



european parliament

information series

the sittings

6

june 1976

CONTENTS

	Page
The week in Strasbourg	3
European Conservatives' censure motion defeated	4
Gaston Thorn's veiled optimism about July Summit	7
36 million pounds help for Friuli earthquake region	8
Commission to set up women's bureau	10
The road to Puerto Rico	12
Plea for emergency help for Lebanon	13
UNCTAD IV: looking back at Nairobi	13
Tripartite Conference: looking ahead to Luxembourg	14
Need for common policies: energy, industry, foreign	17
Competition policy	19
Community law takes precedence	21
Parliament's 55,274,994 u.a. preliminary estimates for 1977	22
Public accounts committee set up	22
Commissioner Lardinois attacks Potato Marketing Board	23
Is the drought a disaster?	24
Other points	25
Question Time	28
Action taken on Parliament's advice	34
Notes	35
References	36
Next sittings	38

SESSION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

1976 – 1977

Sittings held in Strasbourg

Monday, 14th June

to

18th June 1976

The week in Strasbourg

The highlight – in political terms – of Parliament’s week in Strasbourg was undoubtedly the censure motion on the Commission put down by the European Conservatives. Though it was clear from the start that the motion would fail – both the Socialist and Christian Democrat groups had decided in advance to vote against it – the debate was something of a cliffhanger: no one was certain whether Sir Peter Kirk would withdraw the motion, or take it to the vote.

But Sir Peter argued that the Commission was guilty of “flagrant maladministration” in handling the milk surplus question – and so, for the first time in Community history, Parliament wielded its ultimate weapon. The fact that it merely fizzled – the vote was 109 to 18 against censure – detracted little from the historic nature of the occasion.

The week also saw the last appearance of Council President Gaston Thorn – who managed to imply that there would, after all, be some kind of Community representation at the Puerto Rico economic summit, and who delivered an eagerly-awaited statement on direct elections. He came close to expressing optimism that agreement on a seating formula would be reached at the European Council meeting in July – as he put it, no one State would dare to run the risk of assuming responsibility for a failure.

Parliament also discussed the precedence of Community over national law, set up a Public Accounts Committee, debated the results of the UNCTAD IV Conference, and concluded its week by voting a 60 million supplementary budget to provide aid to the victims of the Friuli earthquake disaster.

European Conservatives' censure motion defeated

The motion put down by Sir Peter Kirk for the European Conservatives censuring the Commission for its failure to solve the milk powder surplus problem and for failing to consult Parliament about changes in its proposals was defeated by 109 votes to 18. There were 4 abstentions. The votes in favour came from the European Conservative Group and from Mrs Winifred Ewing, the Scottish Nationalist MP, who sits in the House as an Independent Member.

The censure motion lingered on two crucial issues: whether the Commission is to be held responsible for the present skim milk powder surplus and whether the Commission failed or not to enter into proper consultation with Parliament about changes in its proposals for dealing with the surplus.

As the vote suggests, the vast majority of the European Parliament believes that if any one is to blame for skim milk powder piling up in steadily growing quantities, it is not the Commission: if it is anybody's fault, it is the Council's. The Commission has made a number of proposals for disposing of the surplus and the Council has ignored them. Even more to the point, it now has fresh proposals for introducing the idea of dairy farmers' sharing some of the responsibility for any surplus their production may result in. This idea has been going the rounds for some time. It is hardly the Commission's fault if the Council is slow in taking it on board.

The reason why it is so slow is, of course, because it is hard not to see the idea of 'shared responsibility' as a way of saying the Community herd must be reduced — which is what the European Conservatives see as inevitable anyway. And herein lies the rub. No one particularly wants to reduce the herd. The dairy farmers are the mainstay of European agriculture. They are the ones for whom earning a living is a 365 days a year graft. And to undermine their way of life would be an agricultural disaster. It would also be a financial one. Because, to use the argument always used in defence of the common agricultural policy, surpluses are always cheaper than shortages anyway.



'For nine years this Parliament has been asking, begging, beseeching the Commission to produce the answer to the dairy problem....now is their last chance to produce the answer or else they must go'



'The Commission has done its job'

So complain as the European Conservatives did that the Community could end the year with a butter surplus as well as a milk powder one, the balance of opinion was solidly against them. The inference is inescapable. The European Parliament is not prepared to sack the Commission over a surplus.

Nor did the European Conservatives get much change on the other issue – the procedural one: had the Commission entered into proper consultation with Parliament before changing its proposals for disposing of the milk powder surplus? The European Conservatives said ‘no’. They pointed out that it was nearly three weeks before even the people most affected by the Commission’s new scheme actually knew what was going on. (A deposit is now required on the purchase of fodder proteins. This is redeemed when a quantity of milk powder is purchased for inclusion in the feed).

But Mr Jan de Koning (Du, CD) said ‘yes’: And Mr de Koning is one of the most influential agricultural specialists in the House. He was quite satisfied that Commissioner Petrus Lardinois had entered into proper consultations with Parliament. So that really was that. And all the rest was pretty marginal – or rather concerned with wider issues than these two crucial points of Commission responsibility.

Not that the matter is likely to end there. If the Commission emerged unscathed, it may also have been because of a tacit assumption that the ideas in the pipeline will produce an answer to the surplus problem. What will happen if the situation is no better in December is an open question.

Similarly the debate may help redefine relations between Parliament and the Commission.

To sum up, Parliament rejected the motion tabled because, if it has a quarrel, it is with the Council not the Commission; because, in any case, it has a great deal of sympathy with the dairy farmer and the common agricultural policy generally; and because it is satisfied that the Commission took proper care to consult with Parliament on how the milk powder surplus is to be disposed of.

It is worth noting that all the Commissioners were present for the debate except for Mr Albert Borschette (who is unwell and to whom Parliament has sent wishes for a speedy recovery), Mr Altiero Spinelli, who was fighting the Italian election and Mr Carlo Scarascia Mugnozza the other Italian Commissioner.

The speakers for the motion included Sir Peter Kirk (Br) (whose speech was described by Commission President François-Xavier Ortoli as 'very brilliant'), Mr James Scott-Hopkins (Br) and Mr Ralph Howell (Br) for the European Conservatives. Those against included the President and Mr Petrus Lardinois for the Commission and, from the Parliament, Mr Ludwig Fellermaier (Ge) for the Socialists, Mr Jan de Koning (Du) for the Christian Democrats, Mr Jan Baas (Du) for the Liberals, Mr Albert Liogier (Fr) for the European Progressive Democrats and Mr Nicola Cipolla (It) for the Communists.

Mr Gaston Thorn's veiled optimism about July Summit

Mr Gaston Thorn said that after meeting with Foreign Ministers at the Château de Senningen last weekend he was now more optimistic that the European Council meeting on July 12th-13th would reach a decision on direct elections. Mr Thorn feels that no Member State is now willing to assume the responsibility



'My impression is that we shall reach an agreement in July because, in my opinion, no one is ready to take the responsibility for a failure'

for a failure to get a decision. The outstanding issue is, of course, how many seats each of the Community's nine Member States is to get in the first directly elected Parliament – hopefully in 1978.

