

# PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE OF THE ASSOCIATION

## JOINT COMMITTEE

### MINUTES

of the meetings

of 26, 27, 28 and 29 June 1973

HOTEL DE VILLE

BRUGES

31.7.1973

CPA/CP/275

S U M M A R Y

TUESDAY 26 JUNE 1973

Page

Opening ceremony .....	2
1. Adoption of the draft agenda (CPA/CP/269) .....	4
2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of 26, 27 and 28 March (CPA/CP/264) and of the constituent meeting of 30 March 1973 (CPA/CP/266) in Kinshasa .....	4
3. Appointment of a rapporteur on the annual manage- ment accounts for the financial year 1972 and on the draft estimates for the financial year 1974 ..	4
4. Discussion of the management accounts for the financial year 1972 (CPA/CP/267) .....	4
5. Appointment of a rapporteur on the 9th annual report on the activities of the Association Council .....	4
6. Discussion of monetary relations between European and African countries, and their implications for the African countries .....	4
7. Discussion on the effects of the drought in the SAHEL region and Community aid to the countries concerned .....	5

WEDNESDAY, 27 JUNE 1973

Continuation of agenda item 7 .....	9
-------------------------------------	---

THURSDAY 28 JUNE 1973

8. Discussion, in the presence of the Association Council and the Commission of the European Communities on the Association's current problems .....	12
9. Discussion of a draft joint statement on the drought in the SAHEL region .....	16

FRIDAY 29 JUNE 1973

10. Date and place of next meeting .....	18
--	----

ANNEXES:

- I : Attendance list
- II : Speech made on 28 June 1973 by Mrs Irène PETRY,  
Belgian Secretary of State for Development Aid,  
President-in-Office of the Association Council and  
of the Council of the European Communities.
- III : Speech made by Mr CHEYSSON, member of the Commission  
of the European Communities, on 28 June 1973.

TUESDAY 26 JUNE 1973

OPENING CEREMONY

The meeting was opened at 10.40 a.m. with Mr DEWULF, acting-Chairman, in the chair.

Mr Michel VAN MAELE, mayor of Bruges, welcomed the delegates. He recalled that Bruges had both European and African affiliations, which made the town a most fitting venue for discussions within the joint institution of the Association between countries which, although of different economic levels, were legally equal and sovereign. He pointed out that the Association had broken new ground and hoped that as further experience was gained, it would consolidate and expand despite the jealousies it aroused; these, he said, were in fact proof of the Association's vitality and effectiveness for, as the African proverb put it, 'you don't throw stones at a tree that bears no fruit'.

Mr BERKHOUWER, President of the European Parliament, said that it was important to him to attend the opening ceremony as an indication of the significance which the European Parliament as a whole attached to the meetings of the Joint Committee of the Association. Alluding in turn to the reasons which made Bruges an ideal venue for meetings of the bodies of the Parliamentary Conference of the Association, he said he wished to thank the town for its hospitality and its awareness of the problems of developing countries. He also thanked Mr DEWULF for organizing the meeting, stressing that in him, the Parliament had a Vice-President who believed in the Association and took a keen interest in its activities and in the problems of development in general.

Mr FALL BABAHA, spokesman for the African delegates, thanked the authorities of the town of Bruges and Mr DEWULF for the warm welcome they had received. Taking brief stock of the situation, he began by mentioning a happy event, the accession of Mauritius, which was now a full member of the Association. But there were others less fortunate, such as the plight of five of the Sahel countries, amongst the least advanced, which were suffering a tragic drought. He observed that there had been a movement of genuine solidarity on the part of all members of the Association and that prompt and effective aid had come from both the Member States of the EEC and the other African States of the Association. For this reason, far from being discouraged by misfortune, the Sahel countries - of which he himself was one representative - were resolved with the help of their European partners and through their own efforts, to build their economy, to review the problems of soil treatment and conservation, and to introduce a genuine water policy in Africa. This was where the arrangements under the EEC - AASM Association for economic, technical and financial cooperation would be particularly useful.

Mr DEWULF, Vice-President of the European Parliament and acting chairman, drew attention to two important international events in 1973, viz. the multilateral trade negotiations in GATT and the negotiations for the renewal and enlargement of the Association Convention. Europe had a concise part to play in both and must show itself able to assume its responsibilities towards the rest of the world.

He also drew attention to the intense diplomatic activity in Africa, with a series of Pan-African meetings to establish or strengthen African solidarity and economic independence. He felt that an association between Europe and Africa, both taken in the widest possible sense, on the basis of genuine partnership, would be an incentive to a more equitable form of cooperation between the developing countries and the developed countries as a whole. In fact, the policy of association was quite compatible with Europe's world-wide responsibilities. There was no more than a difference of degree in the links between Europe and third countries. Finally, Mr DEWULF expressed the hope that the forthcoming International Sugar Agreement, in which the Community and its Associates were to participate, would be the test of this resolve to cooperate on concrete problems.

The meeting was adjourned at 11.35 a.m.

o o

o

The meeting was resumed at 4.40 p.m. under the chairmanship of Mr Dewulf, acting chairman.

The Chairman informed the Committee that the African group proposed Mr KASSONGO as chairman to replace Mr NGO'O MEBE.

Mr KASSONGO was unanimously elected Vice-Chairman of the Joint Committee.

1. Adoption of the draft agenda (CPA/CP/269)

The Chairman proposed as an amendment to the agenda that the consideration of Item 6 be postponed until Thursday's meeting, since the President-in-Office of the Council and Commissioner Cheysson were detained in Luxembourg by an important EEC meeting. Following Mr Spénale and Mr Dagadou, the Chairman proposed that instead a new item should be inserted to permit discussion on that day of the effects of the drought in the countries of the Sahel region, which directly concerned the members of the Joint Committee.

The Committee adopted these amendments to the agenda.

2. Approval of the minutes of the meeting of 26, 27 and 28 March (CPA/CP/264) and of the constituent meeting of 30 March 1973 (CPA/CP/266) in Kinshasa

The minutes were approved.

3. Appointment of a rapporteur on the annual management accounts for the financial year 1972 and on the draft estimates for the financial year 1974

Mr FALL BABAHA, nominated by the African group, was appointed rapporteur by the Committee.

4. Discussion of the management accounts for the financial year 1972 (CPA/CP/267)

The Chairman proposed that discussion of the management accounts be postponed until the autumn session in order to allow the rapporteur, whom the Committee had just appointed, sufficient time to examine the accounts and to present his draft report.

5. Appointment of a rapporteur on the 9th annual report on the activities of the Association Council

Mr BERSANI, nominated by the European group, was appointed rapporteur.

6. Discussion of monetary relations between European and African countries, and their implications for the African countries

Mr SPENALE recalled that he had originally asked for this item to be included in the agenda. At the meeting in Kinshasa it had indeed seemed important that the African countries, whose currencies were linked with European currency areas, should look into the advantages and disadvantages of such an arrangement. A second reason was that the present confusion in international monetary relations was a matter of concern to political leaders everywhere. It was regrettable that there was no monetary union,

and none in Africa. Union of this kind would imply acceptance by the countries concerned of joint decision-making and a joint issuing authority.

On reflection, Mr Spénale wondered whether this item should be kept on the agenda and a full-scale debate opened at this stage. The situation was complex in the extreme and the Joint Committee's findings might well appear highly critical towards certain countries. For this reason, he proposed the adjournment of this debate, but recommended that the African countries should study the problem in depth amongst themselves.

The Committee decided to defer discussion on monetary relations between European and African countries.

7. Discussion on the effects of the drought in the SAHEL region and Community aid to the countries concerned

Mr FERRANDI, Director-General with responsibility for the European Development Fund, was invited by the Chairman to describe the situation in greater detail than had been provided in the international press.

