

Annex

# Official Journal

## of the

### European Communities

No 1-266

English edition

## Debates of the European Parliament

---

1980-1981 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 9 to 13 February 1981

European Centre, Luxembourg

### Contents

<b>Monday, 9 February 1981</b> . . . . .	1
Resumption of the session, p. 2 — Tribute, p. 2 — Membership of Parliament, p. 2 — Committees, p. 3 — Order of business, p. 3 — Speaking time, p. 7 — Tabling of amendments, p. 8 — Action taken on Parliament's opinions, p. 8 — Voting time, p. 9 — Fixing of book-prices, p. 14 — Question time, p. 17 — Next sitting, p. 30 — Annex, p. 31	
<b>Tuesday, 10 February 1981</b> . . . . .	33
Position of women in the Community, p. 33 — Welcome, p. 39 — Position of women in the Community (contd), p. 39 — Minutes, p. 67 — Agenda, p. 70 — Position of women in the Community (contd), p. 70 — Urgent procedure, p. 89 — Political groups, p. 90 — Next sitting, p. 90 — Annex, p. 91	
<b>Wednesday, 11 February 1981</b> . . . . .	96
Minutes, p. 97 — Voting time, p. 97 — Fourteenth General Report and the Commission's programme, p. 125 — Question time, p. 145 — Urgent procedure, p. 158 — Next sitting, p. 158 — Annex, p. 159	
<b>Thursday, 12 February 1981</b> . . . . .	177
Minutes, p. 178 — Urgent procedure, p. 179 — Agenda, p. 190 — Fourteenth General Report and the Commission's programme (contd), p. 193 — Welcome, p. 202 — Urgent procedure, p. 202 — Membership of Parliament — Credentials, p. 203 — Fourteenth General Report and the Commission's programme (contd), p. 203 — Voting time, p. 226 — Agenda, p. 234 — Common organization of market in sugar, p. 235 — Common organization of market in fishery products, p. 237 — Urgent procedure, p. 239 — Fishery products (contd), p. 239 — Substances with hormonal, etc., effects, p. 246 — Membership of Parliament, p. 257 — Convergence and budgetary questions, p. 257 — Next sitting, p. 263	

(Continued overleaf)

## NOTE TO READER

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

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

Contents (continued)

Friday, 13 February 1981 . . . . .	264
Minutes, p. 266 — Committees, p. 266 — Urgent procedure, p. 266 — Additional part-session, p. 271 — Energy, p. 271 — Tax-free allowances, p. 273 — President Sadat, p. 274 — Aid to Calabria, p. 275 — Trade-union leaders in Brazil, p. 275 — Sugar-cane industry, p. 276 — Agenda, p. 279 — Committees, p. 279 — Voting time, p. 279 — Sugar-cane industry (contd), p. 288 — British prisoners in Iran, p. 290 — Driver's hours, p. 290 — EEC motor-vehicle industry, p. 294 — Book-prices (contd), p. 296 — Exemption from VAT, p. 301 — Western Sahara, p. 303 — Credentials, p. 305 — Tabling of amendments, p. 305 — Tabling of motion for a resolution, p. 306 — Next part-session, p. 307 — Minutes, p. 307 — Adjournment, p. 307 — Annex, p. 309	

*Resolutions adopted at sittings of 9 to 13 February 1981 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 50 of 9. 3. 1981.*

## SITTING OF MONDAY, 9 FEBRUARY 1981

1. Resumption of the session . . . . .	2		
2. Tribute . . . . .	2		
3. Membership of Parliament . . . . .	2		
4. Membership of committees . . . . .	3		
5. Order of business:			
Lord Bethell; Mr Lange, Chairman of the Committee on Budgets; Mr Spinelli; Mr Lange; Mr Balfour; Mr Lange; Mr Diana; Mr Coppieters; Mr Balfour; Mr Pannella; Mr Fanti; Mr Møller; Mr Cariglia; Mrs Roudy; Mr Charalambopoulos; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mrs Poirier . . . . .	3		
6. Speaking time:			
Mr Pannella . . . . .	7		
7. Deadline for tabling amendments:			
Mr Adam; Mr Arndt; Mr Hamilus . . . . .	8		
8. Action taken by the Commission on the opinions of Parliament . . . . .			
9. Votes . . . . .			
• Delatte report (Doc. 1-792/80): Regula- tions on sugar and isoglucose:			
Mr Delatte, rapporteur . . . . .	9		
Mr Diana . . . . .	9		
Explanations of vote: Mr Pesmazoglou; Mr Georgiadis . . . . .	9		
Point of order: Mr Bangemann . . . . .	10		
Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	10		
• Proposal for a regulation (Doc. 1-701/80) and motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-813/ 80): Regulations in the cereals sector:			
Consideration of the proposal for a regula- tion:			
Explanations of vote: Mrs Poirier; Mr Fanton; Mr Früh; Mr Collins; Mr Diana; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Maher; Mr Hord; Mrs Ewing; Mr Davern . . . . .	10		
Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	12		
• Van den Heuvel report: Human rights in Uruguay:			
Explanations of vote: Mr Koutsocheras; Mrs Macciocchi; Mr Pannella; Mr Almi- rante; Mr Van Minnen; Mrs Baduel Glorioso; Mr Blaney . . . . .	12		
Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	14		
10. Fixing of book prices — Report by Mr Beumer (Committee on Economic and Mone- tary Affairs) (Doc. 1-554/80):			
Mr Beumer, rapporteur . . . . .	14		
Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr von Bismarck; Mr Balfour . . . . .	15		
11. Question Time (Doc. 1-842/80):			
Question No 1 by Mr Adam: Regional policy:			
Mr Andriessen (Commission); Mr Adam; Mr Andriessen; Mr Boyes; Mr Andriessen; Mr Welsh; Mr Andriessen; Mr Seal; Mr Andriessen; Mr Price; Mr Andriessen; Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Andriessen; Mr Griffiths; Mr Andriessen . . . . .	17		
Points of order: Mrs Ewing; Mr Blaney . . . . .	19		
Question No 2 by Lord Bethell: Air tariffs in the Community:			
Mr Andriessen; Lord Bethell; Mr Andriessen; Mr Habsburg; Mr Andriessen . . . . .	19		
Point of order: Mrs Ewing . . . . .	20		
Question No 3 by Mr Price: Possible new gas reserves:			
Mr Davignon (Commission); Mr Price; Mr Davignon; Mr Seligman; Mr Davignon . . . . .	20		
Question No 4 by Mr Patterson: Transfer of nationality, and Question No 5 by Mr Enright: Proposed British Nationality Law:			
Mr Thorn (Commission); Mr Patterson; Mr Thorn; Mr Enright; Mr Thorn; Mrs Kellett- Bowman; Mr Thorn . . . . .	21		
Question No 6 by Mrs Fullet: Selection of			

