatives and representatives of all circles concerned in production in a grand campaign to involve all sectors in effective participation in tackling the major problems of international cooperation.

A further group of problems concerns methods and aims of cooperation projects, beginning with

**Bersani**

trade projects, on which we feel that it is essential that the Community should define more clearly its own world policy, particularly in regard to primary commodities, on which there has been much discussion recently at various international conferences. This is one of the matters which is of greatest interest to most of the Third World, which is not so much asking for aid but rather that a policy should gradually be worked out which would enable the countries concerned to stand on their own feet, as far as possible.

There are also the financial problems. For example, at recent meetings in Caracas, in which a representative of this Parliament also took part, new banking and financial structures were spoken of, which would serve as a vehicle for more sophisticated and practical forms of co-operation.

In the same way the recent energy conference highlighted the connections between the various forms of cooperation, as far as the basic resources still available in the world are concerned. Yet a further group of problems concerns the relationship between the various technical, industrial, commercial and other cooperation policies and food aid policy. Strictly speaking, this food aid policy cannot be considered a development cooperation policy, but it has by now come to take up such a prominent part in the Community's thinking that it cannot be ignored, and indeed that it calls for a practical organization and coordination of measures to show our solidarity with less developed peoples.

In 1974, the EEC as such, that is to say, apart altogether from bilateral aids, assigned 265 million units of account, and in the next three years it will double this sum, which will mean a volume of aid double that provided for by the financial and other measures contained in the Lomé agreements.

Mr President, development cooperation policy has by now become an essential part of the internal and foreign policy of our Community. While our association policy was crowned with the exceptionally successful results of Lomé, our global policy is still being defined, with regard to its criteria, its means, its mechanisms and its objectives. I have referred to the need for vigilance against the danger of dissipating our energies by spreading them over too vast an area. We must instead seek to work out more consistent regional policies, beginning with the Mediterranean and Latin America, without however overlooking the possibility of setting up contacts with other areas amongst the weakest and most needy in the entire world.

The generalized preferences, the customs tariff measures, the world agreements on primary commodities, the new principle of export income guarantees laid down in the Lomé Agreement the increased food aids, the contribution already referred to of a sum of 3 thousand million dollars to launch a UN fund, for which Commissioner Cheysson argued so long and so courageously, all these show that we are already on the way to meeting our enormous commitments to the cause of international solidarity. Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in all these matters the EEC has often been in the forefront and indeed, as was the case in regard to generalized preferences, for a long time way out on its own in front, but it has nevertheless in spite of everything been always prepared to discover in a broader compass such as that of the UN new prospects which underlined its own broad vision, with regard to tackling the needs of the world.

These needs are pressing needs and becoming increasingly serious. They impel us to adopt an increasingly more effective and responsible attitude. Gentlemen of the Council and Commission, we must speed up our efforts to work out new mechanisms and new proposals as a matter of urgency. Parliament has frequently adopted the stance of a critic, and a very vehement critic at that, urging and inciting, aware always of its responsibility for all policy on these matters. It would like to assure you, however, once again on this occasion, when we are trying to translate our ideas and our visions into practical and concrete measures, that whenever you come to us with proposals which we consider useful and practical, you will always find us at your side with a firm resolve to help and encourage you.

*(Applause)*

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

**Mr Deschamps.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, you will understand that, speaking in this important debate on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group, I should like to begin by paying a warm tribute to Mr Maurice Dewulf, who was for many years a Member of this Assembly and to whom the report on which we are to vote today was originally entrusted.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the motion for a resolution before us begins with a statement whose importance cannot be exaggerated. The resolutions and recommendation adopted by the Council, it says, can form a proper basis for a future Community development policy. On behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group, I am delighted to join in the tribute thus paid to the

**Deschamps**

work done by the Council, which adopted these resolutions, as well as the Commission, which prepared the ground for them, and in particular Mr Cheysson, whose 'fresco' of Community action now receives well-earned recognition.

The second point of the resolution is similar to the first and is just as important. It expressly requests the Commission to elaborate proposals and the Council to adopt decisions to broaden still further the scope of this policy. Here again the resolution has, of course, our full support. It is not enough to make a start, the important thing is to keep up the work. Our cooperation policy must be extended and broadened in close cooperation among those—Council, Commission and Parliament—who have so far helped to shape the policy and get its implementation off the ground.

The motion for a resolution goes on to deal with the important question of where the aid should be directed. Our answer is perfectly straightforward: where it is most needed. We qualify this by stressing that aid should be granted on the basis of the recipient countries' capacity to make effective use of aid, their efforts to ensure that all strata of the population benefit from the advantages of progress and the amount of aid received by them from other sources.

To these criteria we add the fundamental principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of such countries.

We naturally endorse this principle which, though simple, is in no way simplistic. To say that aid should be granted first and foremost where it is most required is to exclude choices which might be made for purely political reasons.

On the other hand the criteria are cited by way of illustration and our group might perhaps not have presented them in the same order. One of the criteria is that aid should benefit all strata of the population. We accept this, although we stress that the governments who make such efforts to ensure that all sections of the population benefit from our aid without distinction should not all be of the same type, should not all pursue the same philosophy, and should not all belong to the same category.

We would have wished, moreover, that in considering distribution of aid, priority had been given to the principle of non-interference in internal affairs. In our view this is the crucial point, as we have emphasized on many occasions, especially in connection with the Lomé negotiations, and it is just as crucial for the countries with which we have been negotiating.

In paragraphs 4 to 7 the resolution deals with cooperation policy in the context of the Communities' policies as a whole. It puts the principle that, in order to be accepted, a Community cooperation policy must take account of its effects on the other sectors of Community policy. Compensatory measures are recommended for those regions and sectors experiencing the greatest repercussions from development policy. Stress is laid on the need to inform and win over the public and your rapporteur, Mr Bersani—to whom I should like at this point to pay tribute for the work he has devoted over the past year to the report he submitted to us today—underlined the importance of this aspect a few minutes ago. In practice, we believe that this public relations exercise should be pursued on a continuous basis, in particular through consultations with both sides of industry, in other words the leaders of industry and the trade unions.

Christian-Democrats support this principle. Social justice throughout the world cannot be forced through against the interests and legitimate rights of European workers. At the same time, we must not allow this consideration to be used by anyone as an instrument with which to resist development aid. We believe it essential to avoid balancing the interests and rights of European workers against those of workers in the developing countries. Although we have often underlined the solidarity of workers all over the world, we feel it necessary to restate it firmly today.

We must bring home to the public at large that today, even more so than yesterday—and perhaps the public will be better able to understand it today—cooperation is not only a human duty but also a positive step towards prosperity in Europe, and it would be very short-sighted to ignore this.

Going on to deal with the order and urgency of Community action, the resolution stresses the necessity of laying down priorities—and this is important—on the basis of the data provided in the Commission communication. The examples quoted at this point in the resolution were mentioned earlier on.

In connection with food aid, attention is called to the need for broader measures on more of a Community basis. The Community food aid programme for 1975 must be established rapidly and intensified. These priorities have the backing of the Christian-Democratic Group. It believes that these priorities should be gauged according to the needs of the countries to which aid is to be accorded.

**Deschamps**

We consider food aid to be a crucial factor in the immediate future, although not a crucial or permanent factor in our cooperation policy. On the contrary, the purpose of our cooperation policy is to render food aid unnecessary, although we do not go along with those who, on grounds of principle or of desirable structural changes, might be prepared to allow hundreds of thousands of human beings to die in the meantime. If everything is to be done to allow the leaders of the developing countries to provide for the future food supplies of their peoples, we must in the first instance protect these people from starvation, and we must all unite in our efforts to achieve this purpose.

The resolution also deals in some detail with the question of generalized preferences. It contends—and we agree—that it is necessary to carry out an evaluation of the operation and efficacy of the scheme and to remove non-tariff obstacles to trade, and it cites the example of the experiment with the Lomé Convention, namely its stabilization fund. We endorse these principles. We feel that opening a market to the products of developing countries gives them the best chance of making really steady and permanent progress. We feel that after the Lomé experiment and the setting up of this stabilization fund, which seems to us the most novel and probably most interesting feature of the Convention, we should strive to improve the scheme as we have known it hitherto. Countries must, however, make sure that non-tariff obstacles to international trade are abolished. It would be wrong, after announcing the abolition of duties, to reimpose them through the effects of quotas or licences, or to retain obstacles to trade in tropical products.

In paragraph 12 of the resolution, agriculture is taken to be an essential area of development policy. This is plainly true, Mr President, and indeed for two reasons: Firstly because in many countries the survival of the population depends on agriculture, and secondly because many countries have to rely on agriculture for their economic and social development.

Community and bilateral aid forms the subject of paragraphs 13 to 15. The rapporteur has dealt very well with this question, and we support the three proposals put forward: it is necessary to expand action at Community level, although at the same time bilateral contributions are important and have proved their worth. At the same time bilateral policies must be harmonized and coordinated with the Community's policy.

In the view of the Christian-Democratic Group, paragraph 16 is particularly important since it deals with non-governmental measures. We have always felt that although such measures may

not be the most significant, in terms of volume, among Community actions on behalf of the developing countries, they are necessary and should receive material and practice aid from the Community. The fact is that there are things which official bodies cannot do, cannot do quickly enough, or cannot do well enough because of the slow and cumbersome way in which administrations act.

There is also the inadaptability of some structures to local and immediate needs. In such cases non-governmental action can prove valuable, and should be supported.

Underdeveloped countries should also be helped to get together and cooperate. We should contribute to economic cooperation between developing countries and the formation of integrated regional groupings. We consider this to be one of the most effective instruments of our cooperation policy. I should like to make three points in this connection.

Firstly, the developing countries, no less than Europe, should be able to benefit from the advantages offered by large markets.

Secondly, the formation of large markets and regional groupings calls for experience. We ought, therefore, to pass on to our partners in the developing countries our legal, administrative and commercial know-how.

Thirdly, in some parts of the world—and I am thinking particularly of Latin America—the Common Market still tends to arouse fear. We should reassure these countries by helping them to form their own groupings and by showing that we want them to enjoy the same advantages as we have opened up for ourselves.

The Community cannot restrict its aid to those associated or about to be associated with it. It is necessary to fix the amounts of financial and technical aid to the non-associated. The Community must be open; we must not withdraw into our own shell.

Our development policy must be based on these principles: we cannot turn away those who do not benefit now and will not do so tomorrow from the efforts of the Community as a whole. At the same time, as pointed out in paragraph 20 of the resolution, the ACP countries remain in a privileged position. The principle of non-discrimination with regard to non-associated countries cannot detract from our privileged relations with the partners of the Lomé Convention.

We have in fact entered into voluntary agreements with them and we must keep to our commitments to them if the Community is to retain its credibility in the world. No one would

**Deschamps**

understand us if we acted otherwise. This privileged cooperation is in any case in no way exclusive. Other forms of cooperation with other countries, with other regions of the world, are necessary. We have demonstrated this in connection with food aid, and we could do so in other sectors. Besides, the ACP group includes some of the world's poorest countries.

My last point is that we must work within the United Nations on the definition of a new world economic order, and then strive to bring it into being.

Christian-Democrats cannot, any more than the other groups gathered in this Assembly, accept a so-called world order which perpetuates division and which will soon, if we cannot expect to prevent it, lead to conflict between rich and poor. We must work together, all of us—and that is the ultimate objective of our cooperation policy—to bring men and countries closer together.

That, Mr President, is what I wanted to say on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group, since it has, from the beginning, helped to work out this policy with the other groups, since so many of its members have devoted themselves wholeheartedly and with determination to it, since they have encountered a spirit of positive cooperation among all the groups of this Assembly. We are convinced that we shall all join in approving this resolution today, a resolution which will in a way be the charter of our development cooperation policy. Up to now we had no clear-cut policy in this sector such as we had in others. Henceforth we shall have one and we shall be in a position to move forward towards an extension and globalization of this policy.

*(Applause)*

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

**Mr Broeks.** — *(NL)* Mr President, on behalf of my group I should like to begin by thanking the rapporteur for an excellent report, with a particularly clear structure.

One can well imagine how when the Lomé Convention was signed, the countries that were not involved looked on with envious eyes.

I think that the objective of our aid, which we cannot of course give entirely by ourselves, should still be to help all the countries in the world, as well as the Lomé Convention countries, to arrive at greater economic and social independence. That this must not constitute a threat to what we have achieved with the Lomé

Convention goes without saying and is, moreover, clearly stated in paragraph 20.

But I think that now that the agreement between the Community and the 45 ACP countries has been reached, it is still more important than formerly for the Communities' development cooperation policy to be given a general character and to be clearly publicized.

The 45 ACP countries are only a part of the total number of developing countries. Moreover, some of the other countries have a number of especially large problems, for instance an extremely large population; I have in mind Bangladesh, India and Pakistan, but the poor countries in central America ought not to be forgotten.

This report is not concerned in the first place with the hunger that exists in the world at the moment and the food aid the Community is providing to meet it. The food aid ought not of course to be forgotten at this point in time, but we can expect that it will not always have to have the same dimensions as in the last few years, since we can hope that this situation will come to an end, and that harvests will get better. Although we know that food aid will continue to be necessary for many years, we hope from the bottom of our hearts that it will not need to be as large as in the last few years.

Another point of the report that I find important is paragraph 14, pointing out the importance of bilateral contributions by the Member States, and that they have proved their worth. Paragraph 15 correctly points out, however, that it would be desirable to harmonize the bilateral policies with the Community policy, so that the nine countries are not working entirely at cross purposes.

Of the criteria mentioned in paragraph 3 of the motion for a resolution on the geographical distribution of aid, the criterion that the recipient countries must make efforts to allow all strata of the population a wider share in progress than hitherto is especially important.

Nor must the aid given increase existing inequalities among the population. In this connection, one may of course ask whether this constitutes interference in internal affairs. We have had extensive discussions on this in committee, and have come to the conclusion that, if we extend aid, we have the right to attach certain conditions to it, as mentioned in paragraph 3, and that on the other hand the recipient countries have the right either to accept the aid on these conditions or not, and that it cannot be said that this means interference in internal affairs.

**Broeksz**

The Community already has at its disposal a number of instruments which provide a basis for a general Community policy on development cooperation, namely the generalized preferences and food aid. These instruments must now be further developed and extended. At the same time, however, it is very important for new instruments to be created. The Community will have to make every effort to promote the conclusion of world raw materials agreements. With the stabilization schemes under the Lomé Convention the Community will already have made the first step in this direction. To avoid unfair discrimination between food-producing or raw-material-producing developing countries, these stabilization schemes must be expanded, or else replaced by world raw-material agreements. There will also have to be financial cooperation in proportion to the financial aid to be given to the 45 ACP countries.

The figures mentioned so far by the Commission, 105m u.a. in 1976 and 210m u.a. in 1980, must in this connection be regarded as totally inadequate. Mr President, our group is aware, and we clearly said so at the last meeting of the Joint Committee, that it is impossible to bring about world development cooperation if the financial resources for this are to be provided entirely by the Community alone. It is obvious that a contribution has to come today not only from America and from the countries of the Eastern bloc, but no less from the rich oil-producing countries, and that this contribution has to be a significant one.

We must seek to encourage this in all possible ways. Paragraph 4 of the motion for a resolution states that all development cooperation measures must take account of possible repercussions on other sectors of Community policy. Thus, for example, the textile industry will experience the consequences of the broadening of the possibilities for importing textile products from the developing countries into the Community. The adjustment of the industrial structure this requires must be facilitated by Community measures.

A balanced Community policy on development cooperation also requires, however, that if the Community, say, takes special measures under the Common Agricultural Policy or the Common Commercial Policy, it must in turn explicitly take account of the consequences for the developing countries.

It is not my intention to go through the points of the resolution individually. We still have an extensive agenda and I wished merely to bring out a number of points we found important. I shall close by noting that a Community policy

on development cooperation must have as its final objective the bringing about of a fundamental change in the present relationship between rich and poor countries. In this connection it is obvious that the Community as such participates actively and constructively in the discussions within the United Nations on a new economic order.

*(Applause)*

**4. Welcome to Mrs Thatcher**

**President.** — Honourable Members, on behalf of myself and the House I cordially welcome Mrs Thatcher, Chairman of the British Conservative Party, to the visitors' gallery. We are delighted to see her.

*(Applause)*

**5. The Community's overall development cooperation policy (cont.)**

**President.** — We shall now resume the debate on Mr Bersani's report on the Community's overall development cooperation policy (Doc. 42/75).

I call Miss Flesch to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group.

**Miss Flesch.** — *(F)* Mr President, honourable Members, on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group, I would like firstly to thank the rapporteur, Mr Bersani, for the very interesting report which he has presented to us and to include in these thanks Mr Dewulf, who was initially rapporteur on this problem. Mr Bersani's report occupies a somewhat special place amongst the reports prepared by this House, since it required a great deal of patience on the part of the rapporteur who continually had to revise his approach to his report, in consequence of the submission of new documents or new considerations by the Commission. The working party which was specially created to keep abreast of these matters met eleven times and the Committee on Development and Cooperation itself met four times to consider this report. It is therefore one of those reports which has taken up a lot of our time and I would like to pay tribute particularly to the patience, understanding and goodwill of Mr Bersani.

For the Community's overall development cooperation policy to succeed, certain conditions must be taken into account now and in the future. For our Community, it is important that, when a measure is adopted in this area, account should be taken of its repercussions on other

**Flesch**

sectors of Community policy, which means, in this specific case, that we must take account of the effect and repercussions of any measure taken in the area of Community policy on the development aid policy. I would like to underline here that this has not always been possible in the past and, in order to ensure that our development aid policy is accepted by public opinion in our countries, it will be necessary to contemplate the application of compensatory measures for the restructuring of regions and sectors which could be affected by development aid this policy.

On the other hand, even in such conditions, if we are to be consistent in our development aid policy and make it more effective, we must first of all provide proper information for public opinion in the Community and make that public opinion more aware of the matters involved. In future, it will be more necessary than ever to obtain understanding for the reasons behind our policy which, is after all a vital necessity for the people of the developing countries and at the same time, indirectly, for our own peoples.

Finally, frequent consultation is required with both sides of industry. Firstly, of course, within the Community, but also, in the longer term, consultation with both sides of industry in the developing countries, since this will prove to be necessary, as will the provision of information. Here I would like to add to what Mr Deschamps has just said: it is not a matter of setting Community workers against developing country workers: it must be understood that this is a joint enterprise. The overall Community policy for development cooperation is based principally on the ideas which the Commission developed in its communication to the Council entitled 'Fresco of Community action'. In this connection, I would thank Mr Cheysson for his untiring efforts to stimulate our Community into following a conscious development policy.

As regards the 'fresco', one could say that the main ideas of our development aid policy can be resumed in a single formula 'to each according to his needs employing all our resources'. At all events, the Committee on Development and Cooperation believes that this does not mean that the Community should be ready to distribute its aid before certain conditions are fulfilled. As paragraph 3 of the motion for a resolution in the Bersani report underlines, such aid should also take account of the following criteria: the capacity to make effective use of increased aid, in other words, absorptive capacity, the assent of the recipient country to endeavour to ensure that all strata of the population can benefit to a greater extent from the advantages of progress and, finally, the amount

of aid received by such countries from other sources.

People may criticize these criteria and claim that they mean that the Community and the Member States, in granting aid to the developing countries, wish to interfere in the domestic affairs of these countries. The Committee on Development and Cooperation discussed this problem at length and its conclusion was that it was at all events indispensable and necessary to avoid interference in the internal political affairs of countries receiving aid.

At the same time, this should not prevent, in the committee's opinion, the Community and its Member States establishing conditions and being concerned about the use to which aid granted in this way is put. To grant aid to any country on any conditions would not be in the interests of the Community or of the recipient country. The Community has just concluded a convention with 46 African, Caribbean and Pacific countries. This represents a remarkable gesture by the Community towards a large number of countries situated in different parts of the world, and we underlined this aspect in the resolution which we adopted here some time ago on the convention. The ACP countries have shown great confidence in concluding this convention with the Community. For them it is an important political action which should not be underestimated.