As early as November 1972 the African countries affected by the drought alerted the Committee. The EDF together with the authorities of the countries concerned gave immediate consideration to priority measures and a joint plan was drawn up covering:

- 1. the problems of transporting gift consignments. It was not enough to send cereals and milk powder; transport had then to be provided to the outlying areas of the SAHEL region in order to meet the needs of the stricken population. The cost of such transport ran to thousands of millions of CFA francs;
- 2. the provision of seed for the next harvest as existing stocks had been exhausted;
- 3. compensation for heavy livestock losses by means of aid to breeders in the form of subsidies paid out by governments from the EDF;
- 4. storage problems, the purpose here being to anticipate further periods of drought and to speed up the drilling of wells.

Total Community aid amounted to approximately 20 million u.a. In addition the Community had sent 44,500 tons of cereals (barley and maize) under its 1971-72 food aid programme a further 58,400 tons would be shipped by October under the 1972-1973 programme. Parallel with this, Member States had provided bilateral assistance to the countries affected in the form of 37,500 tons of cereals as food aid for the period 1971-1972 and a further 72,750 tons under their 1972-1973 programme.

Altogether, the Community and the Member States had made a considerable effort, far beyond that of other industrialized countries. And the Community was prepared to go even further.. Transport was the most serious problem in providing food for people in need and the Community had decided to make funds available for the provision of transport into the very heart of the SAHEL countries.

Over and above this emergency aid consideration should be given to a medium-term and long-term policy incorporating a dam-building programme and a more rational livestock policy under which goats and sheep would no longer destroy the sparse grass which provided pasture for nomadic flocks. What was needed here was a stronger type of grass. Finally, the Commission's proposal to achieve stable prices for certain products vital to the AASM, was highly reassuring and would constitute a most practical form of economic aid.

Mr OUEDDO (Chad) was gratified to note how effective Community aid had been and how much had been accomplished. However, EDF funds should not be diverted from their initial objective, and the emergency aid granted to combat the drought should not drain the resources of the EDF and deprive the countries affected of the means required to finance infrastructure projects they had submitted to the Community. On the contrary, supplementary aid should be provided to crop and livestock farming over and above the funding of previously planned projects to develop infrastructure in the five Sahel countries.

Mr AIGNER, while advocating a special effort in the transport sector to prevent supplies from rotting in the ports, felt it equally important for the Committee to set up a working party with the ambassadors of the countries concerned to organize assistance and forestall further catastrophes of the same sort.

Mr BERSANI agreed with Mr Aigner's proposal for a coordinating body for aid to the Sahel region. More rational water consumption was one point which required study. Finally, the press in the Member States should be informed of all that had been done by the Community.

At this point in the discussion, the Chairman proposed that the news media in the Member States should make a special effort to draw attention both to the problems facing the stricken countries and the assistance which had already been and was to be provided by the Community; all this required the approval of public opinion. He further suggested, that the Committee draw up a statement on these problems.

Mr HARZSCHEL felt that the paramount need was for long-term planning and a general programme drawn up with the cooperation of all the countries concerned.

Mr FERRANDI pointed out in reply to a question by Mr Bersani that the Council had recently taken two measures:

1. a measure approving and regularizing Commission action to finance transport from the EDF of goods provided as aid by the Community, the individual Member States and even by third countries.

2. a new measure authorizing the Committee to coordinate air and sea transport for all forms of aid provided by the Member States. This was not an easy task but it should prevent wastage caused by delays in forwarding aid to the stricken population.

Speaking to Mr Ferrandi, Mr SPENALE expressed the view that the Commission representative tended to play down the effects of the catastrophe, adding that he disagreed with him on a number of points. Firstly, he asked the Director-General of the EDF to make it clear whether or not emergency food aid provided to the five countries in the disaster area was to be deducted from the initial overall ceiling on EDF funds for a certain number of projects which these countries had put forward. At first sight, this would not seem to be very generous and would have the effect of penalizing these countries since after payment of emergency aid, the EDF would have no funds left to finance much-needed infrastructure projects and a programme to rebuild their economies. Furthermore, although the African States had alerted the Commission in November 1972, the latter had failed to inform Parliament and to sound the alarm early enough. Had full use been made of all means of transporting food consignments into the interior, rather than allowing the ports of Dakar, Abidjan and Cotonou to become congested? In Mr Spenale's opinion, if there had been a war in the Sahel region, all necessary transport would have been mobilized in one way or another and the necessary funds would have been found.

Mr FERRANDI assured Mr Spénale that the Committee had not underestimated the extent of the drought. It was true that the cost of transporting food to distribution points in the interior had been paid by the EDF, since somebody had to pay and a quick decision had been needed to prevent the goods from perishing in the ports.

It was true that the funds from the EDF amounted to 20 million u.a., half of which was drawn from the appropriations for allocation to the 19 states and the other half from the funds earmarked for the Sahel countries each according to what it had actually received. If Parliament had not been informed of the measures taken by the Community until April 1973, this was because the Commission had worked discreetly and without fuss ever since November 1972, its prime concern being to meet the needs of the Sahel countries as effectively as possible.



Concluding the first part of the debate, the Committee requested the representative of the EDF to prepare a memorandum on the financing of the various aid operations to the Sahel region from both Community and Member State sources.

o o

o

The meeting was adjourned at 6.30 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, 27 JUNE 1973

The meeting opened at 11.20 a.m., with Mr KASSONGO, Vice-chairman, in the chair.

Further discussion on the effects of the drought in the SAHEL region, and Community aid to the countries concerned

Mr SISSOKO, speaking as a representative of one of the countries severely affected by drought, pointed out that 60% of the economy of his country and the neighbouring countries had been destroyed. They would need 20 or 30 years to regain their balance. The measures taken were safety measures and he was grateful to the Community for having taken them. But this was not sufficient; it was necessary to rebuild and prepare for the future. What had been granted **in the way of emergency aid under Article 20** must not be deducted from the sum normally earmarked by the Community for projects submitted by the five States which had received emergency aid. Furthermore, the Community must help these countries to find technical means of preventing the encroachment of the desert.

Mr KAMOSSI LULUNGU pointed out that his country, Zaïre, had done its best to help its African friends despite the limited means at its disposal. The most valuable contribution Europe could make would be to introduce methods of the kind used by Israel for fertilizing the Neguev.

Mr SPENALE, in reply to Mr Kamossi Lulungu said he felt that the Europeans should indeed provide the African countries with all the modern techniques at their disposal, particularly in agriculture, but miracles should not be expected. What he thought would be suitable was a large-scale programme of small projects re-introducing a number of practices in use some years ago, e.g. creating a large number of breeding units by giving breeders three cows and a bull and then, after a few years, taking the same number back to give to others, leaving the breeder with the remainder. Mr Spénale finally proposed a Sahel conference as a permanent body with exceptional powers, which would coordinate the action taken by the Committee and the **EDF**, the French Fund for Aid and Cooperation (F.A.C.) and other aid organizations of the States concerned.

Mr PERRET pointed out that his country's government and those of its neighbours had made a considerable effort to purchase additional food supplies as soon as they had realized that the harvest would be poor. A national campaign to collect money and foodstuffs had been launched and had proved a success. The President of the Republic of Niger had also suggested a Marshall Plan for the Sahel countries, and from this viewpoint it would be a good thing if the Community continued its efforts.

Mr HARMEGNIES pointed out that the European Parliament had adopted two resolutions and, in liaison with the Committee, kept a close watch over Community aid.

Mr BOUDA pointed out that Community food aid had been most appreciated by the people of his country. However, although 40,000 tons of cereals had been announced, only 9,000 tons had reached Upper Volta by 25 June 1973. Admittedly distribution had been difficult for lack of transportation and fuel. A quarter of each consignment of millet, maize or rice was sold on the spot in order to buy fuel. Aircraft had been used to drop supplies over the more inaccessible areas, but they were no longer available and the situation in Upper Volta was far from being under control.