<i>non-quota section projects for the special five-year ERDF programme:</i>		<i>Question No 12 by Mr Israël: Euro-Arab Dialogue and the energy problem:</i>	
<i>Mr Richard (Commission); Mrs Fullet; Mr Richard; Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Richard</i>	22	<i>Mr Cheysson (Commission); Mr Israël; Mr Cheysson; Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Cheysson; Mr Seligman; Mr Cheysson; Mr Doublet; Mr Cheysson</i>	26
<i>Question No 9 by Mr Remilly: Industrial cooperation strategy:</i>		<i>Question No 13 by Mr Turcat: Energy saving in industry:</i>	
<i>Mr Davignon; Mr Remilly; Mr Davignon; Sir David Nicolson; Mr Davignon; Mr Turcat; Mr Davignon</i>	22	<i>Mr Davignon; Mr Turcat; Mr Davignon; Mrs Ewing; Mr Davignon; Mr Moreland; Mr Davignon; Mr Herman; Mr Davignon</i>	27
<i>Question No 10 by Mr Balfe: Beef held at EEC intervention stores, and Question No 33 by Mrs Clwyd: Beef:</i>		<i>Question No 14 by Sir Frederick Warner: Aid for hurricane damage:</i>	
<i>Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Balfe; Mr Dalsager; Mrs Clwyd; Mr Dalsager; Mr Simmonds; Mr Dalsager; Mr Blaney; Mr Dalsager; Mr Marshall; Mr Dalsager; Mr Fanton; Mr Dalsager</i>	24	<i>Mr Cheysson</i>	28
<i>Question No 11 by Mr Vie: Freedom of establishment for gynaecologists, and Question No 49 by Mrs Roudy: Gynaecology in France:</i>		<i>Question No 15 by Mr Pearce: ACP sugar:</i>	
<i>Mr Narjes (Commission); Mr Vie; Mr Narjes</i>	26	<i>Mr Cheysson; Mr Pearce; Mr Cheysson; Mr Enright; Mr Cheysson; Mr Marshall; Mr Cheysson; Miss Hooper; Mr Cheysson</i>	28
		<i>Point of order: Mr Hutton</i>	30
		<i>12. Agenda for next sitting</i>	30
		<i>Annex</i>	31

## IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

*Vice-President*

*(The sitting was opened at 4.30 p.m.)*

**President** — The sitting is open.

### 1. Resumption of the session

**President.** — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 16 January 1981.

### 2. Tribute

**President.** — I have learned with great sadness of the death of Mr Nordlohne at the age of 41. Born on 18 March 1939 in Lohne, Mr Nordlohne has been a Member of our Parliament ever since direct elections. He was a member of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) and sat on the Committee for Social Affairs and Employment.

On your behalf I have conveyed our deepest sympathy to the family of our departed colleague and also to his Group. I would ask you to observe one minute's silence in his memory.

*(Parliament stood and observed one minute's silence)*

### 3. Membership of Parliament

**President.** — Mr Loules has informed me by letter of 2 February 1981 of his resignation as Member of Parliament.

Pursuant to Article 12 (2), second subparagraph, of the Act concerning the election of the representatives of the Assembly by direct universal suffrage, we establish that there is a vacancy.

The Greek authorities have informed me by letter dated today of the appointment of Mr Kappos as Member of Parliament.

The German authorities have informed me of the appointment as of 30 January 1981 of Mr Franz as Member of Parliament to replace Mr Köhler.

**President**

I welcome these colleagues and would point out that, pursuant to Rule 3 (3) of the Rules of Procedure, any Member whose credentials have not yet been verified takes his seat provisionally in Parliament and on its committees with the same rights as other Members.

4. *Membership of committees*

**President.** — I have received

- (a) a request from the Socialist Group that Mr Abens be appointed a member of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment in place of Mr Koutsocheras and that Mr Koutsocheras be appointed a member of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport in place of Mr Abens;
- (b) a request from the Communist and Allies Group that Mr Damette be appointed a member of the Committee on Energy and Research.

Are there any objections?

These appointments are ratified.

Furthermore, I wish to inform the House that Mr Damette is leaving the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning.\*

5. *Order of business*

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

At its meeting of 15 January 1981 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda which has been distributed to you (PE 71.105/rev.).

At the request of the chairmen of the political groups I propose that the following alterations be made in the draft agenda:

*Tuesday, 10 February:* In the debate on the report by Mrs Maij-Weggen (Doc. 1-829/80) an oral question by Mrs De March (Doc. 1-881/80) on the same subject would be included.

In the afternoon the sitting would not be resumed until 4.30 p.m. in order to allow Mr Anwar El Sadat,

President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, to address the Members of the European Parliament at 3.15 p.m.