Parliament was discussing a motion put down by the Socialist, Christian Democrat, Liberal and European Conservative Groups stressing its hostility to the idea put forward by France that the number of Members in the first directly elected Parliament should continue to be 198 as at present. The motion was agreed to.

36 million pounds help for Friuli earthquake region

The European Parliament has passed a supplementary budget of 60 million units of account (some 36m pounds) for help to the Friuli earthquake region. Mr Michel Cointat (Fr, EPD), rapporteur for the Budgets Committee made it clear that, at least as far as Parliament is concerned, this 60 mua need only be a beginning.

The money will help towards schemes for getting farming back to normal; it will help towards repairing road, bridges, electricity supply networks and water mains; and it will also be channelled through the hill farming directive for less-favoured areas, the Friuli region being re-classified to bring it within the scope of the directive.

*'I found the experience of my
visit to the Friuli region
heart-rending'*



Lord Bessborough (Br, EC), who visited the region on behalf of the European Parliament gave the House his impressions of the devastated area.

'I found the experience of my visit heart-rending. While I was there the 923rd body was drawn out of the rubble. I saw many of the ruined churches and houses in the area.

All I have time to do this afternoon is to pay a tribute to the magnificent work of all the relief-workers, whether they were the Italian local authorities – I had discussions with the mayors concerned – the Italian Army, or the pioneer battalion of the German mountain division, whose bulldozers were clearing the streets with remarkable efficiency and whose admirably-equipped surgical units in tents were performing noble work.

I admired, to, the gallant efforts of the French protection corps – the Pompiers – as well as those of the Austrians and Canadians, who lost a helicopter while I was there.

Those long hours in the devastated area were a moving experience. An extraordinary silence reigned over the small town of Gemona, to which few inhabitants had returned.

Only the birds sang. Yet, despite the terrible distress, one of the Italians present at the time of the first tremors was able to describe to me quite gaily what it was like when, as he said, 'the earth dances'. It made you weep. It was fortunate that the first tremor occurred at 9 o'clock on a warm evening when most people were sitting outside their houses, otherwise the casualties would have been much more severe – not a thousand dead but many thousands dead, and the casualties would have amounted to tens of thousands.'

Lord Bessborough added, 'I must admit that I was a little disturbed by the fact that immediate aid from other parts of Italy, or even from Switzerland, Germany or Austria, did not reach the area as rapidly as one might have hoped. I hope therefore that the House may consider that the formation of a rescue-corps, whether for earthquakes, floods or other disasters, might be desirable. I would not necessarily think of a completely independent corps, but that the Commission might have within its capability a directorate which was fully aware of all the national resources and international resources – the Red Cross – which might be available within the Community, and in the event of further disasters be able to mobilize those units more rapidly than was the case in Friuli. From great disasters one god thing may arise. The god thing in this case was that this terrible disaster increased Community solidarity and sympathy.'

President François-Xavier Ortoli who visited the area on 22nd May also praised the work being done in the Friuli region and the courage and dignity of the people there. He was asking approval for 60 m.u.a. to be made available including 45 m.u.a. under the Guidance Section of the EAGGF and 15 m.u.a. for infrastructure work.

The Commission's aim was to make a lot of money available at once to underline the Community's solidarity with the Friuli region.

As to the future, this deserved careful thought. The Commission would certainly look into the idea of an emergency headquarters to mobilize help at short notice.

Mr Luigi Rosati (It, CD), who comes from Bolzano, expressed his thanks on behalf of all in the Friuli region. All the money will go to the local authorities to be used in the best way possible. Mr Franco Concas (It, S), who is from Vittoria Veneto, said: 'There are fresh tremors nearly every day, leaving the people in a states of suspense and fear that something even worse may occur.'

**Commission to set up a women's bureau:
there will be a woman in charge**

Commission Vice-President, Dr Patrick Hillery, today told Parliament that his department is setting up a special women's bureau to promote women's interests throughout the Community especially as regards jobs. There will be a woman in charge but, added Dr Hillery alluding to criticism raised in the debate, men would be employed 'at the lower levels'.

The criticism came in a debate triggered off by a question from several members of the Socialist Group including Lady Fisher of Rednal (Br) and Mr John Evans (Br). It came from Mrs Elaine Kellett-Bowman (Br, EC) who was highly critical of the preponderance of men in the higher grades of the European civil service. 'The two ladies sitting on the Commission bench today comprise 0.7 per cent of all males and females in the grades A5 and A6 in the Commission's service' she said.

But Mrs Kellett-Bowman's was no lone voice. All speakers were to some degree indignant that women still seem to be struggling for recognition as equals.

Opening the debate, Lady Fisher reminded the House that there are 35 million women working in the Community. They make up one third of the total work force. But they should not be looked upon as a reserve to be drawn on in times of prosperity and ignored in times of recession. Lady Fisher was concerned about women having access to a wider range of jobs particularly through training and more imagination by employers about hours. She quoted the ILO figures: women have a choice of 25 jobs; men of 300.

Dr Hillery agreed with her. A directive on equal pay had been adopted on 10 February and the directive on equal access to jobs, promotion and training in December. But the Commission did not regard this as the end of the road.

‘These two Directives represent a major step forward in the social progress of millions of women in the Community. But that is not the end of the road. A more long-term job needs to be done in changing traditional anti-feminist attitudes and creating a climate in which it will be regarded as normal that women be treated as men are on their individual merits. This is why the Commission published simultaneously with its proposal for a Directive on equal opportunity a Memorandum dealing with the range of obstacles facing women in the employment field and possible approaches to solving them.

Our next task is to extend equality of treatment into the field of social security where at present there are serious discriminations to the disadvantage of women. Preliminary work is well under way in my Services for the preparation of a first Directive in this field, and Parliament will have an opportunity of debating our proposal in the Autumn.’

Among the other points raised in the debate by Mrs Clara Kruchow (Da, L), Mrs Winifred Ewing (Br, Ind), Mr John Evans (Br, S) and Mrs Elaine Kellett-Bowman (Br, EC) was a general demand for more information. As Lady Fisher put it, ‘If the Commission can make recommendations on how we measure suspended particles in surface water it should be child’s play to bring forward statistics about women.’

But all welcomed the setting up of a women’s bureau.

Another point – raised notably by Mr Michael Yeats (Ir, EPD) – was the need to bring about a change of attitude. He spoke of Irish banks who, until six years ago, had refused to employ women because they would “destroy the confidence of the public in the integrity of our banking system.” Mr Yeats also attacked the fallacy that absenteeism is higher among women than men.