Additional transport facilities are therefore needed to move the supplies still lying in the ports of Abidjan and Lomé.

Looking to the future, a plan was needed to provide aid for well-drilling and dam building.

Mr KAHIN considered that the answer to the Sahel drought lay in medium-term and long-term action and greater joint efforts on the part of the countries concerned. He cited the case of his own country, Somaliland, which in 1972 suffered a serious drought but succeeded in curbing the extent of the disaster through appeals to the local population, particularly civil servants who were asked to give one month's salary.

Mr COULIBALY pointed out that his country, the Ivory Coast, like all the other African countries, had tried to help its neighbours. The press and radio had given wide coverage to the difficulties faced by the Sahel countries and to the relief aid provided by the Community.

Mr GUEYE said that in Senegal all available means had been mobilized at national level to help disaster victims. He hoped with other speakers that EDF emergency aid would not affect the appropriations normally earmarked for infrastructure projects in the five Sahel countries. On the contrary, the drought should act as an incentive to the EEC to provide additional funds to build the economies of the countries concerned.

Winding up the debate, the chairman proposed, and the Committee decided to appoint a drafting committee to draw up a joint statement on the above-mentioned problems.

The following were appointed to the drafting committee: Mr SPENALE, rapporteur, Mr BERSANI and Mr HARMEGNIES, plus a member from the delegations of MALI, SENEGAL and DAHOMEY.

Furthermore, the chairman requested the services of the Commission of the European Communities and the Parliament as well as the secretariat of the African group to draw up for the next meeting in LOME a short document explaining what had been and was being done to combat the effects of the drought.

The meeting was adjourned at 12.35 p.m.

o o  
o

CPA/CP/275

THURSDAY 28 JUNE 1973

The meeting was opened at 10.20 a.m., with Mr DEWULF, acting Chairman, in the chair.

8. Discussion, in the presence of the Association Council and the European Commission, on the Association's current problems

At the request of the Chairman, Mrs PETRY, President-in-Office of the Association Council, summed up the current problems of the Association, giving particular emphasis to the arrangements adopted by the Council at its recent meeting in Port-Louis (See Annex II).

Mr CHEYSSON, Member of the Commission of the European Communities, also took stock of the situation, with special reference to the forthcoming negotiations on the renewal of the Association Convention (see Annex III).

After thanking the previous speakers Mr GUILLABERT said that in his view the negotiations must begin at the end of September as planned. Like Mr Cheysson, he considered that an overall policy on development aid could best be achieved through a successful regional approach that had force of example.

Referring to a newspaper article reporting remarks allegedly made by Mr CHEYSSON implying that the principle of free trade was in jeopardy, Mr Guillabert called for some clarification from the Commissioner himself. The AASM, he added, considered the principle of free trade essential and must remain the starting point of any discussion.

Mr HARMEGNIES reminded the meeting that the basic objective of the Association was to eliminate economic imbalance between the Member States of the Convention. The Community therefore adopt a generous approach, particularly when laying down import arrangements for products originating in the AASM.

Mentioning the work of the Council, in which he had taken part as chairman and leader of the Belgian delegation, Mr Harmegnies pointed out that it was often difficult for the members of the Council, as the appointees of their governments, to take decisions which might seem to clash with national interests of certain social and professional groups, especially European farmers. However, the ministers were equal to their responsibilities and more often than not, were able to reach decisions which also took into account the interests and wishes of the Associated countries.

Mr KAHIN considered that, at the forthcoming negotiations, there should be closer cooperation in the trade sector, especially between the partner states of the Association, in an attempt to give genuinely effective support to AASM export revenue as called for in the Commission's proposal. There should be a renewed effort to encourage investment by adapting EDF aid to the present situation. In short, new impetus should be given to this form of cooperation and the enlarged Association strengthened without imposing ready-made solutions.

Mr CHEYSSON replying to Mr Guillaibert explained what he had meant in his statement on the concept of a free trade area. Free trade should be established on practical lines without overdue regard for legal considerations. The main thing was to establish a permanent contractual system between the trading partners that was above GATT criticism. Europe should not be overdemanding, particularly where reciprocal preferences were concerned.

Mr DAGADOU was gratified to note that the President-in-Office of the Council had stressed anew the Community's political resolve to preserve the achievements of the Association.

The Africans should be clear in their minds and firm of purpose when it came to the content of the new Convention.

He hoped that the next meeting of the Joint Committee would discuss in detail the memorandum presented by the Commission. Finally, the delegate from TOGO hoped that the representative of the Council would be able to confirm Mr Cheysson's statement that the ministers were in favour of the proposals contained in the memorandum concerned.

Mr AIGNER considered that during the forthcoming negotiations, the Europeans should take into account some of the extremely interesting proposals put forward in the Commission's memorandum, adding that this implied a supplementary but indispensable financial effort. The negotiations should take place in a climate of mutual confidence. There should also be an extensive information campaign to capture the attention of the general public.

The third EDF should be for 500 million u.a. per annum, a substantial figure perhaps but a necessary one.

Finally, the speaker warned the Africans against the kind of misguided investment that had occurred in European countries where towns had become uninhabitable and the environment spoiled by errors which should not be repeated.

Mr SISSOKO pointed out that it was the Joint Committee's task to fight the fires burning within the Association. The 'banana war' which had begun three years ago and occasioned lively debate, was now over, as was the fruit and vegetable war, and Mr Cheysson had just settled the quarrel between the advocates of a global approach and the proponents of a regional strategy.

Referring to the major problem of stabilizing AASM export revenue, he recalled that this crucial issue had been raised and tenaciously pursued by the Joint Committee.

As to free trade within the Association, careful consideration was essential. The AASM would welcome the 'associable' countries if they applied to join the Association and would spare no effort to achieve a rapprochement through pan-African meetings in Abidjan, Addis-Abbaba and shortly in Lagos. But certain Member States of the Community seemed to be in a great hurry and this was a possible source of difficulty and confusion. It would be preferable for the Europeans to allow the Africans to talk calmly with each other at the Lagos Meeting and not to interfere. Once they had reached agreement, the Africans would clearly state their position with regard to the memorandum, which they approved as a whole although they might put forward certain minor amendments.

The President-in-Office of the Council, Mrs PETRY, spoke in reply to the questions raised by various speakers. She confirmed what had been said by Mr Cheysson, who at the last meeting of the EEC Council of Ministers had expounded his views on the permanent and contractual nature of arrangements for the free entry of goods, and had pointed out that the Community was not asking for a system of preferences to be granted by the AASM. None of these points had been challenged by the Council, which would no doubt return to them when the negotiations began. At that time, the Community would put a proposal to the Africans and this would then be discussed.

Meanwhile, before meeting the countries eligible for association, the Community must decide its position on a certain number of points contained in the Commission's memorandum. This was particularly true for the stabilization of AASM export revenue.

Speaking both personally and in her capacity as Belgium's representative, Mrs PETRY supported the Committee's views and stressed her determination to do everything in her power to make the negotiations successful.

As to whether there should be a single spokesman in Brussels at the first major Euro-African meeting on 25 July, the Community had no stipulation to make, but the President-in-Office of the Council said she felt that it would be in their own best interests for the Africans to have a single spokesman.

Mr SPENALE came back to what Mr Cheysson had said and recalled that the free trade area had so far been considered as one of the keystones of the Association. In view of Mr Cheysson's statement, he said he would appreciate further explanations of what actually went to make a free trade area as this would clarify both the current situation and future developments.