For its part, the Community undertook both novel and new commitments to these countries. It goes without saying that the Community and its Member States have a duty to respect their commitments. And as paragraph 20 of the motion for a resolution clearly emphasizes, the overall policy should in no way detract from the pursuit and development of cooperation with the ACP countries. Besides, in view of the fact that a large number of these countries are amongst the world's poorest, the Community, by pursuing this policy, is following to the letter the political line established by UNCTAD, and the Commission in its 'Fresco of Community action' also emphasized the need to give most to the least well-off countries.

The Council of the European Communities has adopted the principle of financial and technical aid to non-associated developing countries. In particular, after the signing of the Lomé Convention, we attach very great importance to the fact that the Council and the Commission should put this decision of principle into effect. Here, of course, account must be taken of the Community's capacity and the needs of the non-associated developing countries. The Committee on Development and Cooperation is at present considering a communication from the Commission to the Council on this matter and will

**Flesch**

give its decision in the near future, with a more detailed discussion of the substance of the decision. I wish, however, to underline here and now the importance which we attach to this question.

Our conclusion, Mr President, is that the resolutions and recommendations adopted by the Council can provide a suitable base for the Community's future development cooperation policy. Now decisions have to be taken which will allow us to generalize our cooperation policy. The double basis of our policy has now been clearly defined and the Commission's proposals constitute a large step forward in comparison with what we have done in the past.

As the rapporteur so rightly points out, and this is the conclusion which I would like to put forward on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group, the seriousness of these problems demands that our commitment should be on the same levels as the responsibilities which the Community has towards humanity in general.

*(Applause)*

**IN THE CHAIR: MR SANTER***Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Lord Reay to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

**Lord Reay.** — Mr President, this debate on Mr Bersani's excellent report on the Community's overall development policy is well timed in so far as, so soon after the successful conclusion of the negotiations which ended in the Lomé Convention, we now have an opportunity to emphasize that the Community's attention has not been confined and, in the opinion of this Parliament, should not be confined to those developing countries with whom the Community has association or convention agreements.

Now I do not wish to weaken or undermine in any way the far-reaching possibilities offered to the signatories of the Lomé Convention. I would like therefore to associate myself with the remarks made by, I think, every previous speaker, in the importance that I would attach to paragraph 20 of the motion for a resolution. But, if the Community ever was to take its proper place in the world, it could not have allowed itself to pay exclusive attention to the needs of a minority of the populations of the developing world. Nor of course has it done so. Since 1971, the Community has taken on under international agreement the obligation to disburse 1 287m tons in cereals in its food aid programme.

The cost of this has substantially risen over the years. In addition, the total quantity of food aid given by the Community has continually increased as a result of the additional number of emergency actions involving cereals and other products which the Community has undertaken on top of its normal programme in cereals. As a result of these two factors the value of the Community's food aid programme, and the cost therefore to the Community, was 212m u.a. in 1974 compared with 121m u.a. in 1973 and only 20m u.a. in 1969. Of this quantity, in 1975 80% is to go to countries who are not signatories of the Lomé Convention or to world organizations, and 50% of the amount already allocated is to go to the Indian sub-continent.

Under the generalized preference scheme, the Community has paid particular attention to requests by certain non-associated developing countries notably of course, Commonwealth countries in Asia. The Community's GPS itself now appears to have a coverage considerably in excess of that operated by any other industrialized trading entity. It has been estimated that its total coverage in manufactured goods, textiles and in processed agricultural goods is in theory some 4 billion dollars and that in practice about 2½ billion dollars of imports from developing countries are likely to enter under its provisions in 1975.

In a further effort to honour its commitments to the Commonwealth countries of Asia under the Joint Declaration of Intent which was attached to the Accession Treaty the Community has since reached sectoral agreements with those countries, for example on jute with India and Bangladesh, on coir with India and Sri Lanka, and on handicrafts with India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh. A commercial, cooperation agreement was signed last year with India, it has been extended since then to Sri Lanka, and relevant negotiations are, I understand, now under way with Pakistan and Bangladesh. The objective behind this activity has been to reduce trade disturbances and to compensate for tariff disadvantages resulting from the need for the United Kingdom to align its tariffs on those of the Community.

When it is considered that all these advantages represent an attempt to stimulate the imports of goods from developing countries into the Community, and that this policy has been pursued through a time when, according to a statistic reportedly given recently by Mr Salter of the Commission, the Community's trade deficit with the developing countries has reached the record level of 30 000m u.a., then it is hard to see how much more could have been expected from the Community by way of trade.



**Lord Reay**

Because of this I should like, before ending, to refer to a curious statement issued by six British ministers last week, including Mrs Hart, the Minister for Overseas Development. This was a so called withdrawal strategy, which included the amazing announcement that the Commonwealth non-associated countries of Asia will gain if the United Kingdom leaves the Community. What, one wonders, could they possibly gain? In common with Commonwealth countries in other parts of the world, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Singapore and Malaysia all now do more trade with the other eight than with the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom has a population and therefore you could say a market of 55 million people. The Community has one of 255 million. Moreover the United Kingdom market is not one of the richest of the Community. Even in 1972 the United Kingdom was seventh among nine in terms of gross national product per head and its position will not have improved since then.

The United Kingdom has a grave balance of payments problem. The Commonwealth non-associated countries of Asia do not need a long memory to know what the United Kingdom is likely to do when faced with the need to restore its balance of payments position. In the last comparable period for the United Kingdom, in 1966-1969, British net official aid declined as a percentage of our gross national product. But the memories of those countries do not need to stretch back to 1969—they only need to stretch back to the second week of this month when again a British government was obliged to cut its projected aid programme. And does not, one wonders the echo of a whisper of import controls ever reach overseas? What could the United Kingdom outside the Community possibly offer the Commonwealth countries to compensate for the diplomatic influence she can exercise and which she has exercised within the Community and which she would forfeit by leaving?

Mr President, I do not wish to give the impression that the Community has done all it could do, let alone all that needs to be done for the non-associated countries. There are particular trading requests which we should listen to. There must be a fund for financial assistance as mentioned in Paragraph 19 of the motion for a resolution, and the Commission's proposals are rather modest in this respect. The European Parliament must sustain its pressure. We must support the demands of Mr Bersani. Moreover, on the broader question of the implementation of an overall development policy on a world-wide scale, I agree with the description given by the Commission in their introduction to their Communication COM (75) 94. It is stated there that such an objective comprises two elements: the first

consists of policies and measures implemented by the Community as such and the second element is the need to link co-existing Community and national cooperation policies to form a harmonious whole. I think those are the two main objectives and I agree completely with that analysis of the Commission.

But what we do have already, Mr President, is a sufficient proof of the Community's intention to ensure that the historic responsibilities of individual Member States to specific developing countries and groups of developing countries are assumed and discharged by the Community as a whole, and that the Community itself has a wish to assume responsibilities in the world commensurate with its power and influence. That, Mr President, I submit, is a good basis on which to build.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Kaspereit to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

**Mr Kaspereit.** — *(F)* Mr President, it must be clear to everyone that the document we are considering is not only very topical but also very important.

Its purpose is to establish a kind of charter—to use Mr Deschamps' expression—on development aid in the coming years. I wish, therefore, first of all on behalf of my group to commend the parliamentary initiative which has led to the preparation of this extremely interesting report. Secondly, I should like to congratulate Mr Bersani for the excellent work he has done. I must tell him that I have admired the breadth of understanding, the power of conciliation and even the patience he has shown during discussions in committee.

Let me say directly—and this will come as no surprise to him—that he is assured of my group's support, for we shall be voting for the motion for a resolution presented in his report.

His report gives an excellent synthesis of the problems concerned. Nothing has been left out, and, although resolutions are normally of a rather general character, if we examine this one closely we see that this is not so here.

I shall therefore confine my own remarks to what seem to be the essential points, particularly the need for Europe, I mean our Community, to put into effect a real development aid policy.

With each new day these questions become more complex, more difficult to solve, more critical,

**Kasperet**

one might say. No-one can question the effort, the work which Europe has already put into this. No-one can accuse Europe of cutting itself off from people in distress or failing to try to alleviate their suffering by the best means possible. However, hardship is with us still and extensive action is called for.

Europe cannot succeed by itself, that is true. But it can undoubtedly play the main role, the key role, not merely in awakening the conscience of the other industrialized countries, but also in establishing the new world economic order which is essential to safeguard everyone's right to live, this new economic order to which those aspire, as President Houphouët-Boigny has said, who have nothing, who can do nothing and who wish to change their situation, that is, to be equal to others. Any action that fails to take account of the truth and to tackle the problem in its entirety is doomed to failure. The evil has to be torn out by its roots before it is too late, even if it means upsetting some of our habits.

The energy crisis, which is tending to recede somewhat from view, has shown how fragile the present economic balance is. The Western world, particularly here in Europe, has been deeply shaken by this time of trial.

Let us never forget that there can be no enduring prosperity if the gap between the haves and the have-nots becomes too wide. On the other hand, if it can be reduced, everyone will benefit. We have reached the breaking point and in my view the position is serious. We are already at war; it is an economic war, admittedly, but like all wars, it is brutal, it creates difficulties and suffering. It is time to act and to create a new balance which, unlike the old one, can benefit everyone. Crises are painful, but they have always produced imagination and action. Let us use them in this way; it is, I repeat, high time.

Europe has a vital role to play in this. It alone can serve as an example and driving force, for three reasons: affection, experience, credibility. For centuries the nations of Europe have been associating with people in other lands. They have got to know them, to understand them, to love them and to help them and, as Baroness von Sotner once said, the finest verb after 'to love' is the verb 'to help'.

Europe's experience is unrivalled; as for its credibility, no-one denies it. It has no right, therefore, to fail in its task. Failure cannot be countenanced: too many people are hungry, too many human beings are suffering. The solution lies in enabling these peoples to support themselves and to profit from the forces of world

trade. This is the overriding need. Gifts of whatever kind, such as food aid, the emergency aid for instance, are extremely useful, of course, but they should not—I want to stress this—they cannot provide the basis for a development aid policy. They can only be a provisional and partial complement to it. They simply bridge the gap until a real cooperation policy can produce results. They are a stop-gap and that is all.

Unless these nations are allowed to develop their own resources to exploit them and to trade with them at remunerative prices, unless investments are promoted in their countries which will enable them to feed themselves properly by their own efforts, unless they are allowed human dignity, anything else that may be done is nonsense. It can only prolong their suffering by giving them false hope. Nobody likes charity, however generous, particularly when one is not in a position to refuse it. It is an affront to human dignity. It is distressing to be obligated to others and we know how much resentment and dislike can result.

Food aid is necessary, useful and inadequate in the present circumstances. The Nielsen report on skimmed milk powder as food aid shows this clearly. This food aid must be stepped up, true enough, but on no account should it be used to appease our consciences. Everyone knows that nothing can be done without a real world-wide market organization. But people are afraid of the idea and, because of the interests at stake, few Western countries are anxious to get to grips with the problem. It is so infinitely simple to give one's pittance and avert one's gaze.

The formula for helping the Fourth World and giving it a chance as in the case of the Third World is simple: promote its exports, guarantee correct prices, multiply its investments. If the rich countries began by buying what the poor countries can sell and paying suitable prices for these products, then the pump would be primed as they say. Work creates work. Investment, first in agriculture so that everyone gets enough to eat, then for the beginnings of industry to establish the basis of the economy, would set the process irreversibly in motion and take-off would be achieved.

The Community has realized this and, as far as its means allow, this is what it is doing.

It should be stressed that the Convention recently signed in Lomé with the ACP countries affords an example of what can be done which the other industrialized countries would do well to consider. Some may regard it as nothing more than a regional market organization, but it is a market of vast proportions and the whole world needs to know more about it. At world level Europe

**Kaspereli**

cannot do everything by itself. Our partners must therefore at last get down to considering how to stabilize the prices of raw materials and how to tackle agricultural planning to achieve a sound world-wide organization of the markets and not just some vague international agreements which, in most cases, have proved ineffective—in other words, they must agree to guarantee a fair price.

Let it not be said that that is impossible to define, for we in Europe know what is meant. It requires courage, admittedly. Let us hope that the whole of the industrialized world will, like our Community, give the lie to Aristophanes, who said, I think, that nothing is as cowardly as wealth.

Let me say, briefly, that the guidelines laid down in the Council's resolutions according to which Community action in future will be of three kinds—amplification of the policies conducted by Europe up to now in respect of the Third World; coordination and harmonization of bilateral national cooperation policies with Community policy and development of new cooperation policies—these guidelines are fully approved by our group, which earnestly hopes that they will be applied according to the principles I have enunciated. So, some resolutions have been adopted by the Council, but, as you know, resolutions are slippery things: they are easy to make but hard to keep. What we are waiting for is decisions.

Europe must rise to the heights to which—it aspires and meet the hope it has aroused in so many underprivileged peoples. If I may, Mr President, I shall conclude by quoting a fellow countryman, Albert Camus, who said 'No-one can be really happy so long as so many people in the world are suffering'.

*(Applause)*

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

**Mr Sandri.** — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the motion for a resolution and the explanatory statement contained in this excellent report by Mr Bersani raise problems and propose solutions which have their origin in an overall vision of the reality of the Third World. We should also like to associate ourselves with the tributes that have been paid to our colleague, Mr Bersani, for the patience with which he has worked in drawing up the documents submitted for our consideration and for our subsequent vote. We should also like to add our recognition of the competence and the enthusiasm he has shown in carrying out the mandate entrusted to him.

While subscribing by and large to the report which he has just explained for us, I should like to be allowed to add one comment on the words with which he began his address, when he referred to the tragic events that we have recently witnessed. I should like to say to Mr Bersani that while there were tragic and violent happenings in 1974 and in these early months of 1975, it is also true that this same period saw the end or the approaching end of the process of de-colonization.

The peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea Bissau have gained or are about to gain their independence. We are also witnessing the immediate aftermath of the saddest and most devastating war the world has ever seen, in which a large industrialized country pitted its might and power against the peoples of the Indo-China peninsula. These are tragic events indeed, but at the same time they are a reminder of the direction in which history is moving.

Having said this much, we are convinced, like the rapporteur, that a democratic and effective overall development aid policy, in other words, an effective cooperation policy, must be governed by the conditions to which he has referred.

The first of these conditions seems to us to be the need that has been stated of not interfering in the internal policies of developing countries fighting to recover not only their national resources but also their own historic identity and their own national sovereignty which had in the past been ravaged and trampled upon. Any attempt to violate their independence is a negation of development.

One of our colleagues has stated here that aid should nevertheless be subject to some kind of control, while leaving the country to which the aid is to be given free to reject it. I feel that we should get away once and for all from this ambiguous concept of aid. Cooperation policy is not confined to food aid to people dying of hunger. We are helping them so that we in our turn can be helped and, therefore, we are talking about a policy which is founded on mutual advantage. We need the Third World in the same way that the Third World needs us, and in this sense it seems to me that the statement contained in the last sentence of paragraph 3 of the motion for a resolution is very correct and should be supported wholeheartedly.

Furthermore, development cooperation policy is related to an entirely new international division of labour. The problem must not be seen only in terms of compensating for disadvantages, it involves the broader issues of re-conversion and re-structuring the economy of the industrialized countries. If we do not tackle this prob-

**Sandri**

lem but simply try to by-pass it, it means reducing cooperation policy to hypocritical philanthropy, if not indeed to empty gestures.

Moreover, without wishing to detract from the value of bilateral relations between Member States of the Community and developing countries, it is nevertheless essential to arrange for co-ordination of bilateral policies so as to make them more effective and at the same time to encourage multilateral action on the part of the Community. We are convinced that multilateralism is one of the most effective safeguards against any temptation to relapse into neo-colonialism.

Finally, in the present disturbed state of international relations, the Community must play its part in the efforts being made under the umbrella of the United Nations Organization to bring about a new world economic order.

The motion for a resolution lays down these conditions expressly in paragraphs 3, 5, 15 and 21. These paragraphs alone would suffice to win our prompt appreciation of this document and our vote in favour of it. However, ladies and gentlemen, when we have finished with the plaudits and the tributes, we are still obliged to ask how far these criteria and these new directions are in line with the reality of relationships between the industrialized countries and the developing countries. In fairness it must be said that the European Economic Community is doing its best in this matter, far more so than other industrially highly-developed areas and regions. This is shown by the system of preferences, the food aid policy, the Cheysson Fund, conceived and carried out by means of Community initiatives, and finally the Lomé Convention, which has been described as a historic event. We share this judgement and only hope that the carrying out of this agreement will be inspired by the same high ideals and standards which were in evidence in the conclusion of the agreement itself.

There is no point, however, in turning a blind eye to the other side of the coin. I should like to confine myself, ladies and gentlemen, to drawing your attention to a very recent happening in relationships between the industrialized and the developing countries, namely, the United Nations meeting at Lima last March. At this meeting the Community submitted a document in which united action on the part of the Community Members States was recommended. This is neither the time nor the place to give a complete run-down of the proceedings of this meeting, but the result of the voting which followed it is revealing. The United States, which voted against the proposals of the Group of 77, was helped by the more or less well-disposed abstentions of some Member States

of the European Economic Community, while other Community Member States voted in their favour.

Now, what must not have been the uncertainty and disappointment of the developing countries with regard to the Community, which only some weeks previous had signed the Lomé Convention, when they saw the Member States so out of step with each other on this matter and succumbing to pressure from the greatest industrialized country in the world? While we are on the Lomé Convention, it may also be noted that the head of one European state, which pursues a highly praiseworthy policy in favour of developing countries, speaking to representatives of the African States at a meeting held a few days after the signing of the Lomé Convention, criticized the European Development Fund and said that this country would have liked this Fund to be stronger and better endowed. This statement gives rise to at least some doubts with regard to the Community solidarity which ought to exist on this matter.

I have mentioned only these two examples to show how, on the one hand, the United States exerts continued pressure on Europe to keep it from deciding independently to set up direct relationships with the developing countries and, on the other hand, to show how many European Community countries succumb to the temptation to act independently and of their own accord. It seems to us that these factors give some idea of the obstacles to be overcome before we can arrive at an effective overall development policy.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in the document submitted for our consideration we see a spur and a commitment on the part of the Community institutions to move onwards towards a new set-up, which will put aside all ambiguous ideas of aid and realize that the interests of Europe coincide with the interests of the countries of the Third World. All of this certainly raises problems which cannot be resolved merely by talking about them. It seems to me, however, that Mr Kaspereit is right to impress upon us the drastic nature of the present situation. If the present dialogue being carried on between industrialized and developing countries, however hesitant, fragmentary and contradictory it may be, does not result in increasingly stable and generous structures of cooperation, a time will certainly come very soon when relations between the two sides will become increasingly difficult and troubled.

We feel that the European Parliament, in voting for this resolution, can and should express its resolve and its commitment to avert any confrontation and to restate the need for effective cooperation, and in this matter we feel that it is

**Sandri**

essential that the Community's independence and identity should be restated and translated into hard facts.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Cheysson.

**Mr Cheysson, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (F) Mr President, the Commission is delighted that the Parliament should have devoted an important debate, to quote Mr Deschamps, to the subject of development aid policy.

It was very glad when your Committee on Development and Cooperation set up a working party earlier to study the question of overall development cooperation policy, which, since December 1973 under the chairmanship of Mr Harmegnies first, then Mr Glinne, and with Mr Dewulf and Mr Bersani as rapporteurs, has played a very important role. This seems to augur well and we are very happy to pay tribute to the rapporteur, Mr Bersani, who was already very well informed on our development aid policy, for I recall having heard him at an AASM Joint Committee meeting and Parliamentary Conference held recently in Rome.

We also wish to commend Mr Müller, who has drawn up the opinion of the Committee on External Economic Relations.

Mr President, these reports have been prepared mainly on the basis of a Commission document of August 1974, which has since been supplemented by what we have called the November 'fresco', which itself has been supplemented by two documents submitted to the Parliament and Council in March 1975; all these documents are to be considered in a report by Mr Härzschel to which we look forward with considerable interest.