*Wednesday, 11 February:* At 9 a.m. the vote on the Maij-Weggen report would be taken, as well as the decision on any requests for urgent procedure.

At 3 p.m. Mr Thorn would present the General Report of the Commission for 1980 and its programme of work for 1981. This would be followed by preliminary statements from the political groups, which would be allocated a maximum speaking time of 10 minutes each for one speaker, and the non-attached Members, who would be given a total speaking time of 15 minutes.

The debate on this statement would be continued at the beginning of Thursday's sitting.

At the request of the Council, Question Time would begin with the questions addressed to the Foreign Ministers.

*Thursday, 12 February:* The joint debate on the Vandewiele document on the terms of reference of the parliamentary committees (Doc. 1-820/80) and the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Nyborg and others on the setting up of a committee on fisheries (Doc. 1-775/80) would be deferred to the March part-session.

I propose that we enter on the agenda, after the debate on the statement by the President of the Commission, the reports by Mr Bocklet on sugar (Doc. 1-839/80), Mr Gautier on fisheries (Doc. 1-841/80) and Mr Brøndlund Nielsen on hormones (Doc. 1-804/80), in respect of which the Council has once again requested urgent procedure, and that a joint debate be held on the Bocklet report and a report by Mr Curry on OCT sugar.

These would be followed by the Balfour report on convergence (Doc. 1-136/80) and the continuation of the debate on the Spinelli report on own resources (Doc. 1-772/80).

These in turn would be followed, if necessary, by items on the agenda of the previous sitting which it had not been possible to discuss.

Lord Bethell, do you wish to speak on this item?

**Lord Bethell.** — Mr President, in the absence of the Chairman of the Political Affairs Committee, could I ask you please to clarify whether the motion for a resolution on the Western Sahara remains on the agenda?

\* *Membership of the Court of Justice — Petitions — Document received — Authorization of reports and referral to committees — Withdrawal of a motion for a resolution — Referral to committee — Decisions of the Committee on Agriculture.* For these items see the minutes of the sitting — OJ No C 50 of 9. 3. 1981.

**President.** — Yes. I have not mentioned it, so that means that it remains on the agenda. There is no change there.

I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange, Chairman of the Committee on Budgets.** — (D) Mr President, you have just indicated that the Spinelli report will be debated on Thursday without stating exactly how or when. The fact is that we have 68 amendments to the report at present. It is quite impossible to take an unprepared vote in the House on those amendments. That would in all probability lead to a contradictory decision by Parliament on this report on own resources. Perhaps, Mr President, we should continue the debate and then give the Committee on Budgets an opportunity to discuss those amendments at its normal meeting on 17-18 February, after which a supplementary report could be placed before the House in March and a decision on the report as a whole taken at the March part-session. That would seem to me a more logical procedure if we are to avoid a chaotic situation. Now I am not sure what you mean by continuation of the debate; you used the term in referring to the items on the agenda. However, it would be useful to refer the amendments which have been tabled to the Committee on Budgets and give it a further opportunity to consider them, in which case, as I have suggested, a supplementary report could be placed before the House for a decision in March.

**President.** — I welcome this proposal and am very appreciative of the fact that an effort has been made to keep the number of amendments as low as possible and to word them as clearly as possible. I am therefore very happy to agree to your proposal. This will mean that the Spinelli report is withdrawn from this week's agenda and will be entered on the agenda for the March part-session after it has been considered in the Committee on Budgets.

I call Mr Spinelli.

**Mr Spinelli.** — (I) Mr President, I accept Mr Lange's proposal, although I must add that the preparation of this motion has now been dragging out for more than a year.

I gathered from the interpretation of Mr Lange's speech that he wanted this resolution to be debated in March. In my view we must have a precise undertaking, and not merely a statement that an effort will be made to discuss the resolution at the March part-session.

**President.** — It has been formally decided to refer the report back to the Committee on Budgets. It is no longer therefore a matter for the Bureau. As soon as

the Committee on Budgets feels that the report should be entered once again on the agenda — and as I understand it, that would be in March — the resolution will once again be put on the agenda.

I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange, Chairman of the Committee on Budgets.** — (D) Mr President, you may rely on us to deal with the matter at the committee meeting in order to enable a decision to be taken by the House in March.

**President.** — That solves the problem.

I call Mr Balfour.

**Mr Balfour.** — Mr President, up to now the Spinelli and Balfour reports have been the subject of a joint debate. I presume that the referral back to committee of the Spinelli report will not affect the debate and vote on the Balfour report during this part-session.

**President.** — It does not, because what we are now dealing with, as far as the Spinelli report is concerned, is the amendments to the resolution which have been tabled last week. They are two different matters and can be kept separate.

I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange, Chairman of the Committee on Budgets.** — (D) Mr President, Mr Balfour is mistaken. We had already decided at the January part-session that there would be no joint debate on these two reports, so that the matter is really settled.

**President.** — I have also received two requests, submitted pursuant to Rule 12 of the Rules of Procedure, for alterations to the draft agenda.

First of all, the Committee on Agriculture requests that the Kirk report on fishing quotas (Doc. 1-831/80), the Provan report on bovine livestock (Doc. 1-859/80) and the Früh report on less-favoured regions in Germany (Doc. 1-860/80) be entered on the agenda. In view of the fact that our agenda is already an extremely long one, the chairmen of the political groups did not want to support this request, fearing that if it were accepted, it would mean that items already on the agenda would have to be held over.

I call Mr Diana.

**Mr Diana.** — (I) Mr President, the Committee on Agriculture has asked for certain matters, which it considered urgent, to be entered on the agenda, partly

**Diana**

because at the March part-session we shall have to deal with various other important topics, including agricultural prices and the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy

I seem to have gathered, Mr President, that in your opinion, or at least in the opinion of the Group chairmen, we shall not have enough time to discuss these topics at the March part-session. They include some matters which the Committee on Agriculture did not feel to be urgent, while the Council, on the contrary, insists that they should be debated urgently. I find it somewhat strange that if the committee makes one proposal and the Council another, a decision should be taken to accept the Council's proposals as to urgency rather than those made by the committee.