Mrs Winifred Ewing drew on similar examples from her own career first as a barrister then as a politician of men outnumbering women. She is glad women will now be able to sue. But she is concerned to about the more general unfairness women are subject to because they are women.

Another point causing some controversy was an advertisement for posts at the new Vocational Training Centre which specified that the senior position was to be filled by a man and the junior one by a woman. Dr Hillery was slightly mystified. He asked for a question to be put down so it can be looked into.

'It must be the concern of everyone that women are not treated as a labour reserve to be attracted in times of prosperity and dismissed in times of depression.'



Mr Evans spoke highly of the great women in politics for setting an example to all, particularly Mrs Golda Meir. He praised the courage of the Tory Party in appointing a woman as leader.

But he concluded with what was perhaps the most telling comment of the debate: time is not on men's side. They have made a pretty shabby mess of things. Perhaps the generation of women now growing up as the equals of men will make a better job of it. They could hardly do worse.

The road to Puerto Rico

A motion on the Community's participation in Puerto Rico Conference was withdrawn after Mr Gaston Thorn, President of the Council, had assured the House that an agreement on this point had already been reached at official level. He added that this had been the main point of discussion at the Senningen meeting of Foreign Ministers. This was taken to mean that both the President of the Council and the President of the Commission would go to Puerto Rico, although Mr Thorn did not say as much at the time.

Plea for emergency help for Lebanon

Parliament agreed to a motion put down by Mr Jean Durieux (Fr) (for the Liberals) calling for emergency measures to help relieve the sufferings of the people in Lebanon including the refugees. The vote was unanimous with only the Communists abstaining.

Speaking for the Communists, Mr Marcel Lemoine (Fr) wanted a clear condemnation of Syria's intrusion into Lebanon but he got no support. Mr Jan Broeksz (Du) for the Socialists endorsed the motion precisely because it called for humanitarian aid and left politics on one side. Mr Christian de la Malène (Fr) for the European Progressive Democrats spoke of his sense of indignation, shame and sorrow at the world's indifference to the death of an exemplary democracy.

Mr Norbert Hougardy (Be, L), who spoke to the question, argued that the key to the Lebanon problem is a long-term solution for Palestine. He spoke of Christians and Muslims living tolerantly together until recently.

UNCTAD IV: looking back at Nairobi

This was, as Mr Arie van der Hek (Du, S) pointed out, a peculiar debate: after listening to statements from Council President Gaston Thorn and Commissioner Claude Cheysson on the results of the Nairobi Conference, Parliament spent the best part of two hours airing its views on the subject – without so much as a motion to vote on at the end of it all.

There were several points which speakers returned to again and again: the Community's inability to speak with one voice, the coherence of the Group of 77 (currently 114) developing countries, the lack of influence of the industrialized East Bloc countries, and the fact that, if nothing else, the industrialized world and the third world were still on speaking terms.

Opening the debate, Mr Thorn insisted that the Press had overplayed the disagreements, and placed too little emphasis on the resolutions which the Conference had adopted. The tricky matters – raw materials, the stabilization fund, the question of debts – would form the basis of continuing discussions in the future – so nowhere has the door been actually closed. He regretted the failure of the EC countries to adopt a common stand, but welcomed that none has actually been obstructive. And he noted that, despite disagreements in the

Western camp, the third world was perfectly aware that the ideological noises from the USSR and its allies were no substitute for what the West could offer.

Commissioner Cheysson felt that the Conference had identified the problems, even if it hadn't solved them. The third world had come to expect a lot from the Community, which had done much to pioneer constructive relations with them. If the EC had not been able to speak with one voice at Nairobi, at least it continued to do so at the Paris North-South dialogue. It was in some ways unfortunate that, since the EC per se was not a member of the UN, each of its nine Members had been invited to UNCTAD separately. In Paris there was only one microphone for the whole Community.

Most speakers in the subsequent debate agreed that the Conference had not been a total failure. Lord Reay (Br, EC) stressed that the absence of major conflicts at least ensured the continuation of the North-South dialogue. Nairobi had postponed many of the problems, but provided this opportunity to continue talking about them.

Mr Pierre Deschamps (Be, CD) agreed, but was worried that some of the disagreements of Nairobi might reappear in Paris. He also referred to the scant impression the Communists had made on the developing countries, a point echoed by Mr Eric Blumenfeld (Ge, CD), who said that the East took only 5 per cent of total third world commodity exports. (Mr Cheysson later pointed out that that was because the USSR was largely self-sufficient, whereas the west needed the third world's primary products.)

Lord Walston (Br, S) felt that one reason why Nairobi had been less than successful was because the Nine had not prepared themselves sufficiently – maybe they should start now to prepare for UNCTAD V. Mr Pierre Lagorce (Fr, S) was impressed by the unanimity of the Group of 77, despite American attempts to play up differences. US influence was on the wane in the third world. He also felt that the Nine, with their record of success over Lomé, should have done better at Nairobi.

Tripartite conference: looking ahead to Luxembourg 'More training centres and fewer music centres'

Parliament's debate on the June 24th Tripartite Conference in Luxembourg – between the two sides of industry and the Community – focussed on what must be the overriding social problem of the day, unemployment. And there was

'Targets are not popular with ministers, but if we are to carry conviction with the trade unions and the ordinary man in the street, we must have targets for reduced unemployment, inflation and growth. We must have these targets if we are to persuade people the Community is serious.'



broadly-based support for the Commission's guidelines 'for a Community strategy for full employment and stability,' although some speakers added proposals of their own.

The debate centred around two reports, one by Mr Helmut Artzinger (Ge, CD) on the preparation for the Tripartite Conference, the other by Mr Ernest Glinne (Be, S) on two documents and a motion on the subject.

Mr Artzinger, introducing his report, said there were three main reasons why unemployment was not at present decreasing significantly in spite of the current recovery. (1) A lot of industries still had enough capacity, because they had simply not reduced staff to any great extent during the recession; (2) There had been a demographic change in the labour market itself – there were now more people looking for employment; (3) There was now an 'investment gap' – not enough had been invested to provide new capacity.

Like many subsequent speakers, Mr Artzinger stressed that the economic growth rate was critical: too much could risk a renewal of the inflationary cycle. The social partners would therefore have to moderate their demands, and the State its expenditure.

Mr Glinne ran through the main points of his motion, placing special emphasis on the structural causes of unemployment and drawing attention to the fact that

the aims of the developing countries to account for 25 per cent of world industrial production by the end of the century (present figure: 7 per cent) would mean a reform of European industrial capacities.

Mr Ole Espersen (Da, S) also laid stress on the long-term prospects for full employment – the measures proposed by the Commission were likely only to solve the short-term problem. He stressed the need for more worker participation in industrial decision-making. The Tripartite Conference was vital, he thought ‘unless it achieves results, many citizens will lose faith in the Community’s ability to help them’.