The basic, on which everybody agrees, is that the Community must have an overall development aid policy. There is complete agreement on that in every group, as we have seen to our satisfaction this morning. The reasons why such a policy is important for the beneficiary countries have been very well expressed by Mr Kaspereit. I shall therefore not repeat them. However, while the Third World needs this policy, so, too, do we. On several occasions I have stressed that the countries of Europe have too little space to stay turned in on themselves; they need countries outside, countries of the Third World, for their supplies, their markets, their relations in general. This policy is therefore one of mutual interests; Mr Sandri was right to stress this.

Such a policy can be achieved better by the Nine working together than by each of the Nine working in isolation. Everyone realizes this: even Mrs Hart, whom Lord Reay quoted just now, stressed in her report on the Lomé Convention to the House of Commons that the convention achieved some things that no single country could have achieved by itself.

It is true and it is significant that development aid is one of the few areas in which the Community has made progress and particularly brilliant progress during recent months and years.

Let us not forget, for we are speaking of our own dependence on the Third World, that our countries need to recover their power of growth, that our free society cannot develop or improve unless there is growth and that the likeliest source of growth in the years to come is the Third World and the Fourth World enjoying a level of consumption and development more in line with men's hopes and desires, and with our own very selfish requirements.

This policy, then, I repeat, is in their interest and in ours. Let nobody pretend otherwise. What are its main principles? Parliament has admitted that those proposed by the Commission in the course of recent years are the right ones. They are set out again in Mr Bersani's and Mr Müller's reports and the motion for a resolution; there is no need for me to go into them in detail.

To each according to his needs, we have said, and by that we have wished to show that the needs of a developing country depends on the level of its development. For the poorest of all, the thousand million men, women and children in extreme misery, it is food aid, financial aid that matters.

For those with the financial means for development, who have raw materials, goods, people, it is cooperation, the transfer of technology, education that matters. For the many countries which have started to develop, which are still close to the colonial period, where we have systematically developed production in each country and thus made them dependent on exports what is needed is stabilization of their export revenue and a guarantee of markets for their products, as Mr Kaspereit has just said.

Thus, there are three kinds of problem: In some countries several of them apply at the same time; therefore, the kinds of aid and cooperation we provide must be adapted to the individual case. That is what we meant by the phrase 'to each according to his needs'.

It is obviously within the framework of the associations, whatever their legal designation,

### Cheysson

that we can best deploy our means of action, all the more so, since the association agreements provide continuity and permanence by reason of their contractual nature. So it is this that gives our policy its full value, its full effectiveness, which is further strengthened by the institutional arrangements which allow these countries to be directly in touch with our political, moral and social forces of which Mr Bersani speaks on the last page of his report. So we can see that, in the association policies the means of action have been constantly adjusted to the real needs of these countries as indicated or perceived by them. The essential point is that the development of a country comes from itself, its culture, its real nature, and not from technical or economic models imported from somewhere else. All the same, there is no contradiction between this regional policy and the world policy in which we also have to be associated and which we have to play an important role. This is brought out effectively in Mr Müller's opinion it has been mentioned by several speakers, particularly Lord Reay. Beside the associations, we must also therefore have a wider policy, and the need for this is what you have been discussing in this debate. This policy must be centred on food aid—we shall be speaking of this again shortly, when you approve our programme for supplies of skimmed milk powder—on financial aid and, as the report and resolution rightly emphasize, on co-ordination and harmonization of bilateral aid. The report even goes so far as to recommend that reports should be submitted each year on the progress made within the framework of bilateral policies. This is an ingenious and daring solution which the Commission had not dared to propose, but which it will propose now, knowing that it has Parliament's support.

As for direct financial aid from the Community, we provide this in the case of catastrophes. We provided it when countries were affected by crisis, through our contribution to the United Nations emergency action.

We shall have to provide it systematically in future, as we have recommended in our proposals on financial aid to the non-associated countries. We propose gradually to increase financial aid from 100 million u.a. in 1976 to 200 million u.a. in 1980. This matter will be discussed in your Parliament shortly.

This financial aid must, of course, like all our help, be given on the understanding that there will be no interference in the internal affairs of these countries. The experience of these last years, finally brought to an end this night in a country on the other side of the world, have shown how dangerous intervention can be.

This aid must be selective. Since the means at our disposal are limited, we cannot help everyone, everywhere and in every way. The criteria must be the needs of the countries and the degree of hardship. There are other criteria, too—they are, quite rightly, stressed in the resolution—which we had, in fact, indicated in the 'fresco': the country's own efforts, its capacity to make effective use of the aid and the amount of aid received from other sources. The last criteria of all is the sectors for which this aid is to be given. The Commission is only too glad to endorse fully paragraph 12 of the resolution regarding the need to give priority to agricultural investments for food production. The European Development Fund, by the way, actually devoted 27% of its credits during the last four years to agricultural production, while only 8% of the bilateral aid given by each of our nine countries was provided for agricultural production. But this stress on agriculture is absolutely right, the Commission has already made that clear.

With regard to trade, the report, the motion for a resolution and the various speakers have quite rightly highlighted the Community's original and daring action with regard to the adoption of the scheme of generalized preferences. As you know, it has now been decided to prolong this scheme beyond 1980, but it first has to be improved and for this it has to be understood better.

It would be wrong if this system were to benefit only the most advanced countries. But there is a risk that this might happen: the resolution is right to emphasize this. Mr Müller in his opinion refers to a very difficult problem, the choice of beneficiary countries. It does indeed seem shocking that countries with a larger per capita income than that of some of the Community countries should still be among the 77, or rather the hundred odd countries which are beneficiaries of the scheme. This is something that has to be looked into.

Our commercial aid involves a systematic effort to promote trade. Our concern with the problems of trade is shown by our participation in discussions at world level; they can only be solved at that level—I agree here with Mr Sandri. I come now, therefore, to our discussions at world level on the problems of basic products and raw materials. It is the major issue of this decade.

It is the right time to act, as Mr Bersani says. The experience we shall gain from the Lomé arrangements for stabilizing export revenue and guarantees on sugar can and will be useful to us. But we have to admit that this is a ter-

**Cheysson**

ribly difficult matter, which is at the very centre of the new world economic order which we must resolve to promote and to organize.

The need to organize a new world economic order means that the Community's development aid policy must find expression in discussions at world level. Like other speakers and like the rapporteur. I therefore deplore the lack of unity which is all too often apparent among the Nine.

It is a very strange thing, but the unity which the Nine manage to achieve in Brussels is lost again when they speak through their experts in international meetings. The divisions which have marked international meetings for more than a year in increasingly critical circumstances are a threat to the world; it is a serious matter for us that every major international conference at present should become an occasion for confrontation.

It is serious and I consider it intolerable, since we know that when we meet on other occasions we manage to achieve agreement. Just think of Lomé conference, the Commonwealth conference being held at present in Kingston, and so many others!

We must try to recover in these international meetings, perhaps through better prior consultation with our Third World partners, the spirit of cooperation, dialogue and concord that characterizes meetings at a lower level.

While I am on the subject of our work at world level, let me confirm on behalf of the Commission that we intend to make maximum use of the non-governmental organizations and that there will be an appropriation for actions using these organizations in the preliminary draft estimates which we shall be submitting to you in a few months.

The resolution is ambitious and very original with regard to interaction between our development aid policy and the other Community policies. I think this new approach is necessary. Development aid policy has ceased to be a peripheral policy.

Of course, those who wish to limit development aid to financial aid, to charity—and this is unfortunately true of some very big industrialized countries—may regard this aid as marginal, peripheral.

But for us, who are determined to open our markets, guarantee access to the products of the Third World, integrate them to some extent in our economy, there can be no separation or distinction between our development cooperation policy and our other policies.

Interaction and integration. This has implications for our production, our workers, our people. It means that our development cooperation policy must be an overall, comprehensive policy, managed and controlled by all who direct our political, economic and social life. It means that this Parliament and the representatives of the workers, the professional associations and the trade unions all have an important part to play.

In this connection, and echoing Mr Deschamps, I should like to affirm to this House that I feel confident that we can have a constructive dialogue with the unions. On several occasions already, as you probably know, we have organized meetings between all the European unions, the ACP countries and the Commission. Each of these meetings has demonstrated that a constructive dialogue is possible.

This is one of the original features of our present approach and offers great hope for the future.

Of course, the workers' representatives raise questions of compensation, redeployment, security, and they are quite right: our development cooperation policy must be daring and dynamic, but it must not harm the workers' interests; we must take this into account as the committee has done in its resolution.

This, then, is the 'grand design'. It is indeed a great policy, and complements the various government policies. It consolidates the policies of each government just as Community policy consolidates the independence, the sovereignty and the autonomy of the governments' policies in every sphere. It is a grand design which helps the Third World and helps us; it is a programme for which I think we shall be able to win the support of our peoples, particularly the young.

I thank Parliament for holding this long debate on this subject.

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

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

#### 6. *Membership of committees*

**President.** — I have received from the Christian-Democratic Group a request for the appointment of Mr De Koning to the Committee on External Economic Relations to replace Mr Schuijt.

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 111 of 20. 5. 1975.

**President**

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

*7. Regulation on the supply of skimmed milk powder as food aid*

**President.** — The next item is a debate on the report drawn up by Mr Brøndlund Nielsen on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation establishing the general rules concerning the supply of skimmed milk powder as food aid to certain developing countries and international organizations under the 1975 programme (Doc. 50/75).

I call Mr Brøndlund Nielsen

**Mr Brøndlund Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DA) I shall only speak briefly on this important subject, as my report has already been distributed. I shall concentrate on some of the points on which the committee is requesting Parliament's support. We feel that Parliament should endorse the Commission's proposal to supply, in 1975, 43 600 metric tons of skimmed milk powder to developing countries and international organizations under our food aid programme, and I now believe that the programme for 1975 will consist in all of 55 000 metric tons. We have also agreed that 4 500 of this should be held in reserve for use in emergencies, and we consider that any additional supplies which are needed could be bought on the open market, if the Community's stocks are sufficient. It has, in fact, been suggested that, within the context of the Common Agricultural Policy, certain stocks of skimmed milk should be built up, and we consider that, in making these purchases, we should endeavour not to disturb the market situation within the Community, and that in critical situations, simple and unbureaucratic procedures should be applied, so that humanitarian aid can be supplied rapidly and flexibly. We also agree with the Commission's statement that, in drawing up the aid programme, particular attention should be given to the regions most in need: this would apply to such regions as the Indian subcontinent and the Sahel region of Africa.

Generally speaking, we would stress that aid to Asia is especially important; since 1974—if not earlier—this area has experienced far the greatest food shortage.

Since the applications for aid made to the Community considerably exceed the amount originally allocated, the committee requests Parlia-

ment to endorse this proposal to include in the budget appropriations to cover 72 000 metric tons of skimmed milk powder.

I also feel it would be preferable for food aid to be coordinated in the world food programme and the FAO, and at a later meeting the Assembly will be debating the Community's role in the light of the results of the world food conference. Finally, on the subject of overall development policy, I should just like to stress that this is an extremely important issue. During the last debate, the supply of food aid was described as a kind of oxygen mask, and I might also mention that it is a vital condition for general economic development and progress in the Third World.

(Applause)

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

**Mr Laban.** — (NL) Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group I should like to state our agreement with the report by Mr Nielsen and the motion for a resolution it contains. But I should like to make a number of observations. Skimmed milk powder is an excellent food product to meet the great need for proteins in the starving countries of the Fourth World; that is a generally known fact. And the need is so large that in our view even the initial skimmed milk aid programme for 72 000 metric tons must be regarded as thin. The reduction of the budget for food aid in the form of skimmed milk powder to 43 600 tons is a thing the European Community ought deeply to be ashamed of, and the least we can do is support the Commission in urging the Council to restore the proposed appropriation for 72 000 tons to the budget.

On individual paragraphs in the motion for a resolution, I should like to make the following remarks. When it says (a) that we agree with the Commission that if milk powder supplies in the Community are insufficient, the deficit must be purchased on the Community market and (b) care must be taken that purchases on the Common Market do not disturb market relations in the Community, you really have to rub your eyes.

Mr Lardinois, can you not yourself confirm what the Dutch Minister of Agriculture said last week, namely that skimmed milk powder stocks in the Community in the hands of the intervention agency have risen between October 1974 and the present from 330 000 metric tons to 465 000 tons and that another 100 000 tons or so can be expected to be added in the course of this year? This means, therefore, stocks in the Community



**Laban**

of 550 000 tons, and what is it we are discussing here? An increase from 46 000 tons to the originally proposed quantity of 72 000 tons!

So extremely valuable food is lying in our storehouses while thousands are dying of hunger in the developing countries. Why? Because we cannot or will not overcome the financial problems. We can simply give the milk powder away or go on holding it, for the poorest countries can hardly pay anything for it. I would therefore once more stress on behalf of my group that it is necessary for the rich countries at long last to increase their financial efforts for development cooperation and for food aid.

My group therefore expects the nine to put forth the utmost effort in this respect. This does not seem to be the case from the reduction in the budget for the skimmed milk powder programme. The reduction by 29 000 metric tons, on the background of the stocks we have, is particularly parsimonious.

In conclusion, I would point out that in our opinion there should at least be an extra budget to get back to the original 72 000 tons, but in view of the stocks available and the need in the starving countries, I would ask the Commission to bring out a larger supplementary budget. I know for a fact that Mr Cheysson has been instructed to make every effort to ensure that the wish of the Socialist Group, and I hope of this whole Parliament, will be met.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Lord Reay to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

**Lord Reay.** — Mr President, in the opinion of our group this proposal of the Commission and the report of Mr Nielsen both deserve the support of this Parliament. The amount of 43 600 tonnes, which the Commission is proposing, is only about 20% of the amount for which specific requests have been received by the Commission from individual developing countries. In some cases the Commission is proposing to satisfy an even smaller proportion of the amounts requested by individual developing countries, e.g. in the case of Bangladesh it is only able to allocate a tenth of the amount which that country has requested from the Community.

Nor do the amounts proposed by the Commission fully reflect the needs of the developing countries as a whole. On the basis of the figures which the Commission give on page 3 of their explanatory memorandum, this quantity of 43 600 tonnes should apparently feed 4 million people for one year. Those who are starving in

developing countries, of course, number tens, even hundreds, of millions. The Commission proposes that some 80% of this quantity should go to the Indian sub-continent, the Sahel and the poorest East African countries—Ethiopia, Somalia and Tanzania.

The Community's food aid in milk powder is particularly valuable because in this product the Community is one of the main world sources of aid.

Moreover, as Mr Laban has pointed out, milk products are high-protein products and the diet in developing countries suffers above all from protein deficiency. Those who thoughtlessly attack the tendency of the Community's agricultural system to produce surpluses, for the most part very much on the margin of the Community's consumption, should sometimes reflect on these needs of the wider world.

The Commission in its attempt to match supply and demand, has introduced a laudible system of criteria and it would be interesting to hear from the Commissioner how this system is operating in practice and in particular whether the choice of the criteria and the way they are applied are considered to be fair by the countries who are making applications to the Community.

The Commission also wishes the Council to examine the possibility of increasing the amounts allocated to 72 000 tonnes in the context of World Food Conference resolutions. I wonder why it is that the Commission is not able to make a proposal now for greater quantities to be allocated. It would not appear from the figures just given by Mr Laban, that there were not the amounts available to do this or that the amounts were not expected to be available in the near future. Milk products within the Community are often supposed to be a structural surplus within our system. There have been press reports in the United Kingdom recently of stores of milk products rotting, giving a picture of a generally wasteful system. I think it would be helpful if we could have a clearer picture from the Commissioner of the ratio between the existing and anticipated surpluses in the Community and the quantity of milk products which it is proposed to give in aid and also if he could outline the Commission's policy with regard to the differential between the quantities that are held in store and the amounts which it is proposed at any one time to commit in aid.

Finally, Mr President, it occurs to me that the Commission might like us to clarify paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution where we demand non-bureaucratic methods of ensuring the deliv-

**Lord Reay**

ery of supplies in a rapid and flexible manner. The Commission is by definition a bureaucracy. This is not a criticism and I am not using the word pejoratively. It is simply a descriptive fact and I think it would be unfair to give the Commission the feeling that, however imaginative and efficient it might be, it would still be criticized by this Parliament. I think that possibly the rapporteur might exercise his right of reply to explain what he meant.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — I call Mr Cheysson.

**Mr Cheysson, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (F) Mr President, I should like to thank the rapporteur, Mr Nielsen, for his excellent report, and wish to take up various points contained in it, and, with your permission, to refer also to Mr Bersani's report on the previous item on the agenda, for he also deals at some length with food aid.

Our food aid policy has been debated several times by this Parliament, which has approved it. That is the context of this proposal on our 1975 programme for the supply of skimmed milk powder.

To avoid misunderstandings I should like first of all to recall that our food aid policy complements the policy on the stimulation of agricultural production which, in our view, has the greater priority. It is because this production is at present insufficient in the Third World and the Fourth World, that a food aid policy is necessary. But in no case does this mean upsetting the growth of production in the recipient countries. We must be very careful to avoid the repetition of certain defects which have been criticized in other countries' food aid. This underlines the importance of acting in conjunction with the World Food Programme, which is a major concern. A number of the recipient countries will sell our food aid on the market to help finance their own agricultural development projects.

Food aid is nevertheless essential in periods of world shortages, that is, of very high price levels. We feel that we are in a better position than the recipient countries to ensure deliveries on acceptable terms and that food aid should not be replaced by financial aid which would buy less for the same cost.

The Community is in a position to provide food aid. The figures quoted by the vice-chairman of the Committee on Agriculture show the level of our supplies and the increase expected over the coming weeks and months.

As Lord Reay stressed a few minutes ago, our supplies are much greater than we need for our food aid programme which, where skimmed milk powder is concerned, can be carried out without upsetting market conditions.

This food aid is therefore necessary in periods of shortage. It is also intended to cover natural disasters, and we have unfortunately had a fair number of those, the most recent being the Sahel disaster and the Central American cyclone. It is also intended to cover, if I may use the expression, 'human' disasters.

We have had the Bangladesh war, the events in Vietnam, the events in Cyprus which we discussed yesterday. Shortages and disasters are the two reasons for maintaining a large-scale food aid policy. Parliament has always approved this, and I merely wished to recall quite simple principles.

The value of this action lies in the fact that for 1975 we have received 32 requests for a total of 214 000 metric tons of skimmed milk powder. We shall only satisfy a quarter of the requests from these countries, who knew what they were doing. As Mr Laban recalled, the 1975 programme involved 55 000 tons. Parliament now has to approve only 43 600 tons because 11 400 tons were delivered in advance of the programme in circumstances which justified emergency action. The full programme is for 55 000 tons. We had proposed 72 000 tons; in the budget debate, Parliament voted on a proposal for an amendment for 10.5 million u.a., which would have made it possible to restore the amount proposed by the Commission. But the Council, in its usual manner and in seeming indifference to the contradiction between its actual decisions and the fine and solemn statements made by the same ministers at the food conference in Rome, quashed both the Commission's and Parliament's proposals and brought the amount of skimmed milk powder as food aid down to 55 000 metric tons.

The contradiction between that and the statements made in Rome has been brought up many times. For this reason it was agreed that the Commission's proposals would be reconsidered at a meeting of the Council of Development Ministers. Unfortunately, as a result of events which have arisen in one of the Member States, this meeting is no longer being held at present. Consideration of an increase in our aid in skimmed milk powder is therefore being postponed from one week to the next. I am very grateful to Parliament for restoring a sense of urgency in various ways and getting the attention of the Council.

**Cheyssou**

Mr President, the criteria we have chosen for the distribution of our aid should be drawn briefly to Parliament's attention, the more so in that to my knowledge we are the only distributors of aid to have such strict criteria. Our criteria are based above all on nutritional need and, as you know, the amounts supplied envisage distribution in minimal quantities: 30 grammes per day per individual recipient.