Mr CHEYSSON first referred to the negotiation procedure which would be laid down at the conference of 25 July and expressed the hope that during the opening days all the delegations would express their views simply, frankly and directly, in the African manner, and not adopt the style of European speeches customary in international forums.

In reply to Mr SPÉNALE, he pointed out that the concept of free trade as defined by GATT, was quite unambiguous. However, what counted was the way it was put into practice.

We should look beyond the term itself, which had become controversial, to the reality, which was that free trade was not practiced in the same way by all countries. We must therefore draw the proper conclusions from this political reality 'failing which we shall not only find ourselves without applicants for association, but might even run the risk of destroying the Association with our own hands'.

Finally, echoing Mr Aigner's words, Mr Spénale said he was convinced that with the enlargement of the Association on both the African and European sides, a new philosophy would emerge, pointing the way to new relations between developing countries and industrialised countries.

Sir Arthur Douglas DODDS-PARKER agreed with Mr Cheysson that allowance should be made first and foremost for political reality, even if there was little logic to it. It would be necessary to await the outcome of the forthcoming meeting in Lagos to know what the Africans desired.

As to the Community, it now seemed that it would no longer ask for reverse preferences. This was a new and important factor. It should be remembered in this connection that Britain had for a long time had the imperial preference system and that even the USA, although they often overlooked this, had a preferential system with Puerto-Rico, for instance. For this reason, he personally felt that preferences within the Association were certainly acceptable.

As to the forthcoming negotiations, all the African States which might be interested should be invited, including countries like the Sudan, even though its trade was basically with the USA.

As for sugar, it would be desirable to conclude a European Sugar Agreement to include members of the future Association.

With regard to the reconstruction of the economy of the Sahel countries, every available method must be employed to regenerate livestock, including artificial insemination; in the desert areas of the North, which were fertile at the time of the Roman Empire, reafforestation should be undertaken.



In conclusion, he agreed with Mr CHEYSSON, that the new Association Convention should be built on new foundations which would serve as a guide and example for other industrialised countries to make radical changes in their relationships with developing countries.

Mr KAMOSSSI LULUNGU summed up the position in which the Association found itself on the eve of the impending negotiations. Zaïre was in favour of the enlargement of the Association since it would allow a regrouping of African countries. However, enlargement must not jeopardize what had already been achieved. He further observed that even though attempts had been made to stabilize the prices of primary commodities, nothing had been done to curb the rising prices of industrial products imported by the developing countries. The Europeans should continue to help their African partners towards industrialization and hence the production of more sophisticated products for sale on the external market. As to technical cooperation, assistance from foreign experts was in the nature of first-aid until such time as nationals could take over, and should not be viewed as a means of maintaining an area of influence. While EDF aid was appreciated, the scale on which it was provided fell far short of AASM requirements.

The Chairman closed the debate.

9. Discussion of a draft joint statement on the drought in the SAHEL region

On a proposal from the chairman, Mr SPENALE, rapporteur, summarised the contents of the draft statement drawn up by the Drafting Committee.

Mr BOUDA, referring to paragraph 4, requested that it be made clear that the efforts still necessary for the transport of food to the stricken populations must be made before the rainy season.

After Mr PERRET and Mr SPENALE had taken the floor, the Committee decided to word paragraph 4 as follows: 'Furthermore, it has requested (instead of expressed the hope) that the steps still required be taken as a matter of urgency' etc., meaning that action must be taken before the rainy season, in accordance with the wishes of the representative of Upper Volta.

Mr SISSOKO proposed an amendment to section (a) to the effect that the funds used to meet the emergency should not be 'definitively' charged to the European Development Fund and that at all events the funds used on this occasion pursuant to Article 20 should not be deducted from the appropriations earmarked for financing the development projects of the Associated States.

After the Representative of the Commission of the European Communities, Mr PERRET and Mr SPENALE had taken the floor, the Committee decided to adopt the amendment tabled by Mr SISSOKO.

Mr AIGNER, referring to section (c) proposed that it be made clear that all necessary steps should be taken to prevent the encroachment of the desert and 'ensure that the extent of similar catastrophes be reduced' (instead of 'prevent the recurrence of similar catastrophes').

The Committee adopted this amendment.

Mr AIGNER, taking up a suggestion made by several speakers, requested the addition of a new section (d) stating that the European Commission and the Associated States would draw the necessary inferences from this experience and make provision for emergency plans.

On a motion from the rapporteur, the Committee adopted this amendment.

The draft joint statement thus amended was unanimously adopted.

The meeting was adjourned at 6.40 p.m.

o            o  
o

FRIDAY 29 JUNE 1973

The meeting opened at 10.30 a.m. with Mr KASSONGO, Vice-Chairman, in the chair.

Mr BEHRENDT, who had not been present when the joint statement was adopted, said he wished to express his full approval. He pointed out that the European Parliament would continue to pay close attention to the development of the situation in the SAHEL region and would continue to support Community efforts to assist in the rebuilding of the economies of the affected countries.

Mr BOUDA made a general statement to the effect that Upper Volta would continue to contribute to the Association as long as relations between Europeans and Africans were based on equality and the Europeans were prepared to take into account the views expressed by their African partners.

10. Date and place of next meeting

The Chairman recalled that the Committee had already decided in Kinshasa to hold its next meeting in LOME, the capital of Togo.

Mr DAGADOU renewed his government's invitation to the Chairman of the Joint Committee to hold the meeting in Lome between 25 and 31 October 1973.

Following these proposals, the Committee decided to meet in LOME from 25 to 31 October 1973.

In conclusion, the Chairman thanked all the members for their active participation.

The Chairman expressed the hope that the next Euro-African Conference due to take place in Brussels on 25 and 26 July 1973, would afford the opportunity for valuable discussion and provide the 'associable' countries with fuller information. Recalling the hope expressed by an African delegate, he invited the Europeans to do nothing that might interfere with inter-African cooperation.

The meeting was closed at 10.45 a.m.

Annex I

Members attending the meeting of the Joint Committee from 26 to 28 June 1973 in BRUGES

---

Representatives of the  
European Parliament

Mr DEWULF, Acting Chairman  
Mr AIGNER  
Mr BEHRENDT<sup>1</sup>  
Mr BERSANI  
Sir Douglas DODDS-PARKER  
Miss FLESCH  
Mr GALLI<sup>2</sup>  
Mr van der GUN<sup>3</sup>  
Mr HARMEGNIES  
Mr HARZSCHEL<sup>4</sup>  
Mrs IOTTI  
Mr KOLLWELTER  
Mr ROMUALDI  
Mr SEEFELD  
Mr SPENALE

Representatives of the  
Associated States

Mr KASSONGO, Vice-Chairman (Zaire)  
Mr BARIGUME (Burundi)  
Mr NKO'O ETOUNGOU (Cameroon)  
Mr SEVOT (Central African  
Republic)  
Mr OUEDDO (Chad)  
Mr OKOI (Congo)  
Mr POGNON (Dahomey)  
Mr SAMBHAT (Gabon)  
Mr GON COULIBALI (Ivory Coast)  
Mr SISSOKO (Mali)  
Mr FALL BABAHA (Mauritania)  
Mr OSMAN (Mauritius)  
Mr AMADOU GAOH (Niger)  
Mr NDAHAYO (Rwanda)  
Mr GUILLABERT (Senegal)  
Mr KAHIN (Somalia)  
Mr DAGADOU (Togo)  
Mr BOUDA (Upper Volta)

Apologies for absence

Mr ACHENBACH  
ARMENGAUD  
CORONA  
LAUDRIN

The representatives of  
Madagascar.