For the Christian Democrats, Mr Kurt Härzschel (Ge) said that the Tripartite Conference might better have been a four-party conference – with the consumers’ associations included.

Mr Thomas Nolan (Ir, EPD) made an impassioned appeal on behalf of those leaving full-time education and entering the job market for the first time. Many would go straight from school to the dole. He suggested making the retirement age more flexible, so that those who wanted to retire earlier – for health reasons, say – could. This would make at least a few more jobs available at the bottom end of the labour market.

Sir Brandon Rhys Williams (Br, EC) said the EC needed ‘more training centres and less music centres’ if people were to be kept in employment. He agreed with Mr Espersen that worker’s participation was vital, and praised German legislation in this field as being exemplary. He stressed that there existed in the Community universal agreement on objectives – but these objectives were simply not being implemented. It was here that the Tripartite Conference could help.

Mr Herman Schwörer (Ge, CD) stressed that unless inflation could be got down and kept down, no amount of effort to reduce unemployment would be of any avail.

Lord Ardwick (Br, S) said we needed more training centres and more music centres – and to achieve that we needed growth. So far the EC had failed to deal with unemployment – it was time we set ourselves targets, and stick to them.

Mrs Elaine Kellett-Bowman (Br, EC) agreed with Mr Härzschel on the need for the consumers to be represented at the Tripartite Conference. She also thought that the EC’s social, regional and agricultural funds should be stepped up, as Mr Glinne had suggested in his motion.

Mr William Hamilton (Br, S) said he found the debate depressing. 'Our problems are minute in the international context',s he said. We should be wary of transferring our problems to the less developed countries – he referred to how the EC cut down its textile imports from certain developing countries during the textile crisis of 1975. What was wanted was cooperation between governments and organized labour.

Lord Patrick Gordon Walker (Br, S) thought that investment should be got going before the coming bom arrived – otherwise the necessary structural changes would be impossible, and the result would be a short-lived consumer-led bom. He also supported the idea of employment premiums to create jobs – the savings on unemployment benefits would go a long way towards financing such a scheme.

Mr Georges Carpentier (Fr, S) introduced a note of dissent into the debate when he said that, as a Socialist, he could not agree that labour should moderate their pay claims until such time as inflation had been eradicated. After that, workers' income should be indexed to national wealth in terms of GNP.

Replying to the debate, Commissioner Wilhelm Haferkamp said that the Tripartite Conference had been well-prepared. He agreed that, in its strategy, the Commission had emphasized the short-term, but that did not mean it wanted to neglect structural or other problems. He was applauded when he said that it was simply impossible to do everything at once – cut employment, reduce inflation, improve social benefits, increase aid, etc. But he agreed that social policy deserved the same priority as economic policy.

The Commission's strategy, he stressed, was not an à la carte programme, from which countries could pick out those items they liked best. It was a case of all or nothing if it was going to work.

Parliament agreed unanimously to Mr Artzinger's motion (with one abstention) and to Mr Glinne's (with 2 abstentions).

Need for common policies

Energy

Commission Vice-President Henri Simonet told Parliament that the British and the French were engaged in a "dialogue of the Deaf" over what was agreed or

not agreed at the Rome Summit of December 1975 over the floor price of oil. Because of this the planned Energy Council meeting had not been held. Agreement has however been reached at official level on a contingency plan for the share-out of oil supplies in the event of a crisis. Mr Simonet hoped this would firm up into a Community agreement.

He was replying to a motion put down by Mr Gerd Springorum (Ge, CD) the highly respected chairman of Parliament's energy committee which calls for a far firmer Community line on coal. Mr Simonet agreed with the thinking but not with all Mr Springorum – who had the support of all sides of the House – was asking for. After all, he said, coal still accounts for only one-fifth of the EC's energy. He could not accept that aids to the coal industry be made obligatory or stretched over 25 years.

Turning to the wider question of energy policy, Mr Simonet said the Community was in a state of fundamental indecision. For this reason he welcomed Mr Springorum's motion and the comments of the House. He hoped their joint efforts in pressing for a Community energy policy would be to some effect.

All the speakers in the debate, Mr Wolfgang Schwabe (Ge), for the Socialists, Mr Marcel Vandewiele (Be), for the Christian Democrats, Mr Albert Liogier (Fr), for the European Progressive Democrats, Mr John Osborn (Br), for the European Conservatives and Mr Pierre Giraud (Fr, S) and Mr William Hamilton (Br, S) speaking in their own names were concerned at the way the coal industry was allowed to run down.

Mr Hamilton (whose father was a miner who suffered a tragic death from pneumoconiosis) reminded the House that coal was a greater asset than all the oil and gas put together.

He thought, incidentally, more publicity should be given to the Community's help to the British coal industry.

Mr Hamilton was concerned about the vulnerability of North Sea rigs. Mr Osborn was worried about being dependent for oil on politically insecure sources. He believes we are living in a fool's paradise over energy.

Industry

Vice-President of the Commission, Mr Henri Simonet, standing in for his colleague, Mr Altiero Spinelli, failed to convince either Mr Jan Broeksz (Du, S),

who moved the oral question on industrial policy, or Mr Kai Nyborg (Da, EPD) or Mr Tom Normanton (Br, EC) that the Community was making any real progress towards a genuine industrial policy.

But unless a comprehensive Community policy is worked out, Mr Normanton said, Europe will remain simply a grouping of nine markets, not the single market it aspires to be.

Foreign

Should not all the Community's external relations, with all they imply, fit into some coherent policy, asked Mr Jean Durieux (Fr, L) in an oral question put down for Mr Gaston Thorn and Sir Christopher Soames to reply to. Both agreed but Sir Christopher, in particular, put the main accent on the difficulties confronting the Community. The gist of the debate, in speech after speech, was regret that the Community has no foreign policy even though, as Mr Thorn said, if it did as well in other spheres as in foreign policy it would not be doing so badly.

Competition policy

This afternoon's debate on competition policy turned into a discussion on the merits of the market economy – which might, Mr Georges Carpentier (Fr, S) said, be the best system there was when it worked, but might also be the worst when it didn't.

The debate was on an oral question to the Commission, which asked, among other things, about the granting of national aid, export credits, the dismantling of State monopolies, the consumer protection and information service, and the setting up of a European office for competition policy.

Commissioner George Thomson, whose normal responsibility is regional policy, stood in for his colleague Mr Borschette (who is ill) and gave a detailed reply to all the points raised. In fact, he said, Members of the House would probably find all their questions answered in the Commission's Fifth Annual Report on Competition Policy.

Referring to the inventory of state aids, Mr Thomson said that the draft was now being discussed in the individual Member States.

However, because of changing circumstances, it might well be out of date when it appeared. It was also unrealistic to draw up a timetable for reducing aids. It was, at any rate, the Commission's job to ensure that State aids were relevant and justified. As to export credits, it was important to distinguish between internal EC exports and those to third countries. In the latter case, the Commission wanted to see arrangements harmonized.