Moreover, we confine our attention to need resulting from a very low standard of living—we do not take on countries where income is greater than 300 dollars per head—and need caused by balance of payments deficits. This means that several countries which received aid from the Community in the past, Morocco, the Philippines, Tunisia and Uruguay, have stopped submitting requests; we have rejected certain countries—Indonesia, Libya and Syria—that did submit requests. We feel that their balance of payments or their standard of living are sufficient to enable them to buy food from their own resources. Priority has naturally been given to the poorest, those we have referred to rather cruelly in a report as those who suffer most and risk dying first, in particular the countries of Asia. I thank Parliament for approving this course of action.

Of the aid we distribute directly by our own resources, 86% of the milk powder will go to the poorest countries. The overall percentage is a little lower, because we distribute part of this aid through the World Food Programme, which distributes it under very high standards of efficiency. But the snag with these standards of efficiency is that they exclude the countries with the lowest administrative standards which cannot meet the requirements of the World Food Programme.

We are alone in acting in this way, Mr President; I am delighted at Parliament's approval.

I have just referred to the coordination with the World Food Programme. Both it and coordination with the FAO are of a high standard. Of the 55 000 metric tons in the 1975 programme, 25 000 are distributed through either the World Food Programme, that remarkable organization, UNICEF, or the United Nations Agency for Palestinian refugees, though this final part will only be released if the Arab countries confirm that they wish Community aid for these refugees.

So far, 11 400 metric tons have been distributed in emergency circumstances as I just said. This aid went to countries suffering from particularly severe conditions—the Sahel, Ethiopia, Somalia, Guinea Bissau and the Cape Verde

Islands—where, as you know, shortages are particularly acute.

Finally, we decided two weeks ago on an emergency delivery through UNICEF and the Red Cross of 590 metric tons of milk powder to South Vietnam, to be distributed by UNICEF and the Red Cross in all affected zones, irrespective of who was in control. Indeed, there ceased to be a problem of control only a few hours ago.

These then, Mr President, are the main outlines of the programme. The Commission is grateful that Parliament will adopt it in the form in which it was submitted.

*(Applause)*

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

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

#### 8. Directive and decision on the procedures of the Standing Veterinary Committee

**President.** — The next item is a debate on the report drawn up by Mr Ney on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for

- I. a directive amending Directives Nos 64/432/EEC, 64/433/EEC, 71/118/EEC, 72/461/EEC and 72/462/EEC as regards the procedures of the Standing Veterinary Committee
- II. a decision amending Decision No 73/88/EEC as regards the procedures of the Standing Veterinary Committee  
(Doc. 47/75)

I call Mr Noè, deputizing for Mr Ney.

**Mr Noè, deputy rapporteur.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, owing to the illness of our colleague, Mr Ney, who looked after the drafting of this report in committee, the Committee on Public Health and the Environment has instructed me to present the report. The 18-month period expired on 22 June of last year and, since no agreement had since been reached on the committee's role, was then extended, although only for one more year. We therefore now find ourselves at the same point we were at a year ago and must now decide whether the committee should at least be given a permanent statute. The Committee on Public Health and the Environment has considered the matter

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 111 of 20. 5. 1975.

## Noë

and declared its support for the Commission's proposal to extend the committee's mandate for an indefinite period. I should therefore like to ask this House to adopt the resolution, which has two main aims: firstly, as I have said, to remove the limitations, in terms of time, on the committee's activities, and secondly to eliminate the possibility, as it now exists, of the Council, by a simple majority, taking a decision differing from one already adopted by the committee.

Those are the two objectives. The committee has now been operating for quite long enough for us to make a positive assessment of its activities and, as a result, to call for this extension.

The role of the committee, obviously enough concerns trade in meat destined for human consumption and the adoption of measures to combat diseases such as foot-and-mouth in the case of epidemics. Its activities are thus of two kinds: 'emergency' interventions in the case of outbreaks of epidemic diseases requiring, for example, the rapid preparation of the appropriate vaccines, and 'normal' interventions.

I have nothing further to add, except to say that the committee responsible was unanimous in recommending the adoption of this resolution. *(Applause)*

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

**Mr Frehsee.** — *(D)* Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group I should like to say how welcome we find the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture and the fact that the committee responsible, the Committee on Public Health and Environment, has accepted that opinion, just as it has repeatedly expressed its grave concern at the possibility of the Commission's decision-making power in questions of interest to the Community as a whole being restricted by committees of experts from national authorities.

The Socialist Group is convinced that the logical conclusion to be drawn from the institutional structure of the Community is that the European Parliament must be consulted on politically relevant matters. We are therefore opposed to the procedures of the committees on implementing provisions, as are the parliamentary committees, and request that the procedures applicable to the management committees be adopted. It goes without saying that if the reservations reflected in the report are not eliminated, Parliament cannot agree to an extension of the procedures in this form and therefore cannot accept the procedures themselves.

We welcome the fact that the committee responsible has taken over the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture on this, and we welcome and emphasize the appeal to the Council to establish the procedures of the Standing Veterinary Committee in the form repeatedly and again today requested by Parliament, in good time before the time-limit—22 June—expires.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Lardinois.

**Mr Lardinois, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I thank the rapporteur for his report, and in particular for his exposition of the standpoint of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment and I would also thank the Committee on Agriculture for its opinion. It is true that the standpoints are not entirely in accordance with our proposal. Our proposal is not that we should already use the classical management committees procedure in this sector, but aims at making the management committee procedure in this sector more Community based.

The proposal by Parliament to make this management committee procedure into a classical management committee procedure, as Article 43 of the Treaty stipulates for the agricultural sector, goes a bit further. I do not want to say that I am against it—from community considerations I cannot be against it—but the Commission will be happy if it improves the present management committee procedure in the way it has proposed. I assume that Parliament's position as put by your rapporteur will help us at least to reach this first goal.

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

The resolution is adopted<sup>1</sup>.

*9. Regulation fixing the market target price and the intervention price for olive oil for 1975/1976*

**President.** — The next item is a debate on the report drawn up by Mr Liogier on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation fixing the market target price and the intervention price for olive oil for the 1975/1976 marketing year. (Doc 57/75).

I call Mr Liogier.

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 111 of 20. 5. 1975.



**Mr Liogier, rapporteur.** — (F) Mr President, honourable Members, at its sitting of 10 and 11 February 1975 the Council took two decisions on olive oil for the 1975/1976 marketing year. The production target price was fixed at 185 u.a. per 100 kilos an increase of 40.97 u.a. per 100 kilos on the previous figure of 144.03 u.a., and aid to producers was maintained at a level corresponding to the amount in Italian lire obtained by Italian producers for the 1974/1975 marketing year. This amount, which represents the aid granted, was 30 025 lire last year and is therefore the same this year, but the unit of account was worth 712 lire last year, giving a figure of 42.17 u.a. A unit of account is worth 857 lire in the 1975/1976 marketing year, giving a current figure of 35.04 u.a. per 100 kilos.

The Commission must fix the market target price and the intervention price for olive oil for the 1975/1976 marketing year by regulation. This is the objective of the motion before us.

Now, This market target price clearly represents the difference between the production target price and the aid granted to producers. These were fixed by the Council at 185 u.a. and 35.04 u.a. respectively, which means that the market target price is 185 u.a. minus 35.04 u.a., that is 149.94 u.a. per 100 kilos, and it is not up to the Commission to change this.

Moreover, the reasons which led to fixing a difference of 7.25 u.a. per 100 kilos between the market target price and the intervention price for the 1974/1975 marketing year remain valid, and the same difference is to be maintained in the 1975/1976 marketing year.

The regulation submitted by the Commission therefore does no more than to rubber stamp the decisions taken by the Council, on which there will be no going back. This is why it got the unanimous agreement, with one abstentions of the Committee on Agriculture.

Since we were only consulted on what I have just stated, I could perhaps leave it at that. But the proposal for a regulation gave rise to a fairly long debate which, I wish to point out, went beyond the framework of the motion. Many members on the Committee on Agriculture were hoping that the Commission would take advantage of this opportunity to combine the proposal in question with an exhaustive analysis of the situation on the olive oil market, a thing which has frequently been asked for here.

I therefore felt that I should bring this up in the report, and indeed I do so on their request. I noted, in particular, that given that the market target price is based on an estimate of market

trends, the committee greatly regretted that the proposal for a regulation was not accompanied by an analysis of the state of the olive oil market.

Such an analysis would have enabled the European Parliament to give its opinion with all the relevant facts at its disposal. The market target price may differ from the actual market price. If the actual market price is lower, the subsidy will not cover the whole of the difference in relation to the production target price. If the opposite is the case, the subsidy will be higher than the level laid down in Regulation No 136/66. This means that the producers either receive too little aid or too much.

The committee also wanted to recall a point it had referred to in the past in connection with the system of aid to producers. It had often stressed the complexity of the system of controls, which did not provide an effective check on the validity of applications for subsidies. It therefore welcomed Council Regulation No 154/75 on the establishment of a register of oil cultivation in the Member States producing olive oil. This should ensure a more effective operation of the aid system by making it possible to obtain the information necessary to assess the Community's potential production of olive oil.

The motion for a resolution contains three paragraphs, as follows:

'Urges the Commission to submit further proposals on the system for fixing a common price for all producers as soon as possible in accordance with the European Parliament's repeated request;

Approves, however, the fixing of the market target price and the intervention price at the level proposed by the Commission for the 1975/1976 marketing year;

Greatly regrets that the Commission of the European Communities has not accompanied the proposal by an analysis of the state of the oil market.'

(Applause)

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

**Mr Frehsee.** — (D) Mr President, I congratulate Mr Liogier on his precise and pregnant report, which makes it possible for me to be brief.

The Socialist Group will vote in favour of the motion for a resolution, even if it has some doubts. These doubts do not concern the amount of subsidy granted for olive oil, on which we do not have to decide today since it was estab-

**Frehsee**

lished when the decisions on agricultural prices were taken. The reservations of my group concern—as has always been the case here, for example when we were dealing with the memorandum on the adjustment of the common agricultural policy and every time we discuss the proposed agricultural prices—the system. The system, Mr President, is unsatisfactory, and it is unsatisfactory in many respects.

The production target price set within this artificial structure, which was of course created to provide the olive oil subsidy with a framework, is almost exclusively guided by incomes policy. It should, however, take account of all the provisions of Article 39 of the Treaty.

The market target price—as Mr Liogier has already made quite clear—is largely hypothetical. In committee—I would emphasize this—we objected very strongly to being compelled to work with purely hypothetical figures and to the fact that a clear analysis of the olive oil market had not been submitted. This is, however, largely the fault of the system.

It is also unsatisfactory that this subsidy should be fixed and that, as the rapporteur has already remarked, it is as a result always too high or too low by the standards of this House; in other words, the production target price is either not reached or exceeded. This is happening all the time.

All this is very unsatisfactory, and that is why, Mr President, the Socialist Group fully supports paragraph 1 of the motion for a resolution, which urges the Commission to submit further proposals on the system for fixing a common price for oil producers as soon as possible, in accordance with the European Parliament's repeated requests.

Despite these reservations, Mr President, we will, as I have said, be voting for this motion for a resolution.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — Mr President, I too join Mr Frehsee in congratulating our rapporteur, Mr Liogier, on the clarity of his report and on the remarks he has made. I too on behalf of my group will support his recommendations, but with just as much regret as Mr Frehsee on behalf of the Socialist Group and with the same, and probably stronger, reservations.

If I may say one thing, Mr President, I think it is a pity that this particular report has come at a moment when there is a report by the Com-

mittee on Budgets which will be coming before the House, presumably in the May part-session, concerning the irregularities which have occurred in the dispensation of aid to the olive-oil section of the agricultural market. I had hoped they would be taken together at the same time, but unhappily this has not been possible. One only has to look at the overloaded agendas of the Committee on Budgets.

Essentially my reservations run along the same lines as those of Mr Frehsee and Mr Liogier. It is an unsatisfactory way of dispensing aid to olive-oil producers. I don't think there is any doubt that they need aid and that we need the olive-oil coming from Community producers. But having said that, I then say that the methods of dispensing aid are most unsatisfactory. I do not understand why the Commission has not gone further in putting forward new proposals. They know these are unsatisfactory. They know that the register ought to have been compiled, and I don't know why they have not done it. I cannot believe that the Council of Ministers would resist them in any way in trying to do this administrative clean-up, and I am sure it is necessary.

Then we have this extraordinary position where the majority of the aid goes to Italy, as opposed to France; and the payments in Italy are made excessively slowly. It takes something like two years, because the administrative machine in that Member State seems to be rather slow in working. I don't know why this is. I think the procedure has always been centralized in Rome, but that is not my affair. However that may be, payment is remarkably slow.

And so you get the extraordinary position—and I have had the statistical department of the library of this House, Sir, do some research for me over this—whereby some of the appropriations which were authorized in 1972 were in point of fact paid out in 1974 and equally the 1973 appropriations are paid out in 1975. The appropriations for 1975, for instance, were 264.5 million units of account, while the sum paid out in 1974 was 186.8 million u.a. And yet if one goes into it a little deeper, one finds that the sums paid out in 1972 were 235.2 million, in 1973 281.4 million and in 1974 212.2 million u.a.

Those were the appropriations, Sir, and they related to applications concerning something like 445 000 metric tons in Italy and about 880 metric tons in France. But of course they weren't paid out then, they were paid out in 1973, 1974 and 1975. There you have your two-year gap.

Moreover appropriations which were made from the EAGGF in 1972, when the Community was

**Scott-Hopkins**

six, are being paid out in 1973, 1974 and 1975, when the Community is nine. This seems a strange way of going about it.

Also there is a discrepancy between the appropriation of 230 and the payments made of 212.2 and 280.6 million u.a. I could go on for another quarter of an hour quoting figures, but I wouldn't dream of boring the House in that way. What I am saying, Sir, is that there is a confusion of figures here. One only has to compare those figures which come from the statistical department of the library here, those which are used in the Commission's directive and those in the report. I therefore strongly support Mr Frehsee in what he was saying a little earlier on.

There must be—there simply must be—a thorough examination of the whole situation in the olive-oil sector of the subsidy—there was no export subsidy at all and there was no intervention buying in the years that I am quoting, so it was all subsidy—and of where it is going. The Commission really must, as soon as they can, carry out a thorough examination of what has gone on in recent years. As the honourable gentleman for the Socialist Group said, they must come forward with a new and entirely different and more up-to-date method of paying this subsidy which is required. Of course Mr Liogier was right: under the present system of market price and target price you are going to get either overpayment or underpayment.

The last point that I want to make—and I began by saying, Sir, that I regret that the irregularities report is not being taken now—is the following: It is being said by the Commission themselves that 20% of these sums has not been going to the people concerned. It was being irregularly dispensed. Now I don't know whether their figure of 20% is accurate or not. If it is accurate—God help us! For it is a great deal of money. But I don't care whether it is only 5%: it should not be so. But of course the system under which it is at the moment being dispensed as subsidy is asking for difficulties and irregularities. Certainly the delays which are occurring in Italy and which all the honourable gentlemen who come from that country must be fully aware of—these delays ask for trouble. They ask for irregularities to occur. Certainly, if the reports from the various regions are all channelled into Rome and everything has to come out and come in, this is asking for trouble, and it is quite unacceptable, Sir. I perfectly understand that when the Audit Board is set up in the near future and we have stricter control of the budget and stricter control of expenditure, there will be little difficulty; but that does not provide a

solution to the present situation. And as a representative of a new member of this Community, I feel sour that in 1973 and 1974 we should be paying a proportion—a small proportion, I admit—of the funds which were appropriated and should have been spent in 1971 and 1972. It makes me angry when I think that some of those funds, between 5 and 20%, have been irregularly disposed of throughout the olive oil sector. And so I strongly support the plea for a complete review. I strongly support the call for a new system of intervention, of support for the olive oil grower; and I will, with these reservations, Mr President, support Mr Liogier's report.

*(Applause)*

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

**Mr Cipolla.** — *(I)* Mr President, honourable Members, I should like briefly to explain the reasons why we are in agreement with paragraphs 1 and 3 of the motion for a resolution but do not support paragraph 2. I agree with the necessity for a review—as we Communists have often called for in this House—of the system of granting aids to olive oil, which is based on the well-tried principle of not fixing the consumer price for olive oil products at too high a level. If we had done with olive oil what has been done to butter, people in Italy today would no longer consume olive oil but would use margarine instead, as is the case in Holland. Subsidies have in fact had the effect of keeping olive oil prices down for some time and thus maintaining consumption of olive oil which, as has been pointed out, is produced primarily in Italy by some 1 million small firms.

By and large, then, the system was fair. It has degenerated into a bureaucratic mess because the Ministry of Agriculture, for financial reasons, has for several years been delaying payments. In Italy, delaying payments is an expedient to keep in balance a budget which is always in deficit. For this reason every word of support for abandoning centralization in Rome in favour of regional and communal decentralization is music to my ears. I would point out, however, that the principle of subsidizing incomes must remain. It is this, in fact, which is the main significance of the intervention price, which should therefore only be paid to those who have an income in need of supplementing and not to the big absentee landlords, as happens at present, and it must serve to keep down retail prices for olive oil. If we agree on these principles, I believe that a satisfactory regulation can be drawn up.

**Cipolla**

But the Commission's criticisms of the olive oil sector are like those of the man who can see the mote in the eye of his neighbour but not the beam in his own. I am referring to the Commission's management of Community funds, to recent exports of meat, to sales of rice, cereals, sugar, etc. There can be no denying that laws have been wrongly applied, that errors have been committed and, though I am the first to admit that there have been irregularities in respect of olive oil, they are insignificant compared with the major blunders in the management of funds by the Commission in the case of other regulations.

The Commission has chosen olive oil not because it wants to amend the regulation, in which case it would certainly have proposed the modification which we already called for four years ago, but because faced with a deficit caused by the butter surplus—Mr Lardinois knows this—it is forced to cut allocations to the Italian mezzogiorno, to cut several tens of millions of u.a. which go to the 1 million small producers in the South of Italy, to enable Unilever to continue to speculate on margarine and on the butter surplus. This is the truth and this is why we do not agree with paragraph 2 of the motion for a resolution, just as we do not agree with the fact that the Italian Government has this year accepted a flat-rate payment which may be the same, but which is to be paid in devalued money, thus resulting in a Community cutback of several tens of million u.a.

But a reduction of appropriations for Italy will involve further aggravating a deficit situation. Moreover, whilst the country of my honourable friend Mr Scott-Hopkins has justly fought to get rid of a situation in which those who are poor should be forced to pay and those who are less poor should continue to receive from the Community, everyone should be aware that poor Italy still pays more than it receives. The poor farmer from the south thus pays for the farmer in the wealthy regions of the Community, and this is extremely unfair. This is why I am opposed to paragraph 2, which results in an effective reduction, in terms of units of account, of aid.

I say again to this House that we are in favour of an amendment to the regulation, but we are opposed to measures which favour the Community's richer regions at the expense of the poor ones. And here I want to make one point. The series of market regulations have been added to in response to various political and economic events in the Community. I have described it as a kind of huge patchwork quilt, because different principles are applied to each sector. Now that we are just about to embark

on a review of the Common Agricultural Policy, these regulations should no longer be modified one by one, but general principles should be laid down which apply to all. We should modify the Common Agricultural Policy on the basis of these principles. And nobody is going to come and tell me that, for example, wine production needs to be cut down, at a time when anyone in Europe, by importing soya bean cakes from the United States, can produce as much butter as he likes without so much as a square metre of earth or farmland!

We are in favour of an amendment, a change, but within the framework of a general revision of the common agricultural policy which will grant the same conditions to all Community farmers, regardless of whether they produce wine, olive oil, milk or butter, and will oblige all the Member States to contribute to this Common Agricultural Policy according to their resources and will end, on the contrary, a system of selective investments on the part of the Common Agricultural Policy under which those countries having a balance of payments surplus or strong currencies should receive Community subsidies amounting to hundreds and hundreds of millions of u.a., while those in dire economic straits—which is, after all, despite the sacrifices being made by the Italian people, the case of Italy—are forced to pay for the others.