---

<sup>1</sup> Deputizing for Mr BROEKSZ

<sup>2</sup> Deputizing on 26 and 27 June for Mr SCHUIJT

<sup>3</sup> Deputizing on 28 and 29 June for Mr SCHUIJT

<sup>4</sup> Deputizing for Mr COLIN

Mauritius

The Rt. Hon. KISHNA, Member of the Legislative Assembly  
The Rt. Hon. RIMA, " " "  
The Rt. Hon. BUNDHUN, " " "  
The Rt. Hon. SHAM, " " "  
Mr TEELock, Ambassador  
Mr TSANG, First Counsellor

Niger

Mr PERRET, Deputy

Rwanda

Mr MUDENGE, Deputy  
Mr KABALISA, Director-General  
Mr NYIRINKWAYA, Counsellor

Senegal

Mr Amadou BOUTA GUEYE, Vice-President of the National Assembly

Somalia

Mr SHABBELEH

Togo

Mr KOMLAN-KOUMA  
Mr MONSILA

Upper Volta

Mr KONDOMBO, Vice-President of the National Assembly

Zaire

Mr KAMOSSI LULUNGU, People's Commissioner  
Mr MBONZI MATAYOKO, " "  
Mr IZEMENGIA, Counsellor  
Mr KAMA-BUDIANKI, Second Counsellor

SECRETARIAT OF THE PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE OF THE ASSOCIATION

Mr H. R. NORD, Secretary-General of the European Parliament  
Mr Michel EHOLIE, Co-Secretary-General of the Parliamentary  
Conference of the Association

Secretariat of the Joint Committee

Mr VAN DEN EEDE, Director-General  
Mr ARNO, Head of Division  
Miss HENRICH  
Mr VOSSEN  
Miss REUVEKAMP, Assistant

Information and Public Relations

Mr GALLI-CAVOUKDJIAN, Head of Division

Research and Documentation

Miss MICHEL

Administration

Mr GINESTET, Director  
Mr MESTAT, Head of Protocol  
Mr SPITTERS, Head of Division

## ANNEX II

Speech delivered on 28 June 1973 by Mrs Irène PETRY, Secretary of State for Development Cooperation of the Kingdom of Belgium, President-in-Office of the Association Council and of the Council of the European Communities, to the Joint Committee of the Parliamentary Conference of the EEC-AASM Association

---

Mr President,  
Members of Parliament,  
Your Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like first of all to refer to the meeting of the Association Council of 15 June, an important event because it marked our entry into the period of active preparation for the negotiations on the establishment of a new system of relations to following the expiry of the Yaoundé Convention.

This is why I believe it would be useful to outline the form these preparations are taking and look at the three elements into which they may be broken down. First of all, there is the Community, which has begun consideration of the Commission's memorandum on future relations with the Associated States and the eligible states referred to in Protocol No. 22 of the Brussels Treaty of 22 January 1972. The Community, it is true, has not yet been able to reach a final decision on the interesting proposals contained in the memorandum. All the same, as you know, it has already taken several procedural decisions, not least among them the calling of a preliminary conference, to be held in Brussels on 25 and 26 July, to which all the countries concerned have been invited.

Secondly, the African states, as well as Madagascar and Mauritius, are also undertaking active preparatory work. The AASM Coordinating Council met in Mauritius on 13 and 14 June. In addition, in a broader context, a meeting of African ministers took place in May in Abidjan. At the end of May, the Heads of State or Government of the Organization of African Unity, meeting in Addis Ababa to mark the tenth anniversary of the OAU, discussed future relations between Africa and the Community. Finally, a meeting of the Associated States with the eligible Commonwealth African States will be held on 9 July in Lagos. All of us, aware that these preparations will affect the future of relations between our two continents, can have no doubt that they will go a long way towards ensuring that the coming negotiations will be held in the right conditions.

Thirdly, these separate talks have been followed by discussions between the Community and the Associated States in the context of the Association Council. The important meeting of 15 June last in Mauritius narrowed the area of disagreement and cleared up misunderstandings about the Community's intentions, particularly on the policy of association to be pursued with regard to the AASM. In

the opinion of those who took part in the Mauritius meeting, the outcome achieved was highly significant in terms of the future of our association.

On this point I would first of all like to repeat what I said at Kinshasa and Mauritius, and that is to underline the Community's intention to abide fully by its commitments as set out in Article 62 of the Yaoundé Convention, Article 36 of the Arusha Agreement, and Protocol No. 22. This intention was clearly set down in the Community's invitation to the Heads of State or Government of the Associated States and the states eligible for association referred to in the Treaty of Accession.

This letter of invitation specifies that a preliminary conference, to be chaired by the President-in-Office of the Council, will be held in Brussels on 25 and 26 July; it will allow initial contact and discussion between the participants preparatory to the negotiations themselves, which will begin as soon as possible.

In the light of this, and taking account of the political importance which the Associated African States, Madagascar and Mauritius, as well as the Community, attach to the conclusion of a broadly based association, an appropriate framework will have to be found by the Community for its future relations with the states involved.

I would like, however, to draw the attention of your committee to the provisions of Protocol No. 22 relating to the Associated African and Malagasy States. As far as they are concerned, the Protocol confirms the provisions of Article 62 of our Convention while defining and extending their scope. "The new Convention to follow the Convention signed on 29 July 1969", as Protocol No. 22 puts it, will ensure that the AASM keep all they have gained from the Association; at the same time, the Community's relations with the AASM will bring the latter many new advantages and will be based on measures which allow the Association to retain its unique character in the sectors of trade relations, financial and technical cooperation, and joint institutions.

As far as a date for the start of the negotiations proper is concerned, the Community suggested that the July conference would offer an opportunity of fixing one in agreement with the Associated States. The Community also stated that the negotiations would be conducted on its behalf by the Commission, in close liaison with the Member States and the Council of the European Communities.

During the discussion which followed this important statement by the Community, the Associated States raised several questions both of a fundamental and procedural nature. As far as the procedural questions were concerned, and leaving aside the subject of the letter of invitation, which had been addressed to their Heads of State or Government, they felt that, considering the excellent relations it enjoyed with the Associated States, the Community should have taken the precaution of consulting them. They pointed out that, in the absence of prior contacts with the AASM, the Community had acted outside the terms of the Association Convention. Among the fundamental questions, the Associated States asked the Community to give details on the choice between the three formulae proposed by Protocol No. 22. They also wanted information on the Community's position regarding the free trade area. Since these questions are still being considered by the Community, the Association Council was not required to answer them. It has in fact concentrated on questions relating to the nature of the conference, procedural matters and the date of the negotiations proper.

Asked whether the conference of 25-26 July did not constitute a meeting designed expressly for the information of the Commonwealth countries eligible for association, rather than a preliminary conference in the real sense of the term, the Community replied that, in its view, the preliminary conference in July would allow initial contacts to be made and these would do much to improve the information available to the eligible states before the negotiations begin. During this discussion, the Community would have the opportunity to make known its position on the major issues. At the same time, the Associated States and the eligible states could clarify their own attitudes. The Community underlined the important role that the Associated States would play in this exchange of information, thanks to the experience they had gained from their ten years of association.

On the other hand, the Associated States wondered whether the fact that the negotiations would not start 18 months before the expiry of the Yaounde Convention might not prejudice the advantages they had gained - advantages which the Community had claimed it wished to safeguard. With this in mind, they asked the Community whether, pursuant to Article 62 of the Convention, the actual negotiations could open between 15 and 20 September next. I must emphasize that the Community's answer to this question was perfectly clear and designed to remove all remaining doubts. At the meeting in Mauritius I made the following statement on the matter, which received the full support of the Associated States:

"In any event, the Community will at the preliminary conference and thus before 1 August, make proposals on the rules of procedure to be applied at the negotiations, and in particular, on the date on which they are to begin.



In view of the expiry date of the Yaoundé Convention, the Community is aware that the negotiations will have to begin as early as possible after the summer holidays, and whatever happens before the end of September".