Both the Italians and French had brought in legislation to end the tobacco monopoly in their countries. The preliminary consumer protection and information programme was going to be implemented as soon as possible; various draft directives on consumer protection were in preparation.

Finally, as regards an office for competition policy, Mr Thomson felt the time was far from ripe for such a move; as it was, the Commission itself had all necessary powers.

It was Mr Thomson's concluding remarks, however, that set the tone for the subsequent debate. Some Members on the right of the House, he thought, might find it intellectually easier to get back to a simple laissez-faire approach – whilst some of those on the left might prefer to see complete State control of the economy. He himself thought that only a mixed system, despite its difficulties, could provide any lasting assurance of freedom and prosperity.

Lord Patrick Gordon Walker (Br, S), who spoke next, agreed wholeheartedly with Commissioner Thomson. No system could work perfectly, but ours worked better than most. It was difficult to keep a balance between too much and too little State intervention – and to do so successfully instinct was better than dogma.

On that point, Mr Helmut Artzinger (Ge, CD) was in full agreement. Even the dogmatic Germans, he said, recognized that you had to be flexible – the oral question had been put simply out of concern that state intervention, during the recent period of recession, might have been excessive and led to distortions of competition.

Mr Tom Normanton (Br, EC), to, opposed dogma 'at either end of the spectrum', the Conservatives were certainly not in favour of laissez-faire in the Adam Smith sense. The textile and shipping industries were examples of areas where regulation was essential to preserve jobs.

In the opinion of Mr Tom Molloy (Br, S) who was making his maiden speech, laissez-faire was on the way out. He thought that Mr Thomson should adopt a firmer stance – not plant himself in the middle of the road. To that, Commissioner Thomson agreed that he was standing in the middle of the road. But it was a very wide one, and in any case, the middle was preferable to being in a ditch on the left or the right of it.

Community law takes precedence.

Introducing his report, Mr Hector Rivierez (Fr, EPD) went through the events that had led up to the ruling of the Second Senate of the German Federal Constitutional Court that national courts had the right to approach it to determine the validity of a Community law. The point at issue, quite simply, is the supremacy of Community law as laid down in the treaties. If courts in each Member State could contest Community law, the whole structure would collapse, Mr Rivierez said. Did the fact that ‘fundamental rights’ were at issue make any difference? The answer to that had been made clear by the European Court of Justice on 14 May 1974, when it had declared that it could not uphold any measure incompatible with the fundamental rights recognized and protected by the constitutions of the Member States.

Mr Jan Broeksz (Du, S) felt the entire matter, though full of legal intricacies, was of little practical importance. Nevertheless, the European Parliament would do well to keep its eye on the matter.

Sir Derek Walker-Smith (Br, EC) emphasized the fact that EC law related only to matters governed by the treaties. Outside this area national law remained supreme. The German Federal Constitutional Court held the view that German citizens should have the full protection of the Basic Law (Grundgesetz), regardless of Community law. This view had been reached by eminent jurists and deserved respect, whatever else. The question of fundamental rights was vitally important – the best mechanism must now be sought to guarantee them at Community and national levels.

Mr Jacques Santer (Lu, CD) saw the issue very much in terms of democratic legitimacy. How could the primacy of EC law be justified in the absence of more democracy in the Community, he wanted to know. The problem would ultimately be resolved only when the European Parliament was directly elected and was endowed with full legislative powers.

Mrs Winifred Ewing (Br, Ind) supported the idea of drawing up a catalogue of fundamental rights – people should understand what their rights were, and that was best done if they were down in writing. Such a catalogue would involve upgrading the relevant laws of each country to the best that existed in the Community.

Mr Heinrich Aigner (Ge, CD) agreed that what was wanted was secure fundamental rights at European level.

Referring to Mrs Ewing's remarks, Mr Tam Dalyell (Br, EC) felt that the fundamental rights of the Scots were well looked after. He rejected talk of too much de-centralization – nobody wanted a Community of 26 States. Mrs Ewing should make sure that the Shetland Islanders didn't seek independence from Scotland – after all, two-thirds of 'Scottish' oil was theirs.

Parliament's budget for 1977 stands at 55,274,994 ua

There was a pronounced note of austerity in this afternoon's discussion of Parliament's own preliminary draft estimates for 1977. The figure shown represents a 6 1/2 per cent increase on 1976 but even so is not going to offset the effects of inflation. It does not allow for any salary increases that may be awarded in the next budgetary year.

It was Mr Heinrich Aigner (Ge, CD) who pointed out that if Parliament had a single seat there could be a saving of 10 per cent to 20 per cent.

The preliminary draft estimates were put to the vote and agreed to.

Public Accounts Committee set up

Members from all sides of the House welcomed Mr Michel Cointat's (Fr, EPD) report on the role and function of parliamentary control of Community resources and expenditure.

The motion proposed that a new sub-committee responsible for supervising expenditure should be set up – a proposal greeted warmly by most speakers in the debate, although Lord Bruce of Donington (Br, EC) thought that Parliament would be better advised to set up a full committee.

But trouble arose when the House came to vote on the motion. Mr Jan Broeksz (Du, S) and Mr Walter Behrendt (Ge, S) had tabled an amendment to point 6, which read, in the original, 'Authorizes the sub-committee of the Committee on Budgets to publish, if it thinks fit, the minutes and reports of its proceedings'. Although the amendment sought to make only a minor change, the point was raised that point 6 did not in fact comply with Rule 39 of the Rules of Procedure. This lays down that sub-committees 'shall report to the Committees which set them up'.

After a lengthy discussion, in which Mr Erwin Lange (Ge, S) insisted that Parliament, as a sovereign body, should have the right to create a sub-committee with whatever rights it saw fit, the House adopted Mr Michael Yeat's (Ir, EPD) suggestion to simply drop point 6 from the resolution and have it referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure.

Parliament agreed to the motion.

Commissioner Lardinois attacks Potato Marketing Board

After a somewhat heated debate and complaints from Commissioner Petrus Lardinois that Members were simply unaware of the facts, a motion to refer the new potato marketing regulation back to committee was agreed to by a narrow majority.

The debate was also remarkable for a strong attack from Mr Lardinois on the UK's Potato Marketing Board. He argued that over the last five, ten or twenty-five years consumer prices in the Benelux countries – with a very similar climate – had been well below those in the United Kingdom. As for the consumer interest, which was defended with such vigour by Mr Tom Molloy, Lady Fisher and Mr Willie Hamilton this was simply not represented on the Marketing Board. What the Commission was proposing was to ensure free trade in potatoes for the benefit of all. And at the moment there are too many different systems: the UK, Ireland, France, Italy and Holland all have their own.

Mr Jan de Koning, Mr Albert Liogier and Mr Michel Cointat strongly supported the proposals. Mr Liogier reminded the House there are two and a half million potato farms in the Community producing around 40 million tons and for many of them, potatoes are their only crop.