For these reasons, Mr President, although we appreciate the efforts made by Mr Liogier in drawing up his report, we shall be voting against the motion for a resolution.

**President.** — I call Mr Cifarelli.

**Mr Cifarelli.** — (I) Mr President, I have asked to speak on my own behalf for the sake of consistency, and to demonstrate that, although the report deals with an essentially Italian problem, an Italian parliamentarian can indeed look at the problem as a European parliamentarian, without getting up as the defender or spokesman of particular national interests, but solely on the basis of a situation with which he is well acquainted. While making this point I obviously do not intend to say that there is anything wrong in defending national interests and supporting them subject to respect for the regulations and the Treaties.

While I too am sorry that this report is not being discussed together with that referred to by my honourable friend Mr Scott-Hopkins, I remain convinced—not because of any doubt in the basic goodness of mankind, but because I know something about real life and happenings in the Community—that difficulties and fraud crop up not only in the olive oil sector but in



**Cifarelli**

others too. If a thousand people go out and demonstrate for a one lira salary increase, a revolution breaks out, whereas if thousands of millions of lire are secretly moved from bank to bank, in complete disregard of tax laws, no-one notices it and discreet silence prevails.

Since Mr Scott-Hopkins appears to be listening to me with interest—for which I thank him—I should add that I do not intend to argue with him, but only add some detail. It is true that in this matter there have been delays in payments, but this is not due solely to the reason just now given by Mr Cipolla. It is due rather to the great variety of practices and situations, particularly where a million small producers scattered throughout wide areas are concerned. Moreover, the recent centralized payments with direct remittances from Rome were carried out in application of the Community directive to that effect. We ourselves deplored the difficulties which were encountered and asked for control. These delays are precisely the result of the need to carry out such control. It is obvious that to carry out controls case by case takes time.

I may say that I personally warmly supported the Commission proposal, which then became Regulation No 154/75 concerning the setting up of an olive cultivation register. But this request came principally from the Commission—and I think that Commissioner Lardinois will confirm me in this—and it was the Commission which took up the matter with the Italian representative in the Council of Ministers.

On the national level I have also emphatically supported the operation of the national olive oil council which, in each province, revised former estimates of production per hectare, after a certain standardization of production levels had been attempted, for which excessively high reference figures had been fixed, thus preventing adequate control of individual applications.

That is the reason why this succession of operations took a long time.

Mr President, I have tried to paint a true picture of the situation, without trying to deny that difficulties have indeed been encountered. To overcome them is a point of honour for us Italians, both as far as our administration is concerned, and, more generally, as regards our participation in Community activity.

One should not however look only at the situation of the small Italian producers, nor only at the administrative muddles, because sometimes the procedures which appear most routine conceal serious irregularities.

There is one more point I should like to follow up. I want to say at once that I share the desire

to change this system in the general framework of the reform of the Common Agricultural policy. In particular, if there is a sector in which aid to production is essential, it is precisely the one with which we are dealing now. Hard grain, for example, can be sown according to circumstances and need be sown only once. After the harvest, the relevant controls are also fairly easy. In the case of olives, things are very different: the fruit requires a long maturation period and the groves survive for centuries. Production costs are often the result of the very longevity of the olive trees, but their cultivation remains of enormous importance in a Community country such as Italy. That is why wherever such production exists, where it is established, where it is carried out by small concerns, aid to production must be granted on the best possible terms.

It is my belief that this review should be incorporated in the revision of the Common Agricultural Policy, at least to correct certain irregularities, and should be seen as one of the new most important aspects of the Common Agricultural Policy the implementation of which is becoming a matter of increasing urgency.

In making an assessment of the Common Agricultural Policy, we must, however, take oil into account and in this I can only agree with some of the remarks made by Mr Cipolla.

I should like to add that in fixing the price of olive oil, reference has usually been made to seed oil prices; and efforts have always been made to preserve this relationship to avoid a situation arising which might have led to the destruction of a type of farming which survives and flourishes for historical, economic, social and, last but not least, regional policy reasons. It is really essential to help people remain with dignity in their own regions by supporting the economic potential of these areas and not exposing the populations to repeated technical and agricultural changes which are sometimes extremely sudden and extremely varied, and at the same time invariably disastrous.

This brings me to the last point I still want to make to the Commission. The costs of production must be determined, because the whole system is based on the fixing of a production target price, that is, in practice, a production cost for olive oil, on which all the other details of the regulation then depend. Now, my country has always called for the Community to undertake a thorough re-examination of the fixing of this cost of production. Such an identification has in fact never been carried out properly or at an appropriate moment and this has led to uncertainty. And in this I wholly support the remark made by Mr Cipolla in committee. What he in

**Cifarelli**

fact pointed out was that a measure based on the previous year's situation is applied to the following year, that is to the new agricultural year and to the new marketing year, on the assumption that the situation has remained unchanged.

Last year, the market price rose to such an extent as to make the difference between the production target price and the market target price negligible so that as a result there were no grounds for aid for olive oil. Since this situation would have damaged the producers, in view of the fact that the market price is of primary benefit to retailers, who have purchased the oil a long time before aid to the producers had begun to flow, it was then decided to stick to the previous level and express it, not only in units of account but also in lire, that is in the actual currency to be paid to the producers.

If I am not mistaken, this system is also to be applied to the new marketing year. I think Commissioner Lardinois will acknowledge the unusual nature of this system and will agree that it should be reviewed when the Common Agricultural Policy is reformed.

Despite these criticisms, I fully take into account the important requirements this proposal is designed to meet and that it is moreover one of a series of Community laws decided by the Council. For this reason I shall support the report.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Lardinois.

**Mr Lardinois, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — *(NL)* Mr President, perhaps I can be fairly brief regarding this matter.

As the rapporteur has already noted, this matter was essentially already dealt with at the time of the price decisions. It is now more a formal question that still has to be decided, than the core of the matter.

It is clear, Mr President, that we are in a kind of intermediate phase with the olive oil regulations, since the proposals the Commission drew up about a year ago to amend the olive oil regulations were not approved either by Parliament or the Council. I also think that the olive oil regulation is one of the most difficult to administer for practically any administration that we know in Europe, and moreover that this regulation does not work as intended in altered market conditions.

It is intended as a regulation that works like a deficiency payment system, so that no premiums

are paid if the actual market price is above the fixed target price. Practice, however, is different, because the olive oil regulation did not provide for this kind of situation. That is why we have been in difficulties for a few years now. The Commission said in October 1973 that there would have to be changes here; and it made proposals for this. Parliament did not however follow the Commission, nor was there unanimity on the matter in the Council.

We therefore felt we had to let the matter rest, to allow a cooling-off period, and then look at the matter again and bring forward new proposals when we felt that the whole thing was more ripe for change than plainly was the case about a year ago. It is clear to the Commission that this regulation will have to be radically revised, and we shall therefore in due course, and in any case in good time before the 1976 harvest and the 1976 price fixing, bring forward the necessary proposals.

As regards late payment of these premiums to the producers, I have to say to you that we too regret this. I will say—and this is a positive observation to the Italian administration—that one of the reasons why payment is taking place so late at the moment is that a new control system has been introduced in Italy. This automatically means delays in payment. This is a large part of the reason why on 1 January 1975 Italy had a considerable lag in payments out of the EAGGF funds. These are funds that producers and other entrepreneurs in Italy have a right to, but that must be declared. The amount involved is of the order of 500m Dollars, not paid to the Italian Government because the money is only paid out when payment has been declared and therefore has in fact taken place in Italy. This also means great difficulties for the EAGGF, especially since this lag should have been caught up with, say this year. The EAGGF makes no provisions for this, and this will involve us in extra difficulties.

This is one of the most important reasons why we have asked the Council to make available to us for this year those funds left over from last year because of non-declaration of rights to payment.

There are good hopes that the Council will approve this Commission request. That is one of the reasons why comparisons between the various states as regards payments, such as Mr Cipolla was wanting to make, do not work, because one administration makes its declarations and pays out in time, that is immediately, and other administrations not, or less so.

Moreover, I should like to say that my experience here in this Parliament has taught me that

**Lardinois**

whenever we are talking about olive oil there is a danger of reason yielding place to demagogy, and when it is Mr Cipolla who is talking, that is no longer just a danger. I shall therefore pass over him in my answer...

**Mr Cipolla.** — (I) Show more respect for Members of Parliament...

**Mr Lardinois.** — (NL) Mr President, Mr Frehsee asked when we would be bringing forward the new proposals. I have already indicated this in broad outline, but I can assure him that it will in any case be before 1 November 1975. Mr Cifarelli also spoke about increasing the production target price. He was doubtful whether the production target price was in proper balance with the actual costs of production. We must of course adjust the production costs to more modern units, as takes place in other areas of the Common Agricultural Policy. Nevertheless, we felt that we had to increase the production target price for olive oil this year by 35%. That is much more than for any other product, in units of account.

Mr President, I think I have perhaps spoken enough, once, of course, I have complimented the rapporteur. I have no objections to his report or to his conclusions, and can also on behalf of the Commission recommend it to Parliament for approval.

**President.** — I call Mr Cipolla.

**Mr Cipolla.** — (I) Mr President, it is a rule in every parliament that one must listen to and reply to the things one likes and the things one dislikes, provided they are phrased in parliamentary language. This rule must be observed equally both by Members of Parliament and the representative of the Executive. The Commission is moreover a special kind of executive which derives its powers neither from a popular vote nor from a parliamentary vote. Its representatives must therefore be even more careful to respect those who are bound by a popular vote.

Secondly, the questions asked are real questions on which the Commissioner must give an answer not only to us, but also to the Council and to European public opinion. When I raised the problem of whether the system of deficiency payments—which was approved, and applied badly, for olive oil—was preferable to a system of high butter prices, which has led Holland to have a per capita consumption of butter equal to Italy's—1 600 kg—I was decrying a

situation which really exists and you, Mr Lardinois, cannot make the problem disappear by saying that I am being demagogic, because the problem appears in Community statistics. You must reply because if you do not, you are not being discourteous to me, but to Parliament and weakening its already very weak position, Commissioner.

For it is not right to continue saying that there are problems—which we Italians were the first to point out—in the application of the regulation on olive oil, without recognizing that there are even more serious problems for other regulations. You cannot, Mr Lardinois, continue to ask us to uproot the vineyards of the South of France and Italy if you do not at the same time demand the closure in Holland of the dairies producing surplus milk. Only then will you be considered a true European and be respected as a European by us too. In other words you must present a programme which avoids wine surpluses, but which at the same time puts an end to the 15 years of surplus of milk and cheese products which are such a heavy burden on the Community's budget. Only then can your words be considered not as demagogic but as practical. Accusing others of demagogy is a way of trying to avoid facing practical problems which are clear from the Community's own statistics and from the daily realities of the lives of millions of farmers and hundreds of millions of consumers in the Community.

**President.** — I call Mr Lardinois.

**Mr Lardinois,** *member of the Commission of the European Communities.* — (NL) Firstly, I do not think it is my duty to answer insinuations. Secondly, I thought it was olive oil we were discussing here and not butter. Thirdly, if Mr Cipolla is mixing olive oil and butter here, that is not for the first time. He always brings in butter when he wants to criticize me, not only by implication, but also explicitly in the Italian press, attacking me for being the defender of the interests, not of European agriculture, but of a small part of European agriculture. This is so far beneath me that I say here and now that if there is not an end to this, this is the last time Mr Cipolla will be getting an answer from me.

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

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 111 of 20. 5. 1975.

10. *Regulation laying down the trade arrangements applicable to certain goods processed from agricultural products*

**President.** — The next item is a debate on the report drawn up by Mr Frehsee on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1059/69 laying down the trade arrangements applicable to certain goods resulting from the processing of agricultural products (Doc. 44/75).

I call Mr Frehsee.

**Mr Frehsee, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, 1969 saw the entry into force of a regulation that has become famous in the foodstuffs industry, Regulation No 1059. It did not break any new ground and was in fact an amendment to a regulation that had been adopted in 1966. That was the time when the first market organizations were being created. Under this system common prices had to be fixed for certain basic agricultural products; these prices were to be protected against products of the same type from third countries, i.e. agricultural products produced outside the Community and imported into the Community. For this purpose the famous levies were invented. However, these levies apply only to basic agricultural products, whereas not only basic but also processed agricultural products containing basic products protected in this way are bought and sold and imported from third countries.

Regulation No 1059, which is to be amended by the regulation now under discussion, covers foodstuffs and semi-luxuries which contain milk or cream, cereals or products of cereals, butter or sugar. Such goods account for 198 headings in the Common Customs Tariff, in other words 198 different types of foodstuff and semi-luxuries such as chocolate, sugar confectionery, macaroni, spaghetti and the like, pastry, biscuits, cakes and so on, fruit juices and other non-alcoholic beverages.

To allow the foodstuffs industries of the Member States of the Community to produce and market such foodstuffs and semi-luxuries without competition being affected, Regulation No 1059 provides, as a complement to the levies on basic products, for variable components that correspond to the quantity of basic products in the product marketed by the foodstuffs industry. These variable components, which are imposed in addition to customs duty, are fixed by the Commission every quarter on the basis of the difference between the cif price, i.e. the world market price free port of entry into the Com-

munity, and the threshold price, i.e. the import price of the basic product including the levy. The paperwork at the Commission every quarter is pretty extensive. The result appears in the Official Journal of the Communities.

The variable component in the case of a number of foodstuffs and semi-luxuries is, however, comparatively low because they do not contain much in the way of basic products.

Regulation No 1059 and even its predecessor adopted in 1966 consequently contained the provision that to simplify customs procedures, the variable component should be set at zero if it did not exceed 0.25 u.a. per 100 kg of the goods concerned.

This exemption was adopted in 1966. Since then the prices of basic products have hardly increased whereas the prices of processed products have risen relatively steeply. The limit of the exemption is now proving to be too low. The Commission therefore proposes that it should be doubled, i.e. the variable component should be set at zero if it does not exceed 0.50 u.a. per 100 kg. Of the 198 headings in the Common Customs Tariff, three would thus be exempted in the case of trade between third countries and the Community and 25 in the case of trade between the original six and the three new Member States.

The Committee on Agriculture, and incidentally the Committee on External Economic Relations, found this to be an unsatisfactory result for a new arrangement. Both propose that the Commission should go further than it has done. They feel that this minimum amount should be set at 1 u.a. per 100 kg of such foodstuffs and semi-luxuries. These products cost between 50 and 120 u.a. per 100 kg; chocolate happens to cost 100 u.a. per 100 kg; 1 u.a. would therefore mean 1%.

If it were so decided, 16 of the total of 198 headings would be exempted in trade between third countries and the Community and 106 in trade between the original six and the three new Member States. The loss of revenue for the Community would be negligible: the Commission estimates it at 14 700 u.a. The total value of the goods concerned is, after all, relatively low: 60m u.a.

Mr President, a decision by the House in line with what has been unanimously agreed by your committees would hardly affect the competitiveness of the foodstuffs industry in the Member States of the Community. It would follow the external economic line that this House has always advocated, and it is also compatible with the principles of the common agricultural policy. I would therefore ask the House to adopt the

**Frehsee**

motion for a resolution tabled by the Committee on Agriculture, which, as I said, it adopted unanimously, and also to accept the amendment proposed to the third recital and Article 1 of the regulation.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Lardinois.

**Mr Lardinois, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (NL) Mr President, I thank the rapporteur for the report he has produced. I cannot, however, recommend adoption of the proposal without further ado; the rapporteur has tabled an amendment to it. I am however fairly convinced by his arguments, and if the Assembly adopts the amendment and the resolution, I shall alter the proposal in accordance with Parliament's decision.

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

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

11. *Regulation temporarily suspending the autonomous customs duties on certain agricultural products*

**President.** — The next item is a debate on the report drawn up by Mr Hansen on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a Regulation temporarily suspending the autonomous customs tariff duties on certain agricultural products (Doc. 56/75).

I call Mr Hansen.

**Mr Hansen, rapporteur.** — (F) Mr President, I should like to say a few words about this motion for a resolution temporarily suspending the autonomous customs tariff on certain agricultural products, produced in insignificant quantities in the Community.

Your committee felt that if such measures were not taken, imports of products from third countries would upset the competitiveness of the Community processing industry, which would be obliged to offer less competitive prices than those of the third country suppliers of these products.

It seems first of all that the list of suspensions has been largely inspired by data provided by

the national authorities. This data is often incomplete and there is some uncertainty as to future trends in requirements for imported goods. This does not make it any easier to judge this proposal.

The committee regretted the lack of statistics which would enable a regular assessment of the production and requirements of the product concerned to be made. Your committee feels that although the products involved are uncommon and very specialized ones in which the Community has a deficit, it is nevertheless important to keep the market under supervision on account of possible variation in Community production of these products or their substitutes.

We also feel that the suspension measures should only be temporary and maintained only as long as this is in the interest of Community production. A suspension of duties on these products would seem to be a mechanism which could easily be adapted to the quantity of Community supplies. It feels that customs tariffs are not indispensable for products produced in insignificant quantity within the Community and that the abolition of duties should be considered within the appropriate framework, like that of generalized preferences in the case of processed products, and that of GATT. For products coming from the Mediterranean basin this question falls within the sphere of the overall approach to Mediterranean policy. Finally, we should like to underline that in the case of developing countries everything possible should be done to encourage the processing of products within those countries.

I feel I need say no more, Mr President, except to move that Parliament adopt this motion for a resolution. I would add that a favourable opinion was also given by the Committee on External Relations.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Lardinois.

**Mr Lardinois, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (NL) I should merely like to thank the rapporteur for his excellent report, and also to say that the Commission has no difficulty at all with the resolution, if Parliament adopts it.

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

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 111 of 20. 5. 1975.

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 111 of 20. 5. 1975.

**President**

We shall now suspend the proceedings until 3 p.m.

The House will rise.

*(The sitting was suspended at 1.15 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)*

IN THE CHAIR:  
LORD BESSBOROUGH

*Vice-President*

**President.** — The sitting is resumed.

12. *Regulations on Community tariff quotas for bulls, cows and heifers of certain mountain breeds*

**President.** — The next item is a report by Mr Baas on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for

- I. a regulation on the opening, allocation and administration of the Community tariff quota of 30 000 head of heifers and cows, not intended for slaughter, of certain mountain breeds falling within sub-heading ex. 01.02 A II (b) 2 of the Common Customs Tariff
- II. a regulation on the opening, allocation and administration of the Community tariff quota of 5 000 head of bulls, cows and heifers, not intended for slaughter, of certain alpine breeds falling within sub-heading ex. 01.02 A II (b) 2 of the Common Customs Tariff (doc. 6/75)

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

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — I would suggest to you, Sir, that we cannot take the report because Mr Baas is not here and it hasn't been presented to us. Therefore it will have to be done in the May session.

**President.** — Under Rules 30 and 31 of the implementing provisions of the Rules of Procedure, the oral presentation of a report distributed within the prescribed time-limit shall in principle be dispensed with unless new circumstances require it or a fundamental explanation is essential.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — With every respect, Mr President, obviously I entirely agree with that,

but the report has not been presented. Surely if the Liberal and Allies Group are so inefficient that they cannot produce a speaker then indeed it is their fault entirely. As they are not here, I am afraid Sir, in my view, the report will have to be postponed, regrettable as this is.

**President.** — Mr Scott-Hopkins, I am most grateful to you for your observations, but this report was deposited with Parliament in April. It has been presented and I really think that we can, in this case, let it go through.

I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman

**Mrs Kellett-Bowman.** — Mr President, can we not hear Mr Lardinois on the matter, because it is a matter of considerable importance to many of us?

**President.** — I call Mr Lardinois.

**Mr Lardinois, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (NL) Mr President, I am also very sorry that the honourable Member, Mr Baas, cannot present his report orally, since I would then gladly have complimented him on the value of this report and the effort he has put into it. In broad outline I can agree with the report and with the positions the rapporteur has adopted.