It is not difficult to understand the disappointment felt by the Associated States that the questions of substance were not dealt with immediately; the Community is, however, doing all it can to ensure that answers to these questions are received by the Associated States in good time to allow them to contribute still more actively to the success of the Conference. The fact that the Community and the Associated States are committed to proposing that the negotiations themselves begin before the end of September strikes me as being of major importance and one of the factors which has enabled us to reaffirm our common political will to witness the accession of the greatest possible number of eligible states which have expressed an interest in the Association.

Mr President, I would like to refer now, very briefly, to the other matters which the Association Council dealt with at the Mauritius meeting. The Community was able to agree on an improvement of the arrangements for fruit and vegetables imported from the AASM, which will remain valid until the expiry of the Yaoundé Convention. This somewhat thorny question should therefore not cause us any more trouble for some time to come. The solution agreed upon involves the extension of the marketing timetable, on a duty-free basis, in accordance with the second proposal made by Mr Jean REY, the President, on his goodwill mission. Of course, the question will have to be re-examined in the context of future negotiations.

In the second place, the Association Council agreed to an exemption from the rules of origin for certain textile products exported by Mauritius; this was done in the spirit of the declaration annexed to the Port-Louis Agreement to allow the new Association State to adapt its production arrangements in respect of the products in question to the Association's requirements. Thanks to the efforts of all the Associated States, it proved possible to increase the quantities benefiting under this exemption by an amount which should allay the anxieties of the Mauritius authorities.

Thirdly, there was the question of sugar. However, neither the quantities (9,000 tons, where the AASM had asked for 50,000 tons), nor the practical arrangements planned by the Community to give effect to its declaration of principle of 10 October last were considered acceptable by the Associated States, so that the issue of sugar remains open.

The Community went on to provide information on the state of its talks with the Mediterranean countries. These negotiations, which will be held within the framework of a global policy, will nevertheless give priority to relations with the Maghreb countries, Spain, Israel and Malta, and are expected to lead to agreements containing separate sections on trade, cooperation and labour. The agreements would enter into force on 1 September 1974. The AASM pointed out that the countries concerned, some of which, incidentally, are African states, are exporters of products which compete directly with their own.

In a related field, the Community informed the Association Council of the progress of the talks with Brazil, which produces cocoa-butter and soluble coffee, and which is of course requesting concessions for these products. It had been understood that the AASM would be informed of the draft directives for the negotiations so that they could give their reactions, but, whilst having every sympathy for Brazil's position, they had already pointed out that a change in the Community's tariff policy for these products would seriously affect their trade, and they requested that no measures be taken until the Commission had given further study to the state of the market.

We also discussed the forthcoming multilateral talks in GATT. In this connection both the Community and the Associated States drew the Association Council's attention to the declarations made at the Paris Summit. On that occasion, as is well known, the Heads of State or Government of the nine Member States reaffirmed the Community's determination to encourage the development of international trade; this determination was to apply to all countries without exception. The Community then went on to declare itself 'ready to participate, as soon as possible, in the open-minded spirit that it has already shown, and according to the procedures laid down by the IMF and the GATT in negotiations based on the principle of reciprocity. These should make it possible to establish, in the monetary and commercial fields, stable and balanced economic relations, in which the interests of the developing countries must be taken fully into account'.

For their part, the Associated States referred to the African Charter on Cooperation, Development and Economic Independence, adopted in May 1973 at Addis Ababa by the Heads of State or Government of the Organization of African Unity. This Charter establishes objectives which the African governments are committed to defend at the multilateral trade talks, the most important among which are the adoption of effective joint measures to put an end to the continued deterioration in trading conditions for African countries.

At the proposal both of the Associated States and the Community, a procedural agreement was reached under which informative and consultative talks would be held by the individual Association bodies during the preparatory phase and during the negotiations themselves, on the understanding that joint meetings would take place on the spot, that is at the meeting of the GATT Preparatory Committee (in July) as well as at the GATT ministerial conference, during which the actual negotiations would be opened (in September in Tokyo).

By adopting this plan of action, moreover, the Association Council gave direct effect to the resolution on the ninth Annual Report of the Association Council, adopted at the end of last March at Kinshasa by the parliamentary Conference of the Association. You will remember that the Conference had expressed the wish in this connection that cooperation between the Association partners should be continued at the present level or even intensified.

But the Association Council's interest was attracted by a whole series of other points in this resolution, as well as two other resolutions adopted on the same occasion by the Parliamentary Conference. As far as the future of the Association was concerned, particular emphasis was placed on the need to avoid any move to deprive the Association of its 'partnership' content and to transform it into a mere aid agreement, the requirements of market stabilization and the growth of exports from the Associated States, and to strict compliance with the provisions of Article 62 of the Yaoundé Convention.

As far as the Community policy of cooperation and development is concerned, I would like to refer to the exemplary cooperation that has already been established. In order to promote coordination of activities by the Association partners in international organizations for economic cooperation and development, we should like to see the existing dialogue improved still further. As you know, a broad consensus already exists between us in these areas.

I would not like to complete this summary of the activities of the Association Council without mentioning a matter of great concern to public opinion, namely the dramatic consequences of the drought in the Sahel countries. The European Parliament adopted a resolution on this subject on 30 May last, of which Mr SPENALE, who drew up the report, has already informed you. There can be no question as to the effectiveness of the emergency aid supplied to the unfortunate inhabitants of those countries, in particular by the Community and by the Member States. The Associated States, at the Associated Council meeting, expressed their gratitude of the action taken, both under the terms of the Yaoundé Convention and on a bilateral level.

The consequences of this vast human tragedy, which it is our task to try to relieve, will be with us for several years. So many vital parts of the national resources of these countries have been lost that, left to themselves, they would be unable to make an economic recovery in a reasonable period. They have therefore expressed the wish that immediate measures be taken in various specific sectors to help in rebuilding their shattered economies, and that these actions, moreover, should not have to rely solely on the European Development Fund.

I personally believe that solidarity between Europe and Africa should continue to play a full part in a sector where it is absolutely vital. The decision to entrust the task of coordinating completed or proposed studies, as well as proposed measures for the reconstruction of the economies, to a coordinating committee based in Ouagadougou will undoubtedly increase the impact of this act of solidarity. Tomorrow, embracing new countries and new areas, may it provide the impulse for fruitful cooperation to help us attain that better future for which we all so fervently strive.

Speech by Mr CHEYSSON, Member of the Commission of the European Communities, to the Joint Committee of the Parliamentary Conference of the Association, Bruges, 28 June 1973.

---

It is a pleasure and an honour for me to speak today before the Joint Committee and to be able to inform it of the Commission's proposals and, perhaps even more importantly, convey the impressions and ideas which are beginning to emerge on a European level in preparation for the important talks due to get under way during the coming months.

To talk about this for the first time before the Joint Committee is particularly significant, since this parliamentary institution is one of the characteristic features of the Association; it is a characteristic which some people, it is true, find surprising, which is strange when one calls to mind some other attempts at parliamentary relations - the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, for example. What certainly is original, however, is that the agreement establishing the Association included this mixed parliamentary body among its institutions. According to what I have read in the verbatim reports and heard from various quarters, this forum allows very open and free discussions, which in my opinion are extremely valuable.

Since I have been a member of the Commission, debates of parliamentary institutions of the Association have come under discussion in the European Parliament on two occasions - as Sir Douglas Dodds-Parker will certainly recall very well, since he, like Mr Spenale, spoke on each occasion: one of these was in connection with the parliamentary meeting in the context of the Arusha agreement, parallel to your own - a meeting which was held last November in Nairobi - and the other in connection with that most important parliamentary conference in Kinshasa.