**President.** — As the referral to committee of the Spinelli report has made a little extra time available, I propose that we enter these reports at the end of Thursday's agenda.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

Secondly, the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members proposes that a debate on the statement by President Sadat be put on the agenda. The allocation of speaking time would be as follows: 10 minutes for the Council, the Commission and the non-attached Members and 5 minutes for each of the political groups.

I call Mr Coppieters.

**Mr Coppieters.** — (NL) Mr President, our whole Group feels great respect for President Sadat, who is to be a guest in Parliament tomorrow and is due to address us, but that does not prevent us from being unhappy with the way in which President Sadat has been invited by our institution. His visit has not been arranged in accordance with the rules of this Parliament. For that reason alone our Group warns against President Sadat's visit being taken as a precedent in future to circumvent the Rules of Procedure. However, to make this visit meaningful and useful, our Group proposes that after the President's address time should be set aside immediately for statements, with identical speaking time, by the Commission, the Council, the political groups and the non-attached members.

On behalf of various Members of our Group I wish to add that we see this as the introduction to a broader debate on the situation in the Middle East and on the

Palestinian question. That debate might make a contribution to world détente and help to stress the significance of President Sadat's visit, who would then not be leaving our Parliament empty-handed.

**President.** — I must first of all point out that President Sadat is not speaking to the Parliament as such at a plenary sitting. The circumstances therefore are quite exceptional.

I call Mr Balfour.

**Mr Balfour.** — Mr President, in the absence of the Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, who cannot be here today, I would like to emphasize the point that it looks yet again as though the pressure on the agenda of Parliament for Thursday afternoon and evening may well result in the report of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on convergence being postponed once again by a further month.

I would remind the House that this report was adopted by our committee in April 1980 and proposed by the Director-General for Committees for consideration during the part-sessions of May, June and July 1980. The chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs asked the President of Parliament on 23 July last year to put this report before Parliament either in October or November last year, but the length of the Spinelli debate in January and the time taken on the urgency debate meant that it was relegated to an impossible time-slot. I therefore asked for it to be given prime time during this part-session, and Mr Delors wrote to the President on 30 January insisting that it be taken during this part-session.

I would ask this House to reorganize its agenda in such a way that this report, which is already out of date, is got out of the way before the three agriculture debates on Thursday afternoon or evening.

**President.** — Mr Balfour, I think that, on the basis of the agenda I am now proposing to you, there is not the slightest danger that your report will not be discussed on Thursday. If we further change the agenda, that danger could, of course, arise, but for the moment I think there is no danger at all.

We must now go on to consider the proposal by the Technical Coordination Group that a debate on President Sadat's statement be placed on the agenda.

I call Mr Pannella to speak in favour of this proposal.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Mr President, it must be recognized that our Parliament has yet again been placed before a *fait accompli*. Each of us will have his own

**Pannella**

personal opinion as to whether that is a good or a bad thing, I personally consider it a great honour for this Parliament to receive President Sadat. However, I should have preferred to have had the opportunity to express my views in advance and to hear the, possibly contradictory, views of my colleagues. This then is a *fait accompli*, but we bow to necessity through respect for our guest.

Mr President, on this occasion you have found a way of respecting our Rules of Procedure and I agree to it: we are to suspend our proceedings to listen to President Sadat. He will not be addressing a sitting of our Parliament. Coming after the work done by the Council, Commission and Parliament last summer, President Sadat's speech will obviously carry great political weight.

Mr President, the fact that our Parliament is being asked to deliver urgent opinions on fish and butter and that our Members are not the first to express their views when President Sadat comes to make a declaration of great importance to his people, to Europe and to us all, goes to show, in my opinion, that the underlying idea is that our Assembly should be a mere rubber-stamp for decisions taken by the Presidency or by a number of chairmen who dominate the House, sometimes without style. And, Mr President, it seems to me that Mr Coppieters's proposal to grant five minutes to each political group, ten minutes to the Council, the Commission and the non-attached group

*(Laughter from some quarters)*

to express their views on the declaration which we shall be hearing is not contrary to our customs and procedural rules. I therefore ask and insist that Parliament should not disregard an event taking place in its own Chamber, even if not in the course of an actual sitting.

**President.** — I call Mr Fanti.

**Mr Fanti.** — *(I)* Mr President, I wonder why we should vote on a proposal of this kind which would constitute a derogation from the practice that we have established in connection with visits by heads of State.

We Communists are also interested in an exchange of views on President Sadat's speech, but we consider the presidency must make it perfectly clear that a proposal of this kind to the House cannot be accepted. Either we hold a debate, or else we say there will be no debate and we adopt for President Sadat exactly the same procedure as we did for the visit by the head of State of Venezuela. He will make his speech which the political groups will then analyse, drawing the necessary conclusions; the groups will then either approve

or disapprove of Sadat's statements. I do not think that the principle of voting on a proposal of this kind is acceptable.

**President.** — Mr Fanti, the Technical Coordination Group is invoking Rule 12 in requesting that a new item be put on the agenda, namely, a debate on the statement by President Sadat. Rule 12 (2) provides that a political group or at least ten Members have the right to submit at any part-session a proposal for an amendment to the draft agenda. It is for Parliament to decide on this request, once it has been received in due form.

I call Mr Møller to speak against the proposal.