*'Over the last 5, 10 or 25 years
potato prices to the consumer
have been much lower in the
Benelux countries than in the
United Kingdom'*



But the consensus was, as Mr Spicer said, that it was no good thing to debate such an important issue with an eye on the clock. Mr Howell agreed as did Mr Jakobsen though Mr Cornelis Laban did remind the House that the proposal had been discussed three times in committee already.

Is the drought a disaster?

Mr Albert Liogier, who had tabled an emergency motion asking for Community funds to help drought-stricken areas, thought it was. So did Mr Jean-François Pintat. But Mr Cornelis Laban and Mr James Spicer, while sharing Mr Liogier's concern for the areas affected, pointed out that climatic changes were one of the risks of agriculture, and that, anyway, it was too early in the season to predict just how bad the harvest would be. Commissioner Petrus Lardinois felt the same way – and pointed out that last summer's 'drought' had given way to good autumn and winter conditions and harvests had been generally excellent.

Parliament decided to refer this motion to the Committee on Agriculture.

OTHER POINTS

New rules for agricultural alcohol soon

Commissioner Petrus Lardinois said in reply to a question put down by Mr Isidor Früh and colleagues that he will shortly be introducing new proposals for the agricultural alcohol market. Proposals were put forward in 1972 but never got off the ground because the problems of accession introduced a whole series of new factors. Mr Lardinois said he was not in favour of emergency regulations even though Mr Früh had stressed the serious situation threatening the German alcohol industry.

Money to be released for research

Mr Michel Cointat asked Parliament to approve the release of 20,363,439 u.a. in payment appropriations and 41,045,747 u.a. in commitment appropriations for research programmes approved by the Council. Mr Cointat added a cautionary word about tightening budgetary control. His motion, authorising the release of these funds, was agreed to.

Approval for 7 new posts in the Commission

Mr Erwin Lange asked the House to approve the creation of 7 new jobs at the Commission. Those appointed will be concerned with financial control. A motion to this effect was agreed to.

Processing and marketing agricultural produce

The House unanimously agreed to postpone Mr Ralph Howell's report on improving the processing and marketing of agricultural produce to the July sitting.

Four motions through on the nod

At the suggestion of the President, Parliament voted on the four reports down on the agenda for consideration without debate. Three of these were by Mr

Lucien Martens on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture and concerned conducting a census of Community beef stocks, counting fruit trees, and conducting a pig census; one was by Mr Hans Jahn, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on preservatives used in foods. All four were agreed to.

Too many hops

Commissioner Petrus Lardinois could not agree to Mr Isidor Früh's amendment deleting the Commission's proposal to enable members of hop producer's associations to give up membership after a three-year period. But Parliament nevertheless agreed to the motion.

Pollution reports postponed

Two reports by Mr Willi Müller on sulphur pollution were postponed to a later date.

Intervention centres for oilseeds

There was unanimous agreement on Mr Albert Liogier's motion on oilseeds. Commissioner Lardinois said Parliament would receive a report on the subject by the end of the year.

Suspension of duties should be made permanent

Commissioner Lardinois said he could accept some but not all of the motion's proposals, which were aimed at making CCT duty waivers on certain products – including bilberries and Christmas trees – permanent. But the House agreed to the motion unanimously.

Mediterranean produce

Parliament agreed unanimously to the motions contained in four reports by Mr Pintat and one by Mr Laban on import regulations on a range of products from Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia.

Draft estimates of EP revenue and expenditure

Miss Colette Flesch said that the Committee on Budgets had agreed to leave 5 amendments tabled by Mr Heinrich Aigner in abeyance until the autumn budget discussions. The House approved this suggestion, and agreed to the motion and report on Parliament's draft estimates for 1977.

Food aid to UNRWA

The House unanimously approved the proposal for a further 6,784 m.u.a. in food aid to go to UNRWA.

Steak from Botswana

Lord Walston introduced Miss Betty Boothroyd's report on duty waivers for beef imports from four ACP countries, and Botswana in particular. The waivers, he said, had little effect on the Community, but were of great importance to the countries concerned. Parliament agreed to the motion, and also adopted an amendment adding a new paragraph – which draws the Council's attention to the concern felt by beef exporting ACP States about the difficulties they encounter in selling to the EC – by a large majority.

Who does what? Two Legal Committee motions rejected

Motions tabled by Sir Derek Walker-Smith (Br) for the Legal Affairs Committee and which would have brought staff rules and competition questions within the terms of reference of his committee were rejected.

Budget must be implemented

Mr Michel Cointat (Fr, EPD) and Lord Reay (Br, EC) introduced their respective motions – worded identically – calling for the immediate release of the funds earmarked in the 1976 budget as aid for non-associated developing countries. The motions were agreed to.

QUESTION TIME

Question to the conference of Foreign Ministers

Breaking of UN sanctions against Rhodesia

Mr Gaston Thorn, Luxembourg Foreign Minister, agreed that there was a problem, but confirmed that the Nine were united in their stand on sanctions. In his supplementary question, Mr Hamilton (Br, S) wanted to know whether the Community shouldn't be seen to be imposing sanctions, particularly by the black African countries. Mr Thorn agreed.

Questions to the Council

Relations between the Community and China

Mr Gaston Thorn, President of the Council, said that the Commission was at present holding discussions with the Chinese mission to the Communities. He assured Mr Terrenoire (Fr, EPD) that such countries that had had bilateral relations with China continued to do so. Mr Tam Dalyell wanted to know whether more European children should not learn Chinese in school. Mr Thorn, for his part, wondered whether Chinese should not become an official Community language.

Representation of Member States at meetings of the Council

Mr Thorn agreed that civil servants could stand in for ministers at Council meetings. Mr Fletcher (Br, EC) thought that this was undemocratic and slowed down decision-making. Mr Thorn said the matter hinged on the availability of ministers. It was better to have delegation than not to have a quorum.

Entry in the budget of appropriations for financial cooperation with third countries

The matter had not yet been discussed, Mr Thorn said. He hoped it would be in July, and that his successor would inform Parliament of the outcome. He felt an agreement of principle should be reached, but anticipated difficulties in having it ratified by the national parliaments.

Jobs for school leavers and graduates

This was a major preoccupation of the Council, Mr Thorn said, particularly as regards the under-25s looking for their first job. The Commission should now propose formal measures. He agreed with Mr Yeats (Ir, EPD) that action taken so far was unsatisfactory; he thought there should be more dovetailing of national provisions. Mr Osborn (Br, EC) stressed that the situation now was graver than it had been for many years.

Puerto Rico economic summit

Two questions had been put down (by Mr Kristian Albertsen (Da, S) and Mr Cornelis Berkhouwer (Du, L) on the non-presentation of the smaller countries, or the European Community as a whole, at the forthcoming economic summit (Rambouillet II) in Puerto Rico.