**President.** — I call Mr Laban.

**Mr Laban.** — (NL) Mr President, I think that you in fact can say, as far as the formalities go, that this report has been presented. But I would point out that the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture was not arrived at without debate, and I therefore regret, along with Mr Scott-Hopkins, that the Liberal and Allies Group has taken no steps to be prepared for a debate on this matter. Personally I should like, now that this report has come up for discussion, to put a question to Mr Lardinois.

In itself, this is a matter that comes up every year, but my group has repeatedly asked whether it is not possible gradually to arrive at a fully common allocation and administration of the quotas open. I understand that the Member States at the moment still want to keep a finger in the pie, since customs and health regulations are still inadequately harmonized. I should, however, like to ask Mr Lardinois whether he can say how far the harmonization of those regulations has now got. If the restrictions have been removed, I am of the opinion that it is better and more efficient for us to go over to

**Laban**

a fully Community-based allocation and administration of this type of quota.

**President.** — I call Mr Lardinois.

**Mr Lardinois, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (NL) Mr President, I will gladly answer this question by Mr Laban. We also support a more Community based administration of this type of quota. The Commission is at the moment looking into the conditions that have to be met to achieve this objective, in this specific case as in others. Unfortunately, I have to tell Mr Laban that a large number of rules and regulations applied at national level will first have to be harmonized.

I therefore cannot promise Parliament, and in particular the honourable Member, at the moment that we shall be able to solve this problem in the short term. But the Commission can fully support his clear wish to arrive at genuine Community administration in this area.

**President.** — I call Mr Premoli.

**Mr Premoli.** — (I) Mr President, Mr Baas underwent a serious operation a few days ago and it is only for reasons of health that he cannot be present here today. If any Member of Parliament is diligent in working for our Parliament or has Community problems at heart, it is certainly Mr Baas.

**President.** — I greatly regret to hear that Mr Baas is ill and has not been able to attend the Parliament.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The motion is rejected and will be referred to committee.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins for an explanation of vote.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — I myself have voted against this resolution, my Lord President, not because Mr Baas is ill—I regret it if he is and I am sorry about it—but because there is a wellknown procedure in this House of delegating others to take one's place as rapporteur. It happened this morning when Mr Noè took over Dr Ney's place. It's a wellknown procedure in this House and there's no reason why the Liberal and Allies Group shouldn't have made these arrangements. If Mr Baas is ill he has my greatest sympathy.

That is the reason I and my group have voted against this report, purely as a matter of protest.

**President.** — I call Mr Laban on a point of order.

**Mr Laban.** — (NL) Now that I know that Mr Baas is ill, I will gladly join in the good wishes for his speedy recovery. But I also feel that in this case the Liberal and Allies Group should have taken steps to provide for a replacement. That is their business, we can say that here and now, but I feel that is unfair for members of a group that supported this motion for a resolution in the Committee on Agriculture to be voting now in this Parliament, for these procedural reasons that are the fault of the Liberal and Allies Group's inadequate organization, against a report they agree with as far as the contents are concerned. All this does is delay the whole decision-making process a bit more. I should like to make that quite clear.

### 13. Oral question with debate: Fishing sector

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is the Oral question, with debate, put by Mr Corrie on behalf of the European Conservative Group, to the Commission of the European Communities on the fishing sector (Doc. 64/75).

The question is worded as follows:

'What has been done to restore market equilibrium in the fishing sector, and what progress has been made at the International Conference on the Law of the Sea?'

I call Mr Corrie.

**Mr Corrie.** — Mr President, I would like to ask the Commission what has been done to restore market equilibrium in the fishing sector and what progress has been made at the International Conference on the Law of the Sea.

As everyone in this Parliament will know, Sir, the fishing industry has been passing through troubled waters because of rapidly rising costs, particularly the high cost of fuel-oil, and at the same time has been experiencing a dreadful slump in fish prices caused by a glut of fish. This has affected fishermen all over the northern European fishing-grounds, and none more so than those in Great Britain. Many boats have been laid up and whole communities are suffering hardship, as for generations they have depended entirely on the fishing industry to provide jobs. Can the Commission give any hope to these people for the future by doing something to restore the market equilibrium? If there is too much fish in store, could the Commission do something, as has been done with beef, and subsidize it out of store to schools and hospitals

**Corrie**

and old people in the Community? Could the Commission help by advertising fish products throughout Europe to stimulate sales and increase turn-over? Can the Commission do anything to subsidize private storage so that fleets can go on fishing? Can the Commission do anything to 'un-minimum' import prices on imports from third countries? All these things would help to stabilize the market.

And, Mr President, what progress has been made at the Conference on the Law of the Sea? Has any agreement been reached on ways of protecting the young fish stocks before the seas are swept clean by boats from third countries? I in no way wish to get involved in quotas, but I spoke to my own fishing-fleet in Scotland on Saturday and the Clyde Fisheries Association there gave me some frightening figures on what is happening on the west coast of Scotland alone. If I might give you an example, in 1965 the international catch there was steady at somewhere between 60 000 and 70 000 tons. In 1973, that figure had climbed to 250 000 tons. In 1974, there was a massive onslaught by the third-country Persian fleet and this fleet was joined by a Russian fleet comprising up to 50 boats accompanied by six mother-ships. International scientists at that point had suggested that 150 000 tons was more than enough from those waters and yet we were taking out nearly three times as much from that area.

Mr President, the fish stocks cannot survive such an onslaught. Herring will soon be a luxury dish. There will soon be no fish left to protect. Fishermen will no longer go down to the sea in ships. Can the Commission give us some hope for the future? The storm-clouds are still gathering over the fishing-industry. Can the Commission pour some oil on troubled waters? *(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Spicer to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

**Mr Spicer.** — Mr President, I wish to speak very much in support of what Mr Corrie has said and, if I may, extend a little the scope of the discussion.

He has already mentioned the possibility that the Conference on the Law of the Sea will fail and that as a result—and all the rumours seem to point very much in that direction—there may be unilateral action by both Iceland and Norway to extend their fishing-limits. If they do such a thing, it surely must be a direct reflection on a world that has gone completely wrong. There can be no doubt in my mind that if Norway and Iceland, particularly Norway, take such

action, they will be taking it in direct contravention of the trade agreement that they already have with the Community, which allows us to fish within Norwegian waters and allows the Norwegian fishing-fleet to move into waters outside their own particular 'area. Could the Commissioner give us some indication of what the position would be if such unilateral action were to be taken by Norway, and would the Commission and the Community move to condemn such action and indeed make it impossible for them to take it?

In my view, and I think in that of many other people, although the theory of the falling domino doesn't really exist in some other parts of the world, certainly one can see that we are moving into a period, with regard to fishing, where when one goes, another goes and others might follow. And I think that would bring into great disrepute all the effort that has been made to bring some common-sense to fishing in general terms.

Might I, secondly, my Lord President, support Mr Corrie's view on the way in which the estimates of fishing-stocks are really completely out of line with reality. It seems to me that the time is fast approaching when the European Community as such must make a concerted effort to draw together the Community of Nine in a common fishing policy with regard not only to fishing, but also to the research establishment that is needed to back up an efficient and worthwhile industry. And might I ask the Commissioner if some thought could not be given now to at least initially drawing together the nine different strands that exist—but very often with differing views—and sinking their differences in a common maritime research policy with the ultimate aim—so we would hope in the United Kingdom—of producing not only a common maritime research programme but a European maritime research centre? I think that would be extremely worthwhile, and in view of the depletion of the stocks of fish, not only in the European lake, but indeed throughout all the waters of the world, it could be of great help, certainly to the United Kingdom, certainly to Europe, and I personally believe to the world *(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Lardinois.

**Mr Lardinois, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I welcome this opportunity to answer the questions put by the honourable Member, Mr Corrie. Mr Corrie clearly asked what the Community is doing in an attempt to solve the difficulties we are now experiencing in the fisheries sector.



**Lardinois**

To give a proper answer, we must begin by looking at the causes of the present problems. In our view these difficulties can be attributed to a combination of circumstances: for a long time conditions were particularly favourable for landing big catches but this coincided with a period in which the general economic situation was far from buoyant. The combination of these two factors and, as Mr Corrie pointed out, a sudden sharp rise in costs, have resulted in a crisis situation during the past few months in the fisheries sector in the Community.

One of the measures taken by the Commission as such has been to allow the Member States to grant a subsidy on the oil price, amounting to 50% of the difference between the fuel prices in September 1973 and the present prices. This possibility was to apply until 1 July of this year, and I can inform Parliament that an extension was decided by us last week to 1 January 1976.

Secondly we have made a number of proposals to the Council and in the Fisheries Management Committee. One of the decisions taken has been to allow for the time being a refund on exports to third countries, and in particular to the United States, in respect of certain kinds of fish. This has resulted in an immediate easing of the situation in Denmark and in certain other Community countries.

The third measure, decided yesterday by the Council, is to make money available from the resources of the agricultural and fisheries fund for the temporary private storage of frozen fish. The costs of this will be covered by the EAGGF. The aim of this measure is to withhold existing stocks from the market for several months to prevent an extra strain on the fresh fish market. It is, however, not impossible that this regulation will if necessary be extended, at least until 1 August next, to include future catches, if the Commission considers this desirable on the basis of the Management Committee procedure. This was decided yesterday by the Council.

Mr President, this is a decision of principle by the Commission; it cannot, however, take a final decision in this matter because the opinion of the European Parliament is explicitly required for that. The basic regulation will not necessarily have to be amended, but this is a new possibility which is not provided for in the basic regulation. At the very least an *ad hoc* regulation is therefore needed and this will involve consultation of Parliament. However, the Council felt that, in order to partly dispel the present unrest, it—that is the Council—need not discuss the matter further if the Parliament's view on this storage arrangement is favourable; formal adoption would then be sufficient.

I hope that, after this announcement, it will be possible to take early action and that you will be able to indicate your final position on the matter at your next part-session.

Fourthly, Mr President, we felt that the number of kinds of fish for which an import reference price—amounting more or less to a minimum import price—is fixed, especially in the case of frozen fish, should be considerably extended. Here again the Council definitively adopted a favourable position yesterday, so that the Commission can now take an appropriate decision, jointly with the Management Committee.

I am convinced, Mr President, that this will make an important contribution to the protection of our market if, as is now the case, imports seem to be too high, and in my view this arrangement can therefore be seen as the best possible guarantee for the fishing industry itself. Following this decision, the French Government has already informed us that it is withdrawing the application it had made to us for the extension beyond 15 May of certain restrictions on imports into France from third countries.

I therefore feel justified in assuring Mr Corrie that we have taken new and far-reaching measures in four areas to alleviate the present difficulties. I repeat that these measures concern the cost of fuel—for the whole calendar year 1975—a new means of checking excessively high imports onto our market, subsidies to cover the cost of private storage—this expenditure alone will amount to a good 3 million units of account this year; fourthly there is the possibility of refunds—particularly important in the case of the North American market—and fifthly the strengthening of our import policy when imports are too high and the resulting guarantees to fishermen. As regards the Conference on the Law of the Sea, I have little to report at present. I can only say that we have the impression that progress is being made, especially in the informal talks, and that the cohesion of the nine Member States has recently improved considerably at this conference. I believe that this last factor is in itself of very great importance, especially for our common policy.

Mr Spicer put a number of further questions on this matter. Firstly he asked whether it is certain that the Community will also act if fishing grounds important to our Community fishermen are threatened by the unilateral action of third parties. He referred in particular to Norway and Iceland in this connection. I would like to put his mind at rest on this point. He may count on it that if a situation of this kind arises, we shall review our market agreement with those countries which includes a pro-

**Lardinois**

vision to the effect that the existing fishery arrangements must not be disturbed; we shall in fact look after the interests of our own people whose existence would then be threatened, and attempt to find a solution for them.

*(Applause)*

Let us hope that this will remain a strictly theoretical consideration and that retaliatory measures will not be needed.

As to the subject of conservation policy, referred to by Mr Spicer also touched on by Mr Corrie, it is my view that if a clear position is reached on the future of fishing limits, in other words if the Conference on the Law of the Sea takes final decisions, we in the Community shall have to review our policy on the maintenance of our sea-fishing stocks and take the joint measures necessary not only to present but also to reverse the effects of over-fishing. There are clear signs, especially in the North Sea, of absolute over-fishing with a disastrous effect on our fish supplies, especially in the case of herring. The decline in herring stocks, especially in the southern part of the North Sea, is in fact alarming, as Mr Spicer has said. We can no longer be content to leave joint action exclusively to others or to the Member States alone. I believe that this is a matter of Community responsibility, especially—I repeat—if the Conference on the Law of the Sea decides to make far-reaching changes in the economic and territorial rights of the countries bordering on the sea. I have taken good note of Mr Spicer's observation on research and his desire for greater coordination and encouragement by the Community. I was gratified by his comments and Mr Spicer may count on it that the Commission will put forward proposals in this area, precisely because it is so vital for us to safeguard supplies of fish to consumers in the future.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Shaw.

**Mr Shaw.** — Mr President, firstly I would like on behalf of all of us to thank Mr Lardinois for his very valuable contribution this afternoon. We very much appreciate what he has said.

Now I would like to emphasize that we are here in force this afternoon because of the great hardship that has been suffered by our fishermen—I speak personally for the inshore fishermen of the north-east coast with whom I am in constant contact and, of course, many of whom I represent. It is a fact, whether we accept it or not, that many of them feel that the Common Market does not understand their problems and is doing nothing to help them. It is our job to

see that the words of Mr Lardinois are made known in all quarters of the fishing industry and this will go a long way to dispel the fear and prejudice that exists among the fishermen. One understands their fears, because in fact these fishermen, who live a hard and tough life and who have in recent years made a good living, have found in the last year or so that that living has been slipping away and that every time their boat has gone to sea they are the poorer because it has gone to sea. That is the reason for the deep concern shown here. And I must say again that I feel that the points that have been made in such a practical way by Mr Lardinois this afternoon will go a long way to helping them with their difficulties.

May I comment on one or two points. The first is on the point of common research. In my experience, and it goes back a few years, when any government has gone to a fisheries' research association to ask about the pattern of events and what was happening or was likely to happen, I myself have always gone to the fisherman myself and said what do you think? And I have always found that the fishermen themselves and their associations have known far more accurately what is likely to happen through a course of events than any research association. I am not speaking against all research associations. All I am saying is that I hope that in the suggestions put forward by my honourable friend, there will be a real place for the views and opinions of the practical fishermen themselves, because all too often they have been right and been admitted to be right too late in the day by the boffins who have been believed by governments.

Mr President, we welcome particularly not only the practical steps to help the industry so far as fuel is concerned, by way of reference prices, by way of help for private storage, but also the feeling that in future, if people take unilateral action that will harm our fishing industries by the extension unilaterally of their boundaries, such a step will automatically provoke a reaction on our part in the interests of our fishing industry. I believe this will be good news for the whole of the fishing industry and will show them that we have the interest of the fishing industry at heart here in this Parliament and in the Commission and the Community as a whole. What is more, they will see that working with the Community as a whole can bring benefits to the fishing industry of the Community that the fishermen could not achieve for themselves if they were on their own.

In conclusion, Mr President, may I say to Mr Lardinois on behalf of us all, thank you very much for what you have done.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Bersani.

**Mr Bersani.** — (I) Mr President, I would like to make some very brief remarks on this question, which Mr Corrie has presented at such an appropriate time. I would like to say above all that I feel complete solidarity with the problems of the fishermen in the north, which our British colleagues have mentioned here.

Secondly, I would like to stress in my turn the importance of the statements by the Commissioner, Mr Lardinois, which were extremely concrete and positive. In this connection I feel that it is appropriate to recall the problems of fishermen in the southern regions of the Community, especially in the areas of the blue fish, which in practice take in some particularly rich fishing areas in the Adriatic and Ionian seas and processing centres situated principally in France, on the coast of Brittany and in Spain, in the Cantabrian Sea. On recent visits to some of these areas I noticed with great surprise that a large part of the catch is transported to these centres in vehicles which make a return journey of 1 500 to 2 000 km. I think that some aspects of this system need review, since all transport costs are increasing, especially nowadays with the rising price of fuel. I believe, therefore, that the existence of these burdens should lead Italian businessmen, and probably also their European collaborators, to find more suitable solutions in the interests of European fishing, which certainly in many ways deserves special consideration.

These, Mr President, were the remarks I wished to make to Mr Lardinois, while recognizing the open and practical attitude he has adopted to this problem, to this particular aspect which affects a large number of fishermen in my country.

**President.** — I call Mr Laban.

**Mr Laban.** — (NL) Mr President, it is beyond question that at the moment our fisheries are in great difficulties, and that it is very important to know what the results of the Conference on the Law of the Sea, which has been resumed just now, will be. I am grateful to Mr Lardinois for having announced a number of specific measures that may help fisheries, but we are of course side-stepping the fundamental causes of certain difficulties. I do not need to expand on that further; we had extensive discussions last year on the fact that fishermen themselves were too concerned with their economic interests, as long as there were still sufficient fish. Particularly in the North-east Atlantic, people just went on fishing, there was over-fishing, and now that we

have got to the point where enormous ships are being built and very fine fishing gear is being bought, we have to draw the conclusion that if no measures are taken, it will no longer be possible to use the capital invested.

Fortunately, there are in my country people who are now becoming aware of the fact that they have made mistakes and that it is essential to limit catches, to introduce quotas, to have wider meshes. It will probably be a while before we have the results of the Conference on the Law of the Sea. But in any case, a number of measures have now been taken by the North-east Atlantic Fishing Conference which should lead to the fixing of quotas. This is, of course, disturbing to the fishermen, since they will have to keep to them, but we hope that they will at least give fish stocks a chance to renew themselves a bit, so that the possibility of fishing from Northern Europe will remain, at least for the future.

A number of countries are, of course, taking part in this conference that are not members of the EEC. Nevertheless, I should like to ask Mr Lardinois whether it would not be possible for the Commission to attempt to coordinate the positions of those Member States that are taking part in the North-east Atlantic Fishing Conference, where all sorts of measures are being discussed and adopted that are binding on the states taking part in the Conference. Quotas have certainly been discussed this time, but too much room has been left for the possibility that the Danes in particular are taking advantage of, of catching all sorts of young fish for industrial purposes, particularly fish-meal production for animal feedstuffs. You are aware that these various factors bring about an enormous loss of protein.

I can, therefore, on behalf of my group agree in principle with the measures taken. We shall still have to appraise the proposals once they are worked out and put before us, but I should like to ask Mr Lardinois to continue to put the emphasis—and I know he is doing so, as he has told Parliament already—on the need to limit catches, introduce quotas and of course—though this is not his field, it is a Commission matter—avoid further pollution of our coastal waters.

**President.** — I call Mr Lardinois.

**Mr Lardinois, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (NL) Mr President, may I very briefly thank Mr Shaw in particular for his remarks; I can assure him that we shall in fact be embarking on our own research in the fisheries sector and that in this connection we shall call in leading representatives of fishery

**Lardinois**

interests so that our laboratories and research vessels can have the benefit of practical experience.

I also agree with Mr Laban that in the phase we have now reached, it is more than ever necessary for the Community to attempt to coordinate the position of the Member States when they are taking part in conferences such as that on the law of the sea. I can also promise him that in fixing catch quotas and similar matters we shall endeavour to coordinate the position of the Member States participating in this conference.

**President.** — I have no motion for a resolution on this debate.

The debate is closed.

14. *Directive on the reduction of water pollution caused by wood pulp mills*

**President.** — The next item is a debate on the report drawn up by Mr Premoli, on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a directive on the reduction of water pollution caused by wood pulp mills in the Member States (Doc. 28/75).

I call Mr Premoli.

**Mr Premoli, rapporteur.** — (I) Mr President, with regard to the Community's Action Programme on the Environment and this proposal for a directive I must point out that the Commission undertook to submit the proposal by 1 July 1974; however, time slipped by and provisions were made with a certain delay, which we must regret in view of the urgency and seriousness of the environmental problem.

In the programme on the improvement of the environment, the paper and paper materials industry, together with the iron and steel industry and the titanium dioxide industry, is one of the branches of industry which causes the greatest pollution; hence the priority which should be given to our discussion.