**Mr Møller.** — *(DK)* I would like to say that the point at issue here is that we have invited someone as our guest, someone who is due to speak to us tomorrow. A debate on this speech is being requested before we have heard whether it results in any controversial views at all being expressed in this Assembly. Surely this is rather premature? Moreover, is it in keeping with European courtesy to seek a debate on a speech made to us by a guest? Mr Sadat is addressing us outside the agenda. A debate on what is said outside the agenda by a guest in this House can surely not become an official item on the agenda. It is out of keeping with the courtesy due to an overseas head of State, it would be contrary to all the rules of hospitality, and therefore I would strongly urge this Assembly to reject a proposal to discuss a speech which has not yet been made.

*(Applause from various quarters in the centre and on the right)*

**President.** — I call Mr Cariglia.

**Mr Cariglia.** — *(I)* Mr President, I wish to point out that any matter entered on the agenda of Parliament forms the subject of a debate. Therefore, if the Bureau indicates this item as an 'address of greetings by the President of the Arab Republic of Egypt' obviously a debate cannot be held; but if it is treated as an item on the agenda — as was stated just now in answer to the chairman of the Communist Group — quite clearly it must be the subject of a debate.

*(Parliament rejected the request for a debate)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Roudy.

**Mrs Roudy.** — *(F)* I just wanted to say — and I should have liked to be able to do so sooner — that we had been accorded a whole day for the debate on the report by Mrs Maij-Weggen on women's rights. I am

**Roudy**

very pleased that President Sadat is to be here on that day, but this means that we cannot have our entire debate then and I greatly regret the fact.

**President.** — I call Mr Charalambopoulos.

**Mr Charalambopoulos.** — (*El*) Mr President, as far as we are concerned the invitation to President Sadat to speak in Parliament tomorrow is a *fait accompli*. What I should like to ask is whether the Bureau has any intention of inviting in the future, and especially in the near future, other representatives of the Arab world, given that the problem which exists in the Middle East is of crucial importance? Does the Bureau, for instance, intend to invite Mr Arafat to come and speak in Parliament?

(*Mixed reactions*)

**President.** — I should like to make it clear that there is no question here of an invitation to Mr Sadat to address the plenary sitting. It is an invitation by the enlarged Bureau to the President of Egypt to speak to the Members of Parliament in an extraordinary sitting. The question of precedence must therefore be seen in this light, otherwise we shall get entangled in the kind of debate that has just been requested by the Technical Coordination Group.

Are there any further comments?

The order of business is therefore fixed.\*

I call Mrs Van den Heuvel to speak on a point of order.

**Mrs Van den Heuvel.** — (*NL*) Mr President, I sent a note to you announcing a point of order. I intentionally waited until the end of this procedural debate because I had expected Mr Bournias to take the floor to tell us that the statements he made during our last part-session about the Greek Jehovah's Witness Christos Nounis were incorrect. Mr Bournias told us that this man did not exist and that our information was based on incorrect data. I have since sent all the relevant documents to Mr Bournias, including a copy of the sentence handed down on Mr Nounis. I have since been informed of the fact that the non-existent Mr Nounis has been released from prison by the Greek authorities; I felt it desirable to inform the House that it was not I but Mr Bournias who gave wrong information to Parliament last time.

(*Applause from various quarters*)

**President.** — Your statement will, of course, be in the Report of Proceedings. We can have no debate on it.

Furthermore, the Commission has informed us that it is not in a position to give its statement during this part-session on agricultural prices and related measures. This means that this item is withdrawn from the agenda.

I call Mrs Poirier.

**Mrs Poirier.** — (*F*) Mr President, it had been reported in the press — and you have just confirmed the fact — that the Commission will not be making its statement on agricultural prices. On behalf of the 19 French Communist and Allied Members I wish to make a formal request for that statement to be retained on the agenda of this part-session. The matter is extremely important to farmers in my country. The question is whether agricultural prices are to be fixed before 1 April and whether our farmers will at long last obtain satisfaction through the fixing of agricultural prices corresponding to the true increase in their production cost; i.e., as you know, 15 %. I believe that the Commission cannot continually put off its statement . . .

**President.** — Mrs Poirier, the debate on the level of agricultural prices has not yet begun!

**Mrs Poirier.** — (*F*) . . . That is quite so, but I am asking for the Commission to make its statement. This matter is vital to our farmers. Agricultural prices must be fixed before 1 April.

**President.** — Mrs Poirier, you will be aware that under the Rules of Procedure the Commission may speak at its own request. Now, it has not expressed the wish to make a statement on agricultural prices.

## 6. *Speaking time*

**President.** — I propose to Parliament that, pursuant to Rules 28 and 36A of the Rules of Procedure, speaking time be allocated as set out in the draft agenda.

Are there any comments?

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (*F*) Mr President, if you did not keep on saying 'pursuant to Rule 28' I might not ask to speak. But I object to your way of reading into Rule 28 the exact opposite of what it says: it, in fact,

\* See minutes of this sitting OJ No C 50 of 9. 3. 1981.

**Pannella**

only allows speaking time to be limited for an individual debate and not for the whole day. May I stress, Mr President, once again that your interpretation is depriving Members of their right to speak.

Mr President, my views are known: until the Rules of Procedure are amended, I shall continue to remind you that you are misinterpreting them.

**President.** — I shall as usual take note of your remarks.

*(Laughter)*

Are there any further comments?

Speaking time is therefore fixed.\*

### 7. *Deadline for tabling amendments*

**President.** — I propose that the deadline for tabling amendments be fixed as follows:

- 6 p.m. today for reports entered on the draft agenda,
- 10 a.m. on Tuesday for reports added to Wednesday's agenda,
- 6 p.m. on Tuesday for reports added to Thursday's agenda,
- 6 p.m. on Wednesday for reports added to Friday's programme.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I call Mr Adam.