On each occasion I was very impressed by the great interest of the European parliamentarians who had taken part in these meetings. A thing that struck me particularly during the latter debate was that the great majority of members who spoke at Strasbourg were British. I think that this may be taken as an indication of how pleasantly surprised these members have been at the quality of debates in this field. I believe that you have developed a method of frank discussion which seems to me to be very important between nations that have completely different economic problems and cultural, sociological, and political environments.

I have been lucky enough in my career to have spent 15 years in developing countries and I have always found that the most worthwhile thing for me has been to seek to understand the real problems of these countries. Europeans like us can learn a lot and can understand a lot. To some extent, of course, this is achieved through discussions at administrative level, between governments and their diplomats, but it also happens, and perhaps more effectively, away from diplomatic salons and governmental meetings, by direct contact between people; and who can better understand, listen, better express themselves, than those who, in one way or another, possess a mandate to represent their people.

That is why I think that there is an element of originality in this Association, and it seems to me that all those who have had a hand in creating it have a right to be proud.

o o  
o

I have thus begun to speak of the Association and of factors which, to go by some years' experience should, in my opinion, give rise to reflection in Africa, in Europe and - this is something I would like to say more about at the end of my remarks - throughout the entire world. Looking at the way this Association has developed over a period of time, I believe that it has given birth to a series of quite original features and it would be a pity if these did not become more widely recognized, perhaps even more widely available.

These features are indeed so original that they often invite criticism from others. Why should you find this surprising? But why not be proud of the fact that others are able to criticize? This remark is of course inadequate in itself: it should be rounded off by the wish, which we all ought to entertain, that others may come to recognize the elements of this experience, possibly in the context of free discussion, if necessary adding their own improvements. No political system, and this is a purely political issue, no political system should be inflexible; but once these improvements have been obtained, we can only hope that others may progressively achieve the success that this Association has achieved.

In this connection, I would like to refer to two basic problems which I consider very important. First of all I would like to bring up that classic argument, which calls to mind the best scholastic arguments of the Middle Ages, between globalism and regionalism. You might think that I am very stupid, but I do not understand; or rather yes, I do understand the argument for globalism by those who are determined to do nothing, because by starting at a global level it is easy to ensure that problems assume such a magnitude that they will be declared insoluble. Once you arrive at this situation, no amount of brilliant rhetoric will ever lead to any action being taken.

Many years of discussions, often discussions of a very high quality, have unfortunately proved this to be true. Is there any point in recalling all the debates which have taken place in the various assemblies or other institutions of the United Nations? I doubt that anyone could improve on what has been said at the various UNCTAD meetings, or at the United Nations.

Experience has shown that whenever problems are tackled from the start on a world-wide scale, no progress is made. The reason for this is very simple: take a number of European countries and ask them to make a list of exceptions which are vital to them in view of their own economies, covering all products from all parts of the world. When all the exceptions have been added together - and each one in itself is justified - you end up with a list covering absolutely everything that can be imported, and as a result - if one includes the restrictions which the United States, Japan, the European countries, and the entire industrialized world all want to apply - liberalization of trade, which would be so desirable, becomes impossible to achieve.

Think about the stabilization of raw material prices: This or that country might perhaps be prepared to take action on a particular raw material that does not particularly affect its own economy; but if you lump all the industrialized countries together, the final result of all their discussions will be nil, just like it has been, let's face it, throughout the 15 years that the matter has been under discussion.

In other words, experience shows that you do not progress by trying to tackle all of the world's problems on a global scale. So if you are more pragmatic and less intelligent - and on this particular level, I myself don't feel very intelligent at all - you come to the conclusion that groups of countries brought together by history, geography, and economic ties really can achieve unexpected results. And if these results are of such a magnitude that the rest of the world cannot ignore them, then you have a real chance of impressing the rest of the world.

Let's say it in concrete terms. Suppose that preferential relations are established between Europe and Africa, in other words that Europe gives preference to Africa vis-à-vis other continents of the Third World. Suppose we can reach agreement on the Commission's proposals - which the individual European governments have not yet accepted - that Europe should in future institute a system of stabilizing export revenue, so that a bad harvest would not mean the sudden collapse of the development plans of an African country. Resources must be available to ensure that some speculative action on the other side of the world does not lead to an abrupt fall in prices that would mean the loss of export revenue for an African or Caribbean country which was in no way to blame for the speculative action, and thus the collapse of developments planned by the political authorities. Suppose that we finally achieve such a system of revenue stabilization between Europe and Africa - even if it is incomplete and does not apply to as many products as we would like - this would at least show that the theories developed at the various UNCTAD conferences could at last begin to be put into practice. At the next world meeting we would be able to say to those who have not yet granted free entry to their markets, who have not instituted this system of revenue stabilization, we will be able to say to them: how can you dare not to do this? That is the moment when other countries too will perhaps make the same choice, leading to a situation in which, there will be no further point in remaining tied to preferential arrangements, a situation in which the whole world will be able to act according to economic realities.

In other words, I want to reaffirm here today something which has long been a conviction of mine, formed not during my few weeks at the Commission of the European Communities, but during a period of years when I had the honour to serve you, Gentlemen, when for five years I was an official of yours, when it was my privilege to serve countries in Asia and North Africa (Algeria); I want to reaffirm my conviction that there is just one possible way of making any progress on a world-wide level; and that is by setting a regional example of such significance that the whole world is forced to take note.

Gentlemen, if you were not convinced, I would put a question: there is a man in Addis Ababa who in my opinion possesses great wisdom and whom I like very much; the man I am thinking of - and I would not express myself in this way if I were speaking of Ethiopia's Head of State, whom we all respect greatly - is the Secretary General of the Economic Commission for Africa, Robert Gardiner. This man has been in the service of the United Nations for many years. Why do you think Mr Gardiner, a person with a very independent mind, is so much in favour of a serious, thorough and searching study of the Commission's memorandum? It is simply because he has had enough of listening to the same things, debate after debate, without any result; and because he is convinced that if ideas such as those proposed by the Commission were applied to all of Africa, then the whole world would make progress. That is my first point.

The next point should be treated somewhat more circumspectly, given that I am a European, but it seems to me just as important. In what I have said I have always referred to Africa as a whole. I don't believe that a European can ever say anything else. As a continent, you have had your share of troubles and divisions. This continent, now that it is free, has decided to work towards African unity; the specialists have elaborated all the details, every African country has proclaimed its intention with the utmost vigour, the Heads of State or Government have solemnly endorsed it. I believe that whatever happens, it should never be possible for any proposal made by a non-African country or countries, or by a community organization such as ours, to be used or represented as being divisive. What Europe now has to offer in its talks with the African countries is being offered to all African countries that may wish to avail themselves of it. Looking at the path towards African unity to which - as your Heads of State or Government reiterated only a few weeks ago - you have decided so resolutely to commit yourselves, we say this: Gentlemen, we hope that, together, you will work with us, and our dream - and I say this quite categorically - our dream is that you will all work with us together in a single form of association.



This is my unshakable conviction. Perhaps the lucky chance that for five years placed me at the head of a technical organization of yours, an organization in which all the independent African countries, both French-speaking and English-speaking, were represented, perhaps this made me more aware of it. At any rate, we would like to see all of Africa with us in this Association, and if possible on a single basis. This point, and I believe it was the most important one to emerge from the meeting of the Council of Ministers on Monday and Tuesday in Luxembourg, has been recognized by all European governments as an objective that all of us in Europe would like to attain. Despite what certain newspapers may have said, the nine EEC countries were unanimous on this point: we would like to see all African countries adopt the same system of association with us, because then we would know that it could develop in Africa without provoking family quarrels, without countries becoming involved in arguments about who had chosen the most advantageous or politically wisest system. We would like you to stand together in your relations with us.