Wood pulp mills pollute the natural environment with waste water and gas discharges, which are formed naturally in the manufacturing process. The volume of discharges depends on the manufacturing processes used and the size of the plants, and the highly polluting nature of this industry influenced the Commission to give this sector priority, as I have just said.

The paper and paper materials industry—and this should be said right away—pollutes not only

water but also the soil and air. This proposal for a directive is confined to the pollution of surface water because it has to follow fairly strict lines. This pollution is in fact extremely serious, and depends—as the proposal states clearly—on the type of pulp-producing process employed, or the volume and type of discharge, or the environmental characteristics of the receiving medium, or legislation in the Member States. Waste products of paper pulp mills are likely to result in not only the creation of suspended solids and suspended substances, but may also cause a change in the oxygen content, and a discoloration of the receiving water courses, and finally the creation of foam. On the historical side, this proposal was preceded by a communication from the Commission to the Council on problems relating to these industries, which made suitable suggestions for effective action against environmental pollution in this sector. In the opinion which he drew up on behalf of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, Mr Petersen once more urged the Commission to submit detailed proposals which are now—I stress—a matter of urgency. The Commission's explanatory memorandum refers specifically to its undertaking to submit to the Council a communication on special support for wood pulp mills and the need for a study on research and development on the reduction of pollution, aimed at ascertaining the progress in the various Community countries.

The purpose of the brief directive we are discussing today is the harmonization of national legislation and the implementation of administrative action on the basis of the Environmental Action Programme. It is as well to recall that in this field as in so many others no global legislation exists. We lack uniform legislation on this subject in the nine Community countries. Specific legislation exists only in Belgium, France and Germany, while the other Community countries employ guidelines for this particular form of pollution which are part of the general environmental legislation. These differences between some countries with more specific legislation and other countries which use more general legislation, may lead to varying financial burdens on the industries and therefore inevitably to distortion of competition.

I would like to point out that there are internal and external measures to limit pollution. The internal measures are aimed at limiting pollution by altering the manufacturing process, while external measures are concerned with the treatment of waste substances during and after the manufacture of the pulp. The proposed measures make it possible to eliminate, if I am not mistaken, 90% of pollution, and thus relieve a great burden on the environment, bring about

**Premoli**

a true environmental improvement, in a sector where dangers are so high.

The Commission has stressed the necessity for coordination and harmonization, as I said, of policies on production methods for paper and paper materials and has laid down a fixed minimum limit for the discharge of waste substances, so as to contain the danger of environmental damage within fixed limits.

Of course, since there may be differences in the assimilative capacity of the receiving water, application of the proposed standards should be flexible.

As regards existing plants, it is suggested that these measures be applied over a period of time up to ten years, whereas new plants and new capacity which is added to existing plants must respect these restrictive measures, which represent a rigorous modern standard, within twelve months. This flexibility arises from the fact that the conversion of old industries is a long, difficult and expensive process.

With these brief recommendations, which I express also on behalf of the Committee on Public Health which I represent to some extent here as a member, we congratulate the Commission for putting on the agenda a provision in the overall framework of environmental improvement which, if adopted in time with the necessary strictness, will lead to a true improvement of the environment which, as years go on and industrial production intensifies, needs much greater 'cleanliness'.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I now call Lord Bethell to speak on behalf of the European Conservative Group.

**Lord Bethell.** — Mr President, we give a general welcome to this proposal for a directive which will certainly contribute towards the cleaning of our environment. It is one of several proposals which will come before us in the future for the general improvement of the environment, which is of great importance. As Mr Premoli has pointed out, the discharges from the production of pulp are often extremely offensive; they pollute not only water but also soil, and clearly if we can introduce some common policy to prevent or minimize this, it will be a great achievement on behalf of the EEC.

There is an important point of translation that I would like to bring to the House's attention. This is, in the English text, the repeated references to wood pulp mills. I understand that in the French text the reference is to 'pâtes à papier' which would seem to mean paper mills rather than wood pulp mills. I am advised by our

chairman that paper is made from many substances, straw, wood, rags, waste paper and even esparto grass and that it would not really, be practical or useful to confine any directive or any regulation to paper that is merely produced from wood. Could the Commissioner look at that please and consider perhaps whether an alteration in the English text is appropriate.

The second point I want to mention is that of derogation. In Article 4 of the directive, provision is made for departures from the standards laid down in the case of water which is discharged from factories into tidal parts of coastal waters or into tidal estuaries. In my opinion not enough attention is paid in the proposed directive of the difference between water discharged into tidal waters and water discharged into inland water. Clearly pollution can be dispersed so much more easily and is not nearly so dangerous if it is poured or discharged into a tidal waterway. When discharged into an inland waterway, it remains there and pollutes and is very difficult to get rid of. I think it is important that provision should be made for departures from standards in the case where pollution can be shown not to be materially damaging to the environment. But I would ask the Commissioner to consider whether it might not be more appropriate to allow departures from the standards laid down not for a fixed period of five years but for an indefinite period, and to provide instead for regular checks to be made on the discharge. This can easily be done, I am advised, by buoys or by taking samples from the tidal waterway in question, so that a continual check can be kept on whether in fact any damage is being done to the environment.

If the tide is taking all the pollution away then presumably we need not worry about it, and this can be continually checked and damage to the environment prevented. I would have thought this was more sensible than to allow a derogation or a departure from standards for a fixed term of five years. If the standards are strictly laid down and no departures from the standards are allowed in the cases of factories which produce paper and discharge their waste into tidal waters, I am advised that very many paper mills in the continent of Europe will be put into grave financial difficulty.

Once again, of course, we have to strike a balance between commercial reality and the demands of the environment and I would like, momentarily, to strike a personal note, to state that if the price of paper rises any more the publishing industry and the newspaper industry will be placed in even greater difficulty and the book may even become a non-viable product.

**Lord Bethell**

The trend is already moving that way and I would hate to see our Assembly recommend any proposal that would make this situation worse. However, the demands of environmental protection are extremely important and we welcome this proposal with the reservations I have mentioned, which I hope the Commissioner can make some comment upon. I particularly welcome the proposal to provide aid to companies which will find themselves subjected to greater restrictions in their production of paper. It would indeed be a heartless body which would impose restrictions and new rules on industry without making some provision for the alleviation of the extra financial burdens which will be imposed upon these factories. I am glad to note that such provision is made and that factories which are required to fulfil much higher standards will in some respects be compensated for their extra expense and I would like to generally welcome this directive which I hope can be brought to a successful conclusion as soon as possible.

**President.** — I call Mr Scarascia Mugnozza.

**Mr Scarascia Mugnozza, Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (I) Mr President, I would like to thank Mr Premoli for his very full report and Lord Bethell for his speech.

We are—as has been pointed out—in the course of implementing the programme on the environment. I realize that the European Parliament would have liked the deadline of 1 July 1974 which we indicated for the submission of a directive to be kept to. I would also like Parliament to realize the objective difficulties facing us which we have already discussed on other occasions. I sent a long letter on this subject to the chairman of the Committee on Public Health and the Environment, which I hope will one day be discussed in committee. We have certain technical difficulties. It is not the will or the initiative which is lacking, but when directives such as this are being put forward we must necessarily compare our views with the views of technical experts from various countries and consider the various factors concerned, and all that really needs time. It is for this reason that we were forced into a certain delay, a delay moreover, which although within very restricted limits, must be taken into consideration for other current directives too. In any case, as Parliament can see, we have fulfilled most of the undertakings we made and will do even more in the next month to ensure that before the end of 1975, that is the end of this year, Parliament can have the dossier presenting the new Action Programme

on the Environment, that is to say the second programme on the environment which is to cover the next two-year period.

The importance of this directive has already been recognized by the rapporteur. I would like to point out right away to Lord Bethell that in the English translation there was indeed a mistake, because reference is made not only to one type of uplp but to all the pulps used in the manufacturing of paper. The pollution caused is identical for all these products.

Various points were made both by the rapporteur and Lord Bethell, in particular on the problem of aids. In the European Parliament's resolution, mention is made of the granting of immediate support to wood pulp mills. I think that if we followed this course, as Parliament suggests, we will be making a serious mistake because the Council has already started to consider the problem of 'the polluter pays' and has already given its opinion in a resolution which was then followed by a communication from the Commission to Member States. This communication concerns all aids. We cannot use two criteria or two standards, nor can we intervene in some industries and not in others. Our intervention must be global. It is clear that aids to pulp factories come within the general framework of aids, but we cannot issue standards which concern that sector exclusively. In view of this, the request to the Commission in paragraph 6 of the motion for a resolution to submit a communication to the Council on support for wood pulp mills seems to be at odds with reality.

The communication exists already but it concerns all aids which should be granted in cases of pollution, including also aid to be granted to this particular type of industry. I have to point out that the steps which we do take and the possibilities which we leave open—twelve months for new factories and ten years for old factories—prevent difficulties arising on prices, since our environmental policy is closely connected to economic considerations. We wish to avoid distortion of competition, but we also wish to avoid prices rising because of the environmental policy.

Nevertheless we are also convinced that even if some small increase in prices had been made on some products to ensure that pollution was avoided, it would be a sacrifice worth making not only in the interests of preserving the present state of the environment, but also for avoiding the deterioration which with the passage of years would make our planet uninhabitable.

**Scarascia Mugnozza**

Various difficulties and exceptions have been mentioned on the siting of these factories. We believe that plants situated on the coast can have less useful anti-pollution systems than those situated near internal waters. However we must also consider the problem of pollution globally and therefore, although it is true that sea currents can disperse polluting substances more easily than internal waterways, it is also true that we must nevertheless prevent the coasts being polluted. This is the reason why we did not wish to define differences which might have led plants to be sited by preference on estuaries or coasts, thus causing even greater pollution.

These, Mr President, are my answers to the questions put to me. I would add that there is another problem to which we attach great importance and that is the mention made by Parliament of the scope of our action. The rapporteur said that we paid more attention to water than to air and soil. This is true. However I must also remind the rapporteur that in the European Parliament's Committee on Public Health and the Environment the necessity for laying down a priority for the survival of humanity was stressed. In this perspective, we considered today that the pollution of water by these mills was of priority, but this does not mean that in the second programme, when the problem of water pollution has already partly been solved, the problems of the soil and the air will not also be resolved.

Mr President, I have concluded my remarks. I would like once more to thank the Members of Parliament who spoke and ask Parliament to approve the resolution in the light of the observations which I have made.

**President.** — I call Mr Premoli.

**Mr Premoli, rapporteur.** — (I) I would like to thank the Commission representative and Lord Bethell for their appreciation of my brief report and the observations they have made. Lord Bethell's comments were very apt and moreover the Commission representative himself took account of them; Mr Scarascia Mugnozza's remarks were equally correct.

As regards more particularly what the Commissioner said, I would like to say that we agree with the principle of global distribution of special aid. However, in view of the highly polluting nature of these industries, they should receive a substantial part of such funds.

I believe that one of the merits of this proposal for a directive—and here I am in full

agreement with what Mr Scarascia Mugnozza has just stressed—is to have restricted the field. Pollution of air and soil can be dealt with in the more general programme.

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

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

**15. Beef imports**

**President.** — The next item is a debate, by urgent procedure, as decided yesterday, on beef imports, requested by Mr Cointat and others on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats (Doc. 67/75).

I call Mr Lardinois who has asked to make a statement.

**Mr Lardinois, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (NL) Mr President, thank you for having started by giving me the chance to make a statement on this point.

Mr President, since July 1974 the whole Community has had a beef import ban. Exceptions have been made only for some obligations under GATT. The Council of Ministers of Agriculture decided this at the end of July, for a period of three months, which expired on 1 November. The Commission then considered that it had to extend these regulations until now. In other words, seven months have been added, and the regulations have thus been in force for a total of ten months.

Last week, however, the Commission decided to make the regulations a bit less strict, after an exception had been made at the end of March for a quantity of some 17 000 metric tons in favour of the ACP countries.

The concession we have now made is that up to 1 October we are allowing a quantity of 50 000 tons of beef under an export/import arrangement. This involves traders or organizations first of all exporting a quantity of meat to countries outside the Community, without refund, and then obtaining the right to import a corresponding quantity, but with customs duties and a levy. The amount of the levy is to be determined on the basis of registration to be carried out regularly.

Secondly, the European Commission has decided by the same date, that is also over a period

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 111 of 20. 5. 1975.

**Lardinois**

of around four and a half months, to import 67 000 head of young cattle, mainly for Italy, with a small quantity for Germany. The allocation of these cattle is: 97% of the 67 000, that is around 65 000 for Italy, and I think about 1 500 for West Germany. This allocation was made in accordance with the traditional imports to our Community, since in fact it was only these two countries that imported in the past.

Of this last import of young cattle, a third comes from Austria and Yugoslavia together, while the import of the other two-thirds can be distributed by the Italian administration—and we hope evenly distributed—over the areas that traditionally export to Italy. This last, greatest, quantity of two-thirds broadly covers animals with a weight of between 80 and 250 kilos; for Austria and Yugoslavia the weight is between 220 and 300 kilos.

These young animals will have to remain at least five months on the farm in Italy or Germany, and the importing states must take deposits and sureties for this.

Altogether what it comes down to is that with this regulation we shall be getting no extra beef on the EEC market during the whole of 1975, while nevertheless in both ways the traditional exporters to the Community can get some relief. The export/import arrangement has no consequences at all for our market, it is purely a question of the qualities that can be imported or exported—and this is of great importance, particularly for our processing industry. The young cattle to be imported this year will, almost in their entirety, come onto our market during 1976 or the last month of this year.

I think that in this way, in a difficult time like the present, we will have shown our goodwill, in particular to the areas that export to us, without having abandoned our obligations towards our own producers and without taking on great financial burdens.

Yesterday, Mr President, I made the same statement to the Council. A delegation asked to vote on this on the basis of Article 21 of the EEC Treaty, and thus reject the Commission's decisions by a vote in Council. The result of the vote was that, as regards both systems, a majority of six Member States voted for the measures taken by the Commission, with three against. In other words, the great majority in the Council approved the Commission's measures on its own initiative, without our having asked.

In September we shall have to see what we can do for the period after 1 October, regarding

the import of both meat and young animals. I do not want to preempt that, but I hope, Mr President, that developments on the beef market will continue the present trend, and that during the rest of this year we shall continue to be able to allow certain imports, although in October we shall, perhaps, have to be rather careful, especially as far as meat is concerned.

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

**Mr Laban.** — (NL) Mr President, first I should like to say something I feel very strongly concerning the people who are asking for the urgency declaration. This is an important problem, but we consider that it is a great pity that it has come up so late, and that it has therefore not been possible—and this will be true for most groups—to discuss this important subject in plenary sittings. I therefore hope that in future a bit more team spirit will be shown and that matters like this will be put on the agenda in good time.

On behalf of the Socialist Group I am particularly grateful to the Commissioner for his exposition. He will recall that we have continually urged that if at all possible the one-sided beef import ban be made less strict or, if the situation allows, ended altogether. He knows, and I think he shares this view with us, that we are not in favour of endeavours at total self-sufficiency, as regards meat and other products. It goes without saying that for certain important foodstuffs we must protect the interests of the consumer in the Community, but apart from that we must remain open to imports from other countries and must also continue to export to them.

The Commissioner has now been looking for ways of bringing about some mitigation. I must say that the proposal regarding the 50 000 tons that can be imported, with of course the restriction that an equal quantity must be exported, is extremely moderate. The Commissioner has, however, also said—and this is true—that they have a neutral effect.

We are, therefore, particularly pleased that under the agreement with the ACP countries, at least another 23 000 tons extra from the developing countries can come onto the market, and that as far as that is concerned we can retain at least some degree of openness. I should like to ask the Commissioner whether the 50 000 will be imported into the Community in all possible forms, and what the import levy policy regarding that quota will be.



**Laban**

I have said that the first proposal is, in our opinion, rather moderate, but the other proposal, to create a possibility of importing 67 500 young animals, is essential. If I understand it correctly, there is a shortage in the Community on precisely that point. The Commissioner has, I think, stated that the Community preference will be fully maintained as regards these animals. I understand that full customs duties and full import levies are being applied to the import of these young animals. I must say that I therefore cannot understand why my colleague, Mr Liogier, and his co-signatories have got so dreadfully worked up about this matter. The Commissioner has already referred to the fact that meat prices are slowly but surely moving in the direction of the guide prices again. In France in particular, I believe, a percentage of 95% has already been reached and that is, in fact, the highest percentage so far in all nine Member States.

I find the indignation about the 67 500 young animals somewhat exaggerated because I am also informed that France alone is already exporting 120 000 young animals a month to Italy. In comparison with that, the quota of 67 500 animals is only a limited fraction, and I should like to ask the Commissioner whether he can give us any information on the export of these young animals from other Community countries to Italy.

It is clear that my group can agree with the policy of the Commission and the Council, and I am convinced that after the end of this debate the questioners will also be satisfied, and will be able to go back to their constituencies and give an account of everything they have been saying here about this problem.

**President.** — I call Mr Premoli to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Allies Group.

**Mr Premoli.** — (I) Mr President, I simply want to protest about certain things.

I wish to protest against a personal interpretation of the rules of procedure which allows one group to take over initiatives and, in this case, questions, which others had already tabled.

The Bureau of this Parliament must remedy this in future because otherwise it will be the most cunning, and perhaps those who act improperly, who will win and the honest, as usual, will lose.

The Liberal and Allies Group has always been careful not to ask for urgent procedure for a question similar to one already tabled by others through the normal parliamentary

channels. Proper procedures should have led the members of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, who took over Mr Durand's proposal, to bring him into the initiative, to put his name at the head of the list of signatories, which they did not do although they were aware that he was the first to put forward the idea about the importation of beef and veal. Mr Durand had tabled his question at least 48 hours before the members of the Group of European Progressive Democrats asked—surreptitiously and taking advantage of the large numbers present for the vote on the budget—for urgent procedure for the voting of their text.

The member of the Liberal Group will therefore let his question stand, as previously arranged, for the May part-session, so that the Commission can answer it in a precise way, instead of giving a hasty, perhaps inadequate answer, in the presence of a very limited number of Members of Parliament.

I think that it would please my colleague, Mr Durand, if I read out the text he drew up—I repeat—48 hours before the other members of Parliament who somewhat sordidly snatched the initiative from him:

While the Community continues to hold considerable stocks of beef and veal, the Commission has just decided to relax the safeguard clause suspending imports of beef and veal from third countries. Under the "Exim" procedure, vast quantities of beef and veal will probably again arrive on the Community market resulting in a slump in prices and a glut in storage depots. In that case the Community may well have to dispose of stocks that are virtually unsaleable on the Community market, as happened recently.

Does the Commission not feel that its recent decision is likely to cause serious disturbances on the Community beef and veal market? Does it consider it possible to reconcile this measure with the overwhelming need to guarantee stable prices and minimum incomes to breeders?

After considering the procedural aspects may I make some reflections on the practical aspects of this important problem. I believe that the Common Agricultural Policy requires an overall vision which is lacking at present, because only partial solutions are considered.

We cannot continue forever deciding on solutions for individual cases, and ignoring a global approach which alone has any concrete value and can have any effect on agricultural structures in the nine countries.

We cannot continue selling butter at reduced prices to the Soviet Union, piling up mountains of frozen meat in Community cold stores, failing to make timely provisions for a wine policy to prevent popular reactions which are damaging

**Premoli**

to the ideas we are trying to protect. It seems to me illogical for borders to be opened for imports of beef and veal when 250 million metric tons of meat of the same type are locked up in our cold stores waiting for purchasers, and breeders cannot find a market for young animals.

How long will consumers continue to be prepared to pay for a Common Agricultural Policy whose results are quite out of proportion to the enormous budgetary funds devoted to them? *(Applause from the Liberal and Allies Group)*

**President.** — I take note of what you said in your earlier remarks.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — My Lord President, I don't intend to follow Mr Premoli—I hope he will excuse me—in discussing whether or not the Liberal Group has been upstaged in this particular debate. All I would say is that of course we knew about this debate on Monday afternoon, when it was brought before us by the President of the Assembly at that time. Whether or not there was an upstaging or not, that, Sir, is not for me to dabble into.