**Mr Adam.** — Mr President, I wanted to draw attention to the agenda for this part-session which records the decision by the enlarged Bureau that the deadline for tabling amendments would be 6 p.m. last Friday. Now I have not heard any explanation as to why that has happened, but I would point out that it makes it extremely difficult for Members who are not members of the particular committee concerned, particularly if the report has not been previously circulated.

**President.** — In reply to the point raised by Mr Adam, I would point out that it was impossible to put back any further the time-limit for tabling amendments, for the simple reason that the time needed for

translating and distributing them would have meant a delay in dealing with the report.

I call Mr Arndt.

**Mr Arndt.** — *(D)* Mr President, at our last part-session in Luxembourg I specifically asked the Bureau to see to it that at the very least a small chair and an empty desk were made available to each Member to enable him to arrange his documents and prepare for the sitting. At present this Parliament is working under unworthy conditions here in Luxembourg. Most Members do not even have the possibility of arranging their documents.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

Has the Bureau considered this matter and what has been done to enable Members of this directly elected European Parliament to perform their duties properly?

**President.** — Mr Arndt, the Bureau is meeting on Thursday and I shall convey your remarks to it. As you know, Parliament has decided to hold no further plenary part-sessions this summer in Luxembourg.

I call Mr Hamilius.

**Mr Hamilius.** — *(F)* Mr President, I would like to remind my colleagues that a fairly considerable number of offices have been made available to the political groups. I am quite sure that if those colleagues who have found nowhere to sit were to contact their group chairman, the latter would be able to find them not only a chair and desk but even an office!

*(Mixed reactions)*

**President.** — There is no point in continuing this discussion.

### 8. *Action taken by the Commission on the opinions of Parliament*

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

I find that no one has asked to speak on this item.

\* See minutes of this sitting — OJ No C 50 of 9. 3. 1981

\* See Annex

## 9. Votes

**President.** — The next item is votes put on today's agenda pursuant to Rule 33 (4) of the Rules of Procedure.\*

We shall begin with the *motion for a resolution contained in the Delatte report (Doc. 1-792/80): Isoglucose*.

*(Parliament adopted the first six indents of the preamble)*

After the sixth indent of the preamble I have Amendment No 3 by Mr Geurtsen and Mr De Gucht, seeking to add the following new indent:

- whereas the retroactive introduction of the regulation from 1 July 1979 is legally inadmissible;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Delatte, rapporteur.** — (F) Mr President, the Court annulled the decision for procedural reasons. At the same time it gave a ruling on the substance of the matter which it accepted in full. I am therefore against the amendment.

*(Parliament rejected the amendment)*

**President.** — On paragraph 1 I have Amendment No 4 by Mr Geurtsen and Mr De Gucht, seeking to replace this paragraph with a new text to read as follows:

1. Approves the Commission's proposals on condition that the regulation only take effect as from now;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Delatte, rapporteur.** — (F) I am against it.

*(Parliament rejected\*\* the amendment and in successive votes adopted paragraphs 1 and 2)*

**President.** — After paragraph 1 I have Amendment No 2 by Mrs Cresson and others, seeking to insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

- 2a. Hopes that the Commission will take the measures which are essential to provide an incentive for maize production by European growers, without prejudice to sugar producers;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Delatte, rapporteur.** — (F) This paragraph adds nothing to the text before us. It has nothing to do with isoglucose. I am therefore against it.

*(Parliament adopted the amendment)*

**President.** — On paragraph 3 I have Amendment No 1 by Mrs Barbarella and Mr Diana, seeking to replace this paragraph with a new text to read as follows:

3. Stresses that its approval of these proposals must in no way prejudice the adoption of new rules governing this sector following expiry of the validity of the present proposals,

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Delatte, rapporteur.** — (F) I can accept this amendment on condition that it is added to the paragraph rather than substituted for it.

**President.** — Do the authors agree?

**Mr Diana.** — (I) I am in agreement, Mr President.

*(In successive votes Parliament adopted paragraph 3 and the amendment)*

**President.** — I may now allow explanations of vote.

I call Mr Pesmazoglou.

**Mr Pesmazoglou.** — (El) Mr President, I feel obliged to point out that we attach great importance to paragraph 3, which has just been adopted, as there is a serious problem regarding sugar quotas in Greece. The issue is still not settled, and I hope that Parliament's debate on this matter will lead to the approval of definite quotas for Greece, as the issue is creating serious differences amongst the Greek people. Approval for quotas of 250 000 tonnes has been given, but demand based on consumption and production potential exceeds 300 000 tonnes. I want to emphasize how important paragraph 3 is.

**President.** — I call Mr Georgiadis.

**Mr Georgiadis.** — (El) I should like to point out that the issue of sugar quota allocations for Greece is not settled and I should also like to underline the fact that Greece is one country that has not produced a sugar surplus. The outcome of our accession to the Common Market would be counter-productive if, in the first year, sugar production were to be heavily taxed and measures imposed on Greece by the Community to

\* See Debates of 16 January 1981.

\*\* By sitting and standing.

**Georgiadis**

reduce its production when it has managed for several years to produce enough sugar for its own needs rather than creating a surplus. We hope that this point will be stressed in the debate, so that the Commission and Council of Ministers can reach a favourable decision on sugar production in Greece.

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

**Mr Bangemann.** — (D) Mr President, you might perhaps ask colleagues who make declarations of vote like that to indicate how they intend to vote. I would be interested in that, because when an explanation of vote is given I am most curious to know how the honourable Member intends to vote.

(Laughter)

**President.** — Yes, Mr Bangemann, that may be important, but our Greek colleagues have not been as long in the European Parliament as you have. Things will soon sort themselves out.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We shall now proceed to consider two documents on the *common organization of the market in cereals*.

On the proposal for a Council Regulation (Doc. 1-701/80) I have Amendment No 1 by Mr Lipkowski and others, seeking to replace the second paragraph of Article 2 by a new text to read as follows:

It shall apply with effect from the date of the entry into force of the common organization of the market in alcohol.