But this all-African edifice, if this is indeed something you want to strive for, must be based on certain realities. For one thing, you have had a great deal of experience with the positive matters I have mentioned; for another, we Europeans hope very much that you will not turn your backs on the experience you have shared with us and that you will want to remain associated with us in the same way that you have been. If that is what you do want - Mrs PETRY, the Belgian Secretary of State, referred to this on behalf of the Council of Ministers - you have an absolute and inviolable guarantee from the Europeans that everything that has been gained will remain available to you, that all the advantages which have been incorporated in our Association until now will still be available to you in the future: this guarantee on the part of the European governments is unconditional and can be taken absolutely at face value.

What this means is that the financial aid which has been granted during the past years will be maintained, maintained in real terms, of course, and not merely at its nominal value.

What this also means is that the Associated States will be able to take part in the implementation of the agreement and, particularly in the framework of the joint institutions of the Association, they will be able to direct its application.

This means above all that free entry of essential produce to the Common Market will be guaranteed. How will this be done? This is where we come to an interesting question.

Free entry must be assured on the basis of stability and permanence. There is no question of free entry for just one year, involving an annual meeting with a lot of eminent gentlemen from all over the world, and the question: Gentlemen? Do you agree to a continuation? Trade, economic relations, cannot be organized on an annual basis or even on a basis of five-year periods. The free entry

of produce from the Associated States - which we hope will include all of Africa (and when I say Africa, I mean Africa south of the Sahara) - must be guaranteed on a permanent and not on a temporary basis. It will have to be permanent and organized in such a way that it cannot be undermined by third parties.

Now, somebody once said to me that no one would object to this. That is being rather optimistic. I could give you a whole list of objectors here and now. Who are they at the moment? They are the countries that do not benefit from the preferential arrangements which Europe offers Africa. All of them object. They include also industrialized countries that have no intention of granting similar preferences, or of opening their markets. I do not have to name names. So, objections by others to the preferential arrangements granted by Europe must not be allowed to undermine them. Preferences granted by Europe to produce from the Associated States must be permanent and should not be open to challenge under international rules and regulations.

This preferential system, and this is the third point, should also be contractual. Why? Because it is our intention to set up a quasi-permanent system of relations between Africa and Europe and, within this quasi-permanent system, equality between the partners must be established and respected absolutely; also because it is essential that the parties to the Association should work together permanently, and it should therefore never be possible for Europe, unilaterally, to extend or alter what will have been incorporated in the Association agreement.

Where facilities or advantages are granted unilaterally, there is a very serious danger that unilateral changes or extensions will follow. I think that is evident. Take an example: Europe has decided on a system of generalized preferences. All right, when Europe wants to extend its generalized preferences to another country, it consults you, because you enjoy association status; but it does not consult other countries, because as far as they are concerned the granting of generalized preferences was a unilateral concession, not the result of a contractual agreement, thus leaving Europe with complete freedom to make any unilateral change it pleases. It is therefore essential that the preferential system which already exists between the Associated States and Europe - which in future will, let us hope, include a great many more associates - should be a contractual system giving you the right to examine any change in the system or any extension of it.

What we need, then, is a permanent, contractual, preferential system that is not open to challenge by international authorities. Of course, the fact that a preferential system exists in Europe for your products, and very soon now for those of your neighbours, must not place any burden on you. This must be made absolutely clear and I want to be quite categorical: we are not asking, and under no circumstances should we ask, for a preferential system in reverse.

We are not asking, and under no circumstances should we ask, for financial sacrifices from those countries with which we are or would like to be associated. The right of every Associated State to maintain or to establish customs duties or equivalent levies, this right must be clearly emphasized. It should be made plain, indeed, that wherever it is necessary to protect the economy of a country or to provide budget appropriations, each Associated State should have the right, on the basis of its own decision and subject only to a brief consultation with the Community, to maintain or to establish customs duties or equivalent levies.

To recapitulate, then, the conditions that must be met to establish a really meaningful system of preferences applicable to products from the Associated States exported to Europe are as follows: it must be permanent, it must be based on contracts; it must not be susceptible to challenge by international organizations such as GATT; it must involve no reciprocal preferences; it must not interfere with the inalienable right of each Associated State to maintain or to establish customs duties or equivalent levies.

You may be thinking that my opinion is perhaps interesting but that I am wasting your time by expounding it at such length. However, at the risk possibly of being rather indiscreet, I can tell you that I have said exactly the same thing, expressed in the same terms that I have just used here to you, to the Council of Ministers, who have unanimously supported the conditions I have just outlined. You thus have a basic definition of the way the European countries are thinking; but it should be made clear that negotiations are about to start and that the way Europe is thinking is therefore only one of the factors to be taken into consideration, because it is our hope - and once again may I quote what I told the Council of Ministers - that all the interested countries will want to adopt the same form of relations with Europe. If, as a result, all the states felt that one of the proposals should be changed, the Community would re-examine its position. In other words, our first priority is that, if you so desire, all of you in Africa should become associated with us on the same basis. Under these conditions we would say to you that you can retain, without exception, everything that has been agreed between us in the past. As far as the free entry of your exports to Europe is concerned, as well as the preferential system which we are offering you, we will say that we believe it should be contractual, permanent, not open to dispute and that, under it, each Associated State should have the right to impose levies or import duties.

That is what we will say to you. But if, on one of these points, all the African States were to say to us that we were wrong, then - because we want to see all the African States around the same table - the Community would be prepared to re-examine its position. That is what the Commission has proposed.

I am not going to say to you that the governments have endorsed this position unanimously, but I do say that the course we have proposed has now been accepted. I am now going to be asked, of course, why I spoke of several formulae? Because, unfortunately, it is possible that some of the African states won't accept the formulae you know and would wish to continue; in such a case, we, the Community, would like to have from our governments the authorization to consider a less complex formula. But what I am going to say may sound paradoxical: It is my hope that we shall never have to make the choice between the three formulae; for if all of you agree on the most complete of the formulae, the one worked out by you yourselves, the Associated States, this formula which comes so close to the very theories which the nationalists, rightly, propounded before the various international bodies (in that respect you are well ahead of the rest of the world) then there simply won't be any need to choose between the three formulae, because everybody will go for the same one; that is to say the most comprehensive one, namely yours.

That is the crux of the matter. It is a great challenge. These are political negotiations of great importance insofar as their regional nature will inevitably have global consequences, and because the whole of Africa is not something that can be ignored anywhere in the world, so that what we're going to do, - you and your African colleagues together with us Europeans - will have a world-wide significance. What this perhaps represents is the beginning of the establishment of this type of permanent system of relations between industrialized and developing countries of this type of association, based on the very concepts developed by you in the framework of the Yaounde Convention. Undoubtedly, this trend will become more and more widespread in the world of tomorrow. This is a great dream of mine; I find it very symbolic that it was at the same meeting of the Council of Ministers that, on the one hand, these ideas were recognized as reasonable, and, on the other, we, the Commission, received authorisation to negotiate with the North African countries, the Mediterranean countries, with a view to establishing a system of relations characterized by permanent free trade (as is already the case, as you know, with Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco, Tunisia and many other countries) and when I say permanent I mean guaranteed by contract.

At the very moment, therefore, that the European governments are beginning to recognize the most desirable course but are waiting for you to say what you want - for it is up to you in Africa, to decide what is to become of this Association; at the very moment when specific authority has been given to the Commission to negotiate agreements with the North African countries - which, although they are individual agreements on this occasion, nevertheless result from the same will to place trade and financial aid on the permanent footing essential to the promotion of genuine development in each of these countries - it is in fact your decision which will be paramount.

We are at a stage of historical development which affects more than just Africa, more than just your 19 countries, and which can be of tremendous importance. It is because I am so convinced of this, Mr. President, that I have spoken at such length.