What I do know is that this particular debate has come at an appropriate time—perhaps not as far as parliamentary time is concerned—and I am glad we are discussing it, because I think it is important in many aspects. As the Commissioner has said himself, it is a very sensitive area and he knows it is. We have all been through the problems of 1974 concerning our beef market and our beef farmers; we all know the tribulations that many of them have suffered, and, indeed, some are still suffering, although the price is firming up considerably. But a great deal of money was lost by many beef farmers, certainly in my country and I think in other countries as well throughout Europe. As I say, it is a very sensitive area. What the Commissioner is saying to us is that he is allowing imports into the country of more than 50 000 tons on condition that our traders sell 50 000 tons outside of the existing stocks which are in cold storage. At least, this is what I understand, and if I am wrong perhaps the Commissioner would be kind enough to put me right. As I understood it, you cannot import unless you export. That is what he said.

You have got to export before you can import, and you have got to export beef from the existings stocks within the Community—not necessarily in cold store but the existing fresh market. Therefore, our stocks in cold storage

of about 200 000 tons will continue to exist. There is no diminution of that by this particular regulation. Therefore, Mr President, in theory, if this is so it is not affecting the market in any way whatever. It exactly maintains status quo. I must say I should be fascinated to hear from the Commissioner where he thinks our traders are going to be able to sell the European meat in order to buy meat from third countries. Certainly, as you have got 200 000 tons of frozen meat sitting in store there is no question, I would have thought, of selling fresh meat into the Iron Curtain countries, because they would want the cheaper meat which they seem to be able to get at a cut price or at a world price from the frozen stores. I would have thought that market was not particularly open. But nevertheless, I expect the Commissioner will tell us where he sees our traders—not those of the United Kingdom but the traders of Europe—finding this market for 50 000 tons outside the Community.

M. Laban made an interesting point, that he didn't want the Community to be completely self-sufficient in beef. I would disagree with him there. I think we do want to be. But that doesn't mean to say that if we were completely self-sufficient there would be a barrier and we should do no trading. Far from it. But I sincerely hope that everything will be done, and this is why I am hesitant in giving the whole-hearted support that the Socialist Group have given to this proposal. I am not sure that this will not be a psychological setback to some of our beef farmers who won't necessarily understand what the Commission is doing. I believe we want to get the maximum production of beef, the absolute maximum. Now he knows that in this stock taking, which I shall mention again in a moment, there are plans to build up a reserve which is well above the levels of consumption, and over and above that a certain amount of extra reserve for food aid. This gives lots of scope for our Community farmers to increase their production to those levels. I hope that we, and he in particular as the Commissioner, will do everything we can to increase the level of beef production so that we do achieve complete self-sufficiency within the Community. One of the great advantages in my mind, my Lord President, is the fact that what the Community has done in the last year, and is doing now, is to give a stable source of supply to consumers within the Community. This is of paramount importance at a time when the world population is going up. A lot of people are in point of fact demanding—more rightly so in third countries and outside—that individual countries of Western

**Scott-Hopkins**

Europe should not go out shopping on the world markets. One of the great advantages of the Community, to my mind, is its stability of supply for the consumer. This applies in particular to the beef sector.

What I am a little anxious about, over and above what we have been saying about the 50 000 tons, concerns the import of live young cattle. Do I understand the Commissioner rightly when he says that 65 000 head of young cattle are going to Italy and the 1 500 head to West Germany, a third of which will come from Austria and Yugoslavia and two-thirds from the rest of the world. That is over and above the amount which we would have been talking about if the Liberal Group had put up a rapporteur—namely 30 000 head and the 5 000 bulls and cows and heifers. If this is so, then just over a hundred thousand head of young stock is going to be allowed to come into the Community. I don't really quite understand why I was talking about encouraging our producers in this Community to build up their supplies to the consumer: do we really need a hundred thousand head of young breeding-stock to come in? I would have thought this was just a little over the top and that although one needs fresh strains to maintain the virility and for breeding and so on, a hundred thousand head of young breeding stock does seem to me rather a lot. I expect the Commissioner will be able to justify this, and I assume that this is a once-and-for-all measure, but I must admit I do feel a certain anxiety.

On the whole, M. President, I cannot agree with the way two or three honourable Members have talked about taking things in isolation. This is one of the issues being taken in isolation. The Commission has put forward a stock-taking document, on which I have the honour to be rapporteur for this House at a later stage, in which the entire Common Agricultural Policy and all the products have been examined and a report produced. And that stocktaking document contains plans as to how the Commission is to proceed.

And so, while expressing some hesitation and a little anxiety about the part of this proposal and the statement from the Commission referring to young stock, I do not think that the anxieties of Mr Cointat, Mr Duval and Mr Herbert are justified to the extent that they have put them down in this particular motion. I welcome with hesitation what the Commissioner has said and I believe that the opening of the export quota will do no harm. But I

hope he will look again at the level of young stock coming into the Community.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Liogier to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

**M. Liogier.** — (F) Mr President, honourable Members, may I say straight away that if we have asked for urgent procedure it is because the matter is urgent. There was nothing to prevent Mr Durand from combining his question, of which we knew absolutely nothing, with our own! As regards the question of priority which you have just referred to, Mr Premoli, I can deal with that immediately. Here is the answer: on 20 February 1975—I believe that we were really first on that occasion—when you, Mr Lardinois, made a statement on the outcome of the meeting of the Ministers of Agriculture on agricultural prices—I had already asked you if the Commission could confirm the accuracy of the information that it intended in the near future to abolish the safeguard clause and was arranging for imports of large quantities of beef and veal which would be more or less compensated by exports of a similar nature from the Community.

So much then for the question of priority, and I shall go on. Your answer, Mr Lardinois, for which I wish to thank you, was as follows:

'I can say that the Commission is not intending to abolish the safeguard clause but does wish to adjust the provisions of the safeguard clause as they now stand. They are at present investigating whether perhaps after the middle of April Community importers may be allowed to import 100 000 tonnes of beef during the rest of the year free of levies—that is 100 000 tonnes in the framework of the safeguard clause up to about the end of the year. We do, however, make the condition in that case that 100 000 tonnes should first be exported without refund. This is a so-called "ex-im-arrangement" by which exports must be effected before certain rights are granted for the import of a corresponding amount. A measure of this kind would have the advantage that we should be able to maintain more or less traditional flows of trade and in this way remove the political pressure on our whole trade policy without endangering the balance of beef in our Community and without incurring extra costs for the Agricultural Fund.'

From this answer it might well be supposed that there were moves towards simple exchanges or barter in beef and veal of different qualities between the Community and this or that third party, to meet the particular needs of one or the other, which would make it plausible to suspend both the levies and the refunds without affecting the safeguard clause,

**Llogier**

since, as you stated, there would be no extra expenditure by the Agricultural Fund. But I was astonished as well as pleased at the idea that such a procedure could, as you stated, relieve the political pressure on our whole trade policy. But we are now, more or less, back where we started, since the Commission has taken its decision and its entry into force is imminent.

According to our own information, which you have just confirmed, 50 000 tons of beef and veal in all shapes and sizes—live animals, fresh meat, frozen, refrigerated and preserved or processed, etc.—can be imported into the EEC between 1 June and 30 September 1975. These imports will be on the EX-IM system. They will only be authorized if the beef and veal of the same quality has been exported in advance, but without refund, according to the EX-IM procedure.

Import levies are to be fixed by the Commission on the basis of offers made by applicants for certificates. In September, the Commission will review the situation and consider whether to re-open the procedure on the same terms. Now, I must point out a contradiction between, on the one hand, the Community's intention, which you expressed on 20 February 1975, to import 100 000 tons of beef and veal between now and the end of the year which, in your own terms, will be free from levies and on the other, the information which we now have that there will still be import levies, which, it has been agreed, will be fixed by the Commission on the basis of offers made by applicants for certificates. I think I understand the reason for this, which must be the fact that the world market is now in a surplus situation and that prices are therefore lower than ours, so that both you and I are anxious to ensure that imported beef and veal will arrive on the Community market at prices at least equal to if not higher than our own and not start a downward trend on the market.

What I have difficulty in understanding, however, is how you can export without export refunds, since the purpose of these is precisely to enable producers to export without fear of any difference there may be between the Community price and the world price. Transactions involving identical quantities on each side seem to us impossible in the current situation, according to the information we have. We are waiting for clarification from the Commission, for we have a right to expect it to dispel our fears. We should also be grateful if it would tell us what Community countries are likely to receive beef and veal imports on the

conditions it has laid down without extra expenditure by the Agricultural Fund.

We feel obliged to point to the widespread anxiety which has taken hold of dealers following the announcement of beef and veal imports for which they fear, despite promises to the contrary, they will not be compensated, above all at a time when, although prices are rising a little, the market is far from having recovered stability. Current rates in fact average only 87% of the target price—I am speaking of the Community as a whole and do not want to make a special case for France, even if Mr Laban recently mentioned the figure of 95%, although I believe the true figure was only 93%. That was the very top of the curve; but for the moment, we can confine ourselves to the middle. We feel obliged, as I said, to point to the widespread anxiety among breeders. We are of course willing to fulfil our obligations under GATT but we believe we should go no further and should stick strictly to the safeguard clause, which we can expect to be affected by imports which our own breeders are afraid will affect them badly. We should appreciate it if the Commission could give a clear demonstration that these fears are unfounded, for while the explanations given by Mr Lardinois at the opening of this debate were interesting in themselves, they did not, in our view, go to the heart of the matter.

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

**Mr Cipolla.** — (1) I would like to make three remarks.

The first concerns the procedure adopted. Mr Lardinois said that the Italian Government's request not to carry out the EX-IM operations was rejected by the Council by 6 votes to 3. At a time when we are talking of democracy, at a time when we are talking of direct elections to the Parliament, we must reflect on the fact—this is not a personal matter but a legal matter of a general nature—that an executive not elected by the people and in which, beside Mr Lardinois, sit British Commissioners who have already been rejected from government in two elections, can take such an important decision on a regulation of this kind.

Then there is the problem of the qualified majority. Can one talk of a qualified majority, when a vote by Luxembourg—which has 300 000 inhabitants—is equal to a vote by Italy? Did you not say, in fact: 'with France, Ireland and Italy voting against'?

**Cipolla**

Even if the present regulations permit this, I believe that in future we must be careful, because the problem of unanimity should be valid also for decisions of such great importance. It is not thinkable that a purely executive body should have greater powers than any Parliament. I am not saying this in an argumentative way, it is a question of fact, it is a Community rule. I believe that this rule must be changed.

Moreover I do not understand, just as Mr Scott-Hopkins and Mr Liogier did not understand, what advantage a trader can have in exporting meat from Europe as Mr Lardinois said, where the price of meat is higher than in the rest of the world, and importing the same amounts of meat to Europe from the rest of the world. It is clear that this operation leaves someone out of pocket. The press says that it is the Community which pays. Otherwise, can you explain, Mr Lardinois, how this happens? Or are these tradesmen Community benefactors?

Oh happy man, Mr Lardinois, to have such idyllic views of commercial relations. These benefactors export without making any profit, in fact suffering a loss on transport costs, because if they buy at a 100 to sell at 80 outside and then buy at 80 outside to sell at a 100 in Europe, it must mean that they have at least lost the transport costs.

If this is the way things are, the Commissioner must explain to us why the press published extremely disturbing news.

In Italy some major industrialists concerned with exporting industrial products and, in the interest of business, importing agricultural products, stated that they had been offered import vouchers of about 800 lire per kilo. This will obviously create a situation of speculation which will be to the disadvantage of those who have to import meat in order to export industrial products, with consequent inequalities within the Community to the detriment principally of the country most lacking in meat in the Community, which is in fact Italy.

I think that these events must give us food for thought.

I agree with what Mr Premoli said, that is, that this problem cannot be dealt with in isolation, with small provisions like this, because these provisions give rise to great inequality and to speculation. The Commission gains nothing from this, nor does Europe, nor do the farmers, but certain speculative interests do gain.

In this connection I think it would be well to hold a thorough debate, and I hope that the

Liberal and Allies Group will suggest this in a future part-session. Otherwise we will propose a debate on the whole problem of the beef and veal sector because one cannot just bury a decision of such importance, which will have serious consequences on the operation of the markets and not only on the markets but on the very life of the Community itself.

**President.** — I call M. Lardinois.

**Mr Lardinois, member of the Commission of the European Communities.** — (NL) Mr President, I should like to answer the various observations made by honourable Members.

In the first place, the observations by Mr Laban. Mr Laban asked whether the import regulations would apply to all types. I would say in principle, yes, with the exception of young animals; we have a separate regulation for them, and one of the reasons for making a separate regulation was that it was very difficult to fit them into an export/import system.

Then the question whether full import duties and levies apply to importing young animals. That is so in principle; an exception is made only for certain qualities to be imported mainly from Yugoslavia and Austria, for which the levy has been reduced by 25%.

Mr Premoli asked whether this EX-IM regulation would cause disruption of the market. No disruption of the market can be caused by it, since the quantities involved under it are exported again in full. I cannot repeat that often enough. What then is the point of this regulation—Mr Cipolla has brought this up too? Can we expect these exporters and importers to be noble idealists, applying these regulations for the benefit of Europe and the world? No, certainly not, we cannot expect that at all. That is not what they are paid for, and if we did that, they would not survive very long, economically speaking. But we must well understand that the simple idea that 'meat is meat' is just not enough for beef.

There are enormous differences in quality, enormous variations in destination, and that is why, even though we as a Community at the moment have enough meat, we still have a shortage of certain qualities. Despite the fact that other European countries also have enough meat at the moment, we can export certain qualities of which supplies are too large here, on relatively attractive terms. If, then, in a market with supply and demand of more than 6 million tons per year, if you import another 50 000 tons, covered by exports of the same

**Lardinois**

quantity, you will in fact be getting quality exchange. This is possible because of the quality factor and the various markets that are available, without it needing to cost the Community a red cent.

Perhaps it will even give the Community a certain amount of income, but that is not the primary intent: in principle, a levy is asked for. This levy may be very low; whoever comes with the lowest application gets the order. We shall have to see how these developments go. We cannot predict them precisely; perhaps there will be very little enthusiasm for them; we do not know that. All we know is that in the past the trade on various occasions asked for this kind of quality exchange. That is the essential point. We have always had to refuse because it did not fit into our safeguard clause system; we have now found a possibility, while keeping this safeguard clause. That is in the interests of our consumers, and it is also in the interests of maintaining a minimum of commercial relations, and I felt that it was economically worthwhile to try it.

Mr Scott-Hopkins then asked where we could buy this meat. We have, for instance, had requests for the export of certain qualities to the Middle East. We have also had requests for exports of certain qualities to Eastern Europe, if there were corresponding imports of other qualities. In the whole of Europe there is a demand, particularly for factory meat from Australia, South America and so on, of certain qualities of which there are insufficient supplies in our systems. At the moment we have too little of certain types of sausage and other meat products.

We have a GATT quota for the whole Community of 32 000 tons, but this offers insufficient relief for our meat processing factories in the whole of Europe. Mr Scott-Hopkins considers 100% self-sufficiency an attractive idea. From the point of view of market administration if nothing else, 100% self-sufficiency in beef is not at all an attractive idea for me, since we must understand that with full self-sufficiency, consumption is never in line, so that regular surpluses arise. The cost of the beef policy with 100% self-sufficiency amounts perhaps to ten times the cost with self-sufficiency at say 97%. That is why full self-sufficiency in this sector, that can at certain times cost so much, seems to me an anything but attractive idea from the point of view of market administration. But I fully agree that because of our climate and our capacities, and also our types of land and social problems, we must in the main produce our beef ourselves.

I come now to the 67 500 young animals. Mr Scott-Hopkins wonders whether this is not too many, since the 30 000 head agreed to under EFTA have to be added to them. But as against imports this year, in Italy in particular, of at least 1½ million head of cattle, coming entirely from the rest of the Community, there remain only about 100 000 head to be imported from third countries.

Why are they imported from third countries? Because we have specific demand on the Italian market, that in view of the specially desired qualities and so on the rest of the Community cannot meet at a reasonable price. There are certainly calves in the Community, but they are mainly calves that cannot be used in Italy for the specific meat qualities and specific breeding wanted there, whereas particularly countries bordering Italy are frequently much more specialized towards these qualities. Opening up certain possibilities for them is, even looked at qualitatively, certainly not a luxury as regards the reasonable provision of a market with what is demanded.

Now Mr Liogier's observations. He is in fact right; in February I sketched the system in broad outline. We have since then had all sorts of contacts with the ambassadors of the countries concerned, that export to the Community, and with a number of experts from Member States, and we have finally come to the conclusion that the import/export regulation, of which I had already given you a general impression in February, would have to be applied in some points.

Mr Cipolla then asked a further few questions. I note, however, that he is not present and I think I can leave it at that.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

#### 16. *Date and agenda for next part-session*

**President.** — There are no other items on the agenda. I thank the representatives of the Council and Commission for their contributions. The enlarged Bureau proposes that our next sittings be held at Strasbourg during the week from 12 to 15 May and, possibly, 16 May.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

In accordance with the decisions taken by the enlarged Bureau at its meeting of 28 April I have prepared the following agenda for the next part-session:

**President****Monday, 12 May 1975**

5.30 p.m.:

- Order of business;
- Commission statement on action taken on the opinions of Parliament;
- Report by Mr Gerlach on the amendment of the Statute of the European Investment Bank;
- Report by Mr Aigner on the ECSC Auditor's report for the financial year 1973;
- Report by Mr Shaw on the carrying forward of appropriations from the 1974 to the 1975 financial year.

**Tuesday, 13 May 1975**

9.00 a.m. and 3.00 p.m.:

- Report by Mrs Orth on the Eleventh Report of the Mines Safety and Health Commission and the Fifth Report of the General Commission on safety at work in the iron and steel industry;
- Report by Mr Alfred Bertrand on the Social Fund (aid to the unemployed);
- Supplementary report by Mr Dondelinger on measures to combat poverty;
- Report by Mr Petersen on the 1975 information programme;
- Report by Mr Premoli on the pollution of water for bathing;
- *Possibly*, vote without debate on the motion for a resolution contained in the report by Mr Jahn on an inventory of sources of information on the environment.

**Wednesday, 14 May 1975**

11.00 a.m. and 3.00 p.m. until 5.00 p.m.:

- Question Time;
- Oral question by the Political Affairs Committee to the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Member States on the situation in the Mediterranean and the Middle East;
- Joint debate on
  - the oral question with debate by Mr Jahn and others to the Commission on the composition of the Consumers' Consultative Committee and
  - the oral question with debate by Mr Jahn and others to the Council on the same subject;

5.30 p.m.:

*Formal sitting*

Commemoration of the 24th Anniversary of President Schuman's speech.

**Thursday, 15 and possibly Friday, 16 May 1975**

9.00 a.m. and 3.00 p.m.:

- Oral question with debate by the Socialist Group to the Commission on economic discrimination against EEC nationals and firms by countries of the Arab League;
- Report on the supply of milk fats as food aid;
- Joint debate on
  - the oral question by the Group of European Progressive Democrats to the Commission on measures to support the car industry and
  - the oral question by the Communist and Allies Group on the restructuring programme for the motor vehicle production sector;
- Report by Mr Willi Muller on problems of nuclear safety;
- Report by Mr Scholten on the activities of credit institutions;
- Report by Mr Memmel on the issue of Euratom loans to finance nuclear plants;
- Report by Mr Thomsen on the fishing zones laid down by Norway;
- Report on apricot imports from Israel;
- Report by Mr Bourdellès on poultrymeat, pigmeat, etc.;
- Report by Mr Früh on the organization of the market in dehydrated fodder.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I propose that speaking time for the next part-session be allocated in the usual way.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

17. *Adjournment of session***President.** — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.

18. *Approval of minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 5.10 p.m)*