I have a request for a roll-call vote from Mr Klepsch and Mr de la Malène on behalf of their respective groups.

(Parliament rejected the amendment)\*

I may now allow explanations of vote.

I call Mrs Poirier.

**Mrs Poirier.** — (F) Mr President, as a representative of the French Communists and Allies I yesterday visited 2 000 wine growers in Belus in the region of Aquitaine from which I come. They were small and

medium-sized family growers: the very group which is suffering, sector by sector, at the hands of the European institutions. They included producers of Cognac, Armagnac and hybrid vines. These growers refuse to cease production for three essential reasons: they want to continue to cultivate their vines because they constitute a resource for each of them and also for the economy and life of their region, they want to maintain the right to live on the proceeds of their work and land and they cannot agree to an extraneous parasitic authority deciding what they may or may not make, drink and eat.

Mr President, they are quite right and that is why we reject the Commission's proposal to grant export refunds for whisky. My friend, Pierre Pranchère, explained this perfectly during the last part-session.

I just want to add a few brief points: the purpose of the Commission's proposal is to facilitate and subsidize whisky imports, especially into my own country where excellent, indeed prestigious spirits are distilled from grapes and fruit. The first victims will be the small and medium growers, just as they are the first victims of the increase in the taxes on the same spirituous beverages adopted, at the insistence of the European Community, by all the political groups, except ours, in the French National Assembly. More generally, after undertaking a programme to grub up vines, and after restructuring the vineyards in southern France to better prepare for enlargement of the EEC, the Council and Commission now want to sell out our high-quality spirits to imported whisky. That, I think, is the heart of the problem. Unlike French spirits, whisky production is essentially an industrial process, and the Commission, like the French Government, have long since chosen to sacrifice the wishes of people and regions on the altar of capitalist profit. For the same reason the United Kingdom, for example, is continuing to impose taxes on imported wine which are five times higher than those on beer. We are confronted here with a procedural artifice and we clearly cannot accept a dictate from the Commission just as we could not accept any such dictate through a regulation on alcohol, because this approach is fundamentally opposed to the interests of my country.

**President.** — I call Mr Fanton.

**Mr Fanton.** — (F) Mr President, I just wanted to say, on behalf of Jean de Lipkowski, who cannot be here this evening, and also on behalf of French producers of fruit-based spirits, that we were very surprised by the procedure used in this case, because we have been awaiting the 'alcohol' regulation for ten years and it is still not ready. We had hoped that we might discuss the alcohol regulation in depth and we hope that this vote will not prevent us from doing so. But it

\* By electronic vote; see the minutes of this sitting — OJ No C 50 of 9. 3. 1981.

**Fanton**

is quite clear that this vote and decision are contrary to the interests of French producers of fruit-based spirits, and I wanted to make this perfectly clear.

**President.** — I call Mr Früh.

**Mr Früh.** — (*D*) The Christian-Democratic Group rejects this proposal, but not because we are fundamentally opposed to it. However, since a hearing on the legal situation regarding the alcohol market regulation is to be held on Wednesday this week, we feel that we should have waited until then. Instead of that the matter has been brought forward and impatience shown. We shall therefore say no, not because we do not accept the commitment given during the accession negotiations but simply because we should now wait for a clear legal position to be made known; after all we have had seven years to deal with this matter. That is the reason for the Christian-Democratic Group's opposition.

**President.** — I call Mr Collins.

**Mr Collins.** — Mr President, in spite of the rather amazing statement we have just heard from Mr Früh, which is nothing more than an attempt to raise squalid personal prejudice to the level of principle, I wish to make it quite clear that this vote is about a commitment that the Community undertook a good number of years ago, a commitment which has never been put into practice. It is therefore about a different kind of principle. It is about the principle of honesty, and if Members wish to uphold that principle, then they will follow me and the Members of my Group who will support this resolution.

**President.** — I call Mr Diana.

**Mr Diana.** — (*I*) Mr President, I shall vote against, because a resolution of the Council of Ministers dating from 28 December 1972 stipulates that the regulation on distillation of cereals and the regulation on ethyl alcohol must be approved simultaneously to avoid distortions of competition. That being so, it seems to me that Parliament cannot be asked to endorse one of the commitments given previously while no regulation has been proposed in the other area. I think that our British colleagues should not refer solely to paragraph 19 of the Treaty of Accession but should also remember paragraph 18 which has not yet been respected. We cannot simply remember those provisions which suit us and forget the rest. I am against, Mr President, primarily because the committee, when consulted on the matter, decided by a majority that it should not be treated urgently.

**President.** — I call Sir James Scott-Hopkins.

**Sir James Scott-Hopkins.** — Mr President, on behalf of my Group I shall vote in favour of this resolution. I would remind those honourable Members who have just been speaking that what Mr Collins said is quite true. It is also a fact that at the price review of 1980 and at the subsequent negotiations at the end of May between the Foreign Ministers it was agreed by member governments and subsequently by the Heads of State that, unless there were some other outward difficulty, this regulation would be passed. That was the commitment made last year, and I would ask Members to honour those agreements made by member governments and vote in favour of this resolution. It is nothing unusual that this House should be dealing directly with the Commission's draft resolution; there is nothing unusual in that. So I would beg the House in this particular case to support the resolution.

**President.** — I call Mr Maher.

**Mr Maher.** — Mr President, I am supporting this resolution, not because I want to damage in any way the interests of the grape growers or the wine producers, but because I feel that the credibility of this Parliament is at stake if it does not support a decision made many years ago but not yet implemented. I appeal to the producers of grapes and wines to support this resolution, on the understanding that those of us who are interested in the producers of whisky and of the grain from which it is made will support them later on in their efforts to get a better deal in the context of a general policy on alcohol. I think we should be together on this rather than divided. If you support us now, we are prepared to support you later on. I hope to be able to do that.