Mr Thorn said that the Council had not discussed the matter at all, although it had been raised informally at last week's meeting of Foreign Ministers at Senningen. There, broad agreement had been reached that in future no Member State should accept invitations without first consulting its partners. As far as the Puerto Rico Conference was concerned, it had never been a question of having someone to represent the smaller states, but to have the EC represented as a

'What does the Council think of the new economic summit which President Ford has convened in Puerto Rico later this month and at which the Community will not be represented at all?'



whole. It did not look as though this would now be possible for Puerto Rico — which, formally, was simply intended to be an exchange of views, with no decisions being taken.

The whole issue would be placed on the agenda of a future European Council meeting. It was essential that, in matters which fell under the treaties, the Community should be represented as a whole.

Mr Thorn agreed with Mr Fellermaier (Ge, S), who said that the absence of the Commission from Puerto Rico implied that it was no longer acting as “guardian of the treaties” but functioning merely as Community secretariat.

Mr Tam Dalyell (Br, S) and Mr Cornelis Laban (Du, S) both raised the point that the ‘smaller countries’ had helped to bail out Italy and Britain by participating in the recent loans to shore up their currencies — surely they had every right to be represented?

Mr Friederich Burgbacher (Ge, CD) felt that until the EC had shown that it was capable of speaking with one voice, it was unlikely to receive invitations as a Community. Other speakers felt that the Puerto Rico Conference had too many electoral undertones to be taken too seriously.

Questions to the Commission

Courses for young European workers

Mr Guido Brunner said the Commission would be putting forward a proposal. Mr Isidor Früh (Ge, CD) felt that this was an issue which had an important psychological bearing on European integration and could play a significant part in fostering ‘European mindedness’ amongst young people.

Commission’s responsibilities under articles 85 and 86

Commissioner George Thomson told Mr Willy Dondelinger that the Commission had discharged its responsibilities under Rome Treaty articles 85 and 86 in respect of agreements by oil companies in Marseilles. The French authorities had looked into the whole question of their market position and their evidence to the Commission had satisfied Mr Thomson. There was no abuse. He added that

the refining capacity of Marseilles was about 25 per cent of total capacity in France and consumption only around 3 per cent.

Public works contracts

Mr James Spicer is a bit disturbed that although 2536 contracts have been put out to public (i.e. European Community) tender in the UK in the last three years, there have only been 1500 in Germany and 818 in France. Commissioner Finn Gundelach was not completely satisfied. But there had been progress. Italy was being sued for failing to implement the relevant directive (305). But apart from Italy, the Commission's checks showed the EC moving in the right direction. Mr Hugh Dykes wanted to know if Italian firms were aware that contracts awarded to them could be open to question. Mr Gundelach assured him proper warning had been given.

First action programme for the vocational rehabilitation of handicapped persons

Mr Liam Kavanagh (Ir, S) expressed concern about the fact that the Social Fund can not be used to back all the activities recommended in the Commission's action programme for the handicapped. Commission Vice-President Patrick Hillery replied that the aim of the programme was to improve existing facilities. Mr Kavanagh made the point that if the rules were altered the Social Fund could be used towards building new training centres and towards the exchange of staff between rehabilitation centres. Dr Hillery agreed and added: 'the review of the Social Fund is now under way. All the matters mentioned by the honourable Member will be considered during the review'.

Mrs Elaine Kellett-Bowman (Br, EC) asked about sheltered workshops. Dr Hillery replied these would come under a second programme to be announced in the near future.

Mr Tom Normanton (Br, EC) suggested attention should focus on the cause of diseases and their cure. Dr Hillery replied: 'The Commission has already adopted as a priority the use of the best level of treatment and facilities. Information is already available in the Community, together with dissemination of the practices which are found to be most effective'.

Mr Michael Yeats (Ir, EPD) suggested that the Council had to increase Social Fund resources to a realistic level and Dr Hillery replied 'We live in the hope that the Community will budget for an increase in the Social Fund'.

Spare parts for cars

In reply to Mr Christian de la Malène (Fr, EPD), Mr George Thomson said the Commission had made representations to motor vehicle manufacturers. Did the Commission intend to bring prices into line, asked Mr de la Malène. Mr Thomson replied simply that the Commission was not being inactive. It had sent a statement of objections to French automobile manufacturers about rebates to be granted on the sale of spare parts. Mr Tam Dalyell asked if the Commission could really do anything? Mr Thomson replied that the need to enable motorists to get spare parts at the cheapest price and not the victim of price fixing might conflict with ensuring distribution arrangements take proper account of the need for safety.

Uniform identity cards

In reply to Lord Bethell, Mr Finn Gundelach said the Commission was doing all it could to enable people to travel freely throughout the Community. But it attached greater significance to the rights conferred by travel documents than to identity cards or passports themselves. Lord Bethell stressed the psychological boost to be derived from uniform identity cards: 'a simple and cheap way of making sure citizens of Member States were identified and were able to move freely from country to country within the Community.' Mr Gundelach agreed progress had been slow but came back to his original point: 'it is not enough to have such documents if they do not carry with them greater rights than those existing today'.

European Investment Bank loans

In reply to Mr Charles McDonald, Commissioner George Thomson said that most of the loans from the European Investment Bank had gone to the Community's less-favoured regions.

Farm Fund help for French overseas departments

Commissioner Petrus Lardinois told Mr Hector Rivierez there was no question of extending the application of the Guarantee Section of the EAGGF to the French Overseas Departments though special arrangements were possible in the case of individual products.

'Is the Commission satisfied that the criteria used by the European Investment Bank in assessing requests for finance are correct?'



Oil pollution of the sea

Dr Hillery told Mr Kai Nybořg that some 80,000 tons of hydrocarbons are discharged into the sea every year from oil rigs. Mr Nyborg thought it was 7 million. Mr Fletcher said that oil tankers constitute a much greater pollution than the rigs themselves.

Mr Jahn asked what remedy there was against oil firms. Dr Hillery replied: 'The tendency of the debate so far is to attribute the responsibility for pollution arising from exploitation of the seabed as if it were coming from the adjoining territory and as if the work were being done from the land'. Dr Hillery reviewed attempts being made to deal with the problem.

Public purchasing policy and public supply contracts

Mr Finn Gundelach told Mr Hugh Dykes (Br, EC) that the Commission had submitted an amended proposal for coordinating procedures for the award of public supply contracts early in 1973. The Council had done nothing. Thanks to

the efforts of Mr Gaston Thorn, however, it now looked as though the deadlock might be broken.

Over-production of peaches in the Community

Commissioner Petrus Lardinois told Mr Albert Liogier there would be a ban on marketing some varieties of peaches but there was no intention at present of reintroducing monetary compensatory amounts. Mr Lardinois thought the reference prices satisfactory.

In reply Mr Frehsee, who was indignant about 700,000 tons being taken off the market, he said the crop is expected to be very good this year so prices should be lower than in 1975.

Action taken on Parliament's advice

Mr Henri Simonet, Vice-President of the Commission, told the House that the European Community had given its patronage to the Youth Orchestra to be set up by the International Festival of Youth Orchestras Foundation. This follows the motion, put down in Parliament on 8th March by Lady Fisher of Rednal (Br, S). The motion had also made changes in its proposal regarding the staff at the new research centre. Its proposals were now in line with the recommendations made by Miss Colette Flesch (Lu, L).

The motion had changed its proposal on the mutual recognition of qualifications and the right of establishment for carriers further to the report made to the Parliament by Mr Willem Albers (Du, S).

The Council had just adopted the regulation on the European Centre for vocational training and had taken into account the views put forward by Mr Horst Gerlach (Ge, S) in his report.

Parliament, said Mr Simonet, rejected the Commission's proposals for the substance of cereal production and its proposals on the organization of the rice and cereal markets. This further to the reports by Mr Georges Clerfaÿt (Be, Ind) and Mr Jan de Koning (Du, CD). The Commission had now withdrawn its two proposals.

NOTES

New Members

The President announced the appointment of three new EP members – Mr Caro, from the French National Assembly, who will replace Mr Adrien Zeller (CD Group), Mr Tom Molloy, from the British House of Commons, who will replace Mr Guy Barnett (Soc. Group) and Mr Detlev Haase, to replace the late Mrs Elisabeth Orth (Soc. Group).

Petitions

The President announced the receipt of two petitions – one from Mr Volker Heydt on direct elections, the other from Mr Claudio Cianca and 18 others, on measures in favour of emigrant workers.

3,000 visitors to Strasbourg during sittings

Some 80 groups visited Strasbourg during the June sittings to learn something of the European Parliament and its activities. The groups were from nearly all the Member States and included 130 boys and girls from the European School in Luxembourg.

The President gave details of the new schedule for the budget: extra sittings October 25th to 28th

The preliminary draft budget is well ahead of the Rome Treaty Article 203 schedule. (Treaty: 1st Sept) So Parliament will debate it in July. The draft budget will also be ahead of schedule, coming to Parliament by 10th September (Treaty: 5th October). This will be considered in a first reading in Luxembourg in October when an extra week of sittings has been arranged (25th – 28th) for this purpose. The Council will be pronouncing on 23rd November and Parliament will vote on the budget, after a second reading, at the sittings scheduled for December 13th to 17th.

Summing up

At its sittings of 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 June 1976, Members put down 2 questions for debate with the Council, 6 questions for debate with the

Commission and 1 question for debate with the Conference of Foreign Ministers. At Question Time, 6 questions were addressed to the Council, 13 questions were addressed to the Commission and 1 was addressed to the Conference of Foreign Ministers. 20 reports were considered and Parliament delivered 29 Opinions. The House sat for 40 minutes on Monday, for 9 hours 35 minutes on Tuesday, for 8 hours 5 minutes on Wednesday, for 7 hours 5 minutes on Thursday and for 3 hours 20 minutes on Friday, making a total of 28 hours 45 minutes.

REFERENCES

Subject	E.P. Doc. No.	Comm. Doc. No.	Date of Debate
European Conservatives' censure motion defeated	109/76	—	15/6
Gaston Thorn's veiled optimism about July Summit	174/76	—	16/6
36 million pounds help for Friuli earthquake region	153/76	—	15/6
	173/76	165/76	18/6
Commission to set up women's bureau . . .	150/76	—	
The road to Puerto Rico	176/76	—	16/6
Plea for emergency help for Lebanon . . .	134/76	—	15/6
Tripartite Conference: looking ahead to Luxembourg	160/76	—	17/6
	168/76		
Need for common policies: energy, industry, foreign	133/76	—	17/6
	152/76	—	17/6
	147/76	—	16/6
Competition policy	151/76	—	17/6
Community law takes precedence	390/75	—	15/6
Parliament's 55,274,994 ua preliminary estimates for 1977	130/76	—	15/6

Public accounts committee set up			
Commissioner Lardinois attacks Potato Marketing Board	158/76	512/75	18/6
Is the drought a disaster?	175/76	—	18/6
New rules for agricultural alcohol son	155/76	—	18/6
Money to be released for research	103/76	—	18/6
Approval for 7 new posts in the Commission	172/76	—	18/6
Processing and marketing agricultural produce	162/76	241/75	18/6
Beef stocks	124/76	83/76	18/6
Counting fruit trees	125/76	95/76	18/6
Pig production	157/76	112/76	18/6
Preservatives in foodstuffs	177/76	121/76	18/6
Too many hops	156/76	562/75	18/6
Intervention centres for oilseeds	120/76	84/76	18/6
CCT duties on certain products	123/76	87/76	18/6
Mediterranean produce	135/75	105/76	18/6
	136/76	72/76	18/6
	137/76	85/76	18/6
	138/76	53/76	18/6
	139/76	86/76	18/6
Food aid to UNRWA	131/76	42/76b	18/6
Steak from Botswana	127/76	111/76	18/6
Staff rules and competition questions	141/76	—	15/6
	142/76	—	15/6
Budget must be implemented	126/76	—	16/6
	96/76	—	16/6

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used in this text to denote nationality and political allegiance: CD Christian Democrat, S Socialist, L Liberal and Allies, EC European Conservatives, EPD European Progressive Democrat, CA Communist and Allies, Ind Non-attached Independent Members, Be Belgian, Br British, Du Dutch, Fr French, Ge German, Ir Irish, It Italian, Lu Luxembourg, EC European Community.

Next Sitzings

The next sittings of the European Parliament will be held in Luxembourg from 5 to 9 July 1976.

The Sittings

'The Sittings' is intended to give the gist of proceedings in the European Parliament.

A complete record of the proceedings of the House is given in the 'Debates of the European Parliament' which is published as an Annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities.

The 'Debates' and other documents may be obtained either from the Secretariat of the European Parliament (P.O. Box 1601, Luxembourg) or from the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities (P.O. Box 1003, Luxembourg).

Information Offices

The Information Offices of the European Parliament in Dublin and London distribute regular press releases on parliamentary business, and deal with specific requests for information. Lectures to various groups, organisations and schools about the structure and functions of the European Parliament are available on request.

Dublin Office: 29 Merrion Square, Dublin 2

London Office: 20 Kensington Palace Gardens, London W 8 4QQ

If you find 'The Sittings' interesting and would like to receive it regularly, will you please fill in the form below. 'The Sittings' will then be sent to you each month free of charge.

**Directorate-General
for Information and Public Relations
European Parliament, P.O. Box 1601
Luxembourg**

Please send The Sittings to (*):

Name:

Christian Name:

Street No.

Postal Code: Town:

Country:

(*) Please use block letters