**President.** — I call Mr Hord.

**Mr Hord.** — Mr President, I think that there is a great deal of misunderstanding in this issue. This issue is about Community preference in the cereal sector. It so happens that Scotch whisky producers, like many other whisky producers, use Community cereals, and I think many people believe that to have an ethyl alcohol regime would be contrary to the interests of Scotch whisky producers. It would be contrary to the interests of *cereal* producers, and I urge everybody to support this resolution if they are sincerely interested in promoting Community preference in the cereal sector.

**President.** — I call Mrs Ewing.

**Mrs Ewing.** — Mr President, on behalf of the Scottish and Irish members of my Group, I should like to say that we support the principle that the commitment made to this industry should be honoured. I would like to address the misguided lady who spoke, I think sincerely, from the Communist bench about some great capitalist plot. Can I assure her, as the person who represents almost every whisky distillery in the world making Scotch, that it is the small people in the little glens, with low wages and with no other jobs whatsoever, whose livelihoods are at stake in this matter. I should like to put that on record on their behalf. All we are asking, given that we made the agreement with everybody, is that if we took EEC grain we would be compensated, because other grain would be cheaper. It is a matter of everybody keeping their promise to the small people.

**President.** — I call Mr Davern.

**Mr Davern.** — Mr President, I would like to point out, that I was the rapporteur for this report, which was rejected in committee by only one vote in spite of the strongest possible opposition. I would also like to point out that the people who now suggest that we should wait for the alcohol regulation are fully aware that even over the entire period of twenty years that preceded the accession of Denmark, the United Kingdom and Ireland, they could not get agreement on an alcohol regime. Let them honour the commitments renewed in 1980, and let that be the spirit in which this Community can be developed in the future.

*(Parliament adopted the resolution in Doc. 1-813/80)\**

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution contained in the Van den Heuvel report (Doc. 1-693/89): Violation of human rights in Uruguay.*

I may now allow explanations of vote.

I call Mr Koutsocheras.

**Mr Koutsocheras.** — *(El)* Mr President, colleagues, all the members of PASOK will support this motion for a resolution on the violation of human rights in Uruguay but, as we said at the last part-session, there are similar and even more terrible violations continuing to take place in Cyprus where, six years after the Turkish invasion, 2 000 people are missing and 200 000 people are still living as refugees. I should like

you to give your attention to this matter. Furthermore, Mr President, to paragraph 5 referring to the request for an arms embargo against Uruguay, I should like the following provision to be added 'and to break off all economic transactions with the dictatorial regime in Uruguay'.

**President.** — I call Mrs Macciocchi.

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — *(F)* As far as we are concerned, we shall be voting in favour of this resolution but, in my opinion, the conclusions to this report include something which underlines its limitations. The report recommends participation in the unofficial world football championships in Uruguay in May 1981. I understand that the rapporteurs would like to take that opportunity to draw the attention of the world to this detestable regime. But how are we to set about it? The efforts made on these lines during the World Cup in Argentina and the Olympic Games in Moscow did not give the results that had been expected. On the contrary, despotic regimes use these events to strengthen their prestige and convince their own population that they are being treated as normal governments. My question is this: would a boycott not be preferable? A further question: the report makes no mention of the rejection by a majority of the Uruguayan electorate on 3 November 1980 of the draft constitution put to it in a referendum. That was a bitter disavowal of the regime. What do the rapporteurs feel about this? They cannot include this aspect in the report until our Assembly has obtained other information about Uruguay in connection with trade; one speaker said just now that we should cease all trade with that country. But it seems to me that this detestable government unfortunately benefits from financial support and assistance from the multi-nationals; the latest news to reach us is that the International Financial Corporation and the London banking house of Samuel Montague & Co announced on 3 December 1980 a loan of 10 million dollars to Surinvest Corporation, a new investment bank set up in Uruguay. It is against that serious background that we shall be voting in favour of this resolution, which, despite its limitations, still represents an important step by our Parliament towards condemnation of this foul regime.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* Mr President, as our colleague said just now, freedom and human rights cannot be defended by mere words without action. The policy of the majority in this Parliament, Mr President, is to voice complaints whenever human rights are violated, especially if that is done far away, only to take no further action on the positions adopted by us. It is said that we must help Uruguay to return to the fold of democracy by maintaining trade relations because

\* By electronic vote; see the minutes of this sitting — OJ No C 50 of 9 3. 1981.

**Pannella**

otherwise, we are told, the Uruguayans will suffer. Mr President, we are often blackmailed in this way by dictatorships in our countries: we are told that we must choose between bread or freedom. I think we must refuse blackmail of that kind. I think, Mr President, that following the attitude of the European Community as a whole to the events in Turkey — an ignoble attitude which is supported by parts of the Social Democratic Group in this Assembly — it is difficult for us to be credible when we claim to be concerned about freedom in Uruguay. What is happening today in Turkey, which used to be an associated country, is surely just as intolerable, but this Parliament, the Commission and the European Council have aligned themselves with the junta, the murderers and the torturers. I personally shall therefore vote against this report, since the facts demonstrate that your policy is a policy of complicity and connivance. Enough is enough. After this vote we shall ask in the clearest possible terms that Parliament change its attitude, or we shall ourselves take steps to change it.

**President.** — I call Mr Almirante.

**Mr Almirante.** — (*I*) Mr President, we the Members of the Italian National Right Movement shall abstain on this motion. We have noted a serious contradiction between the comprehensive and praiseworthy report by our colleague, Mrs Van den Heuvel, and the text of the motion for a resolution. The report makes a number of important points in favour of the Uruguayan regime — on page 9 the war being waged by the Tupamaros (an extreme left movement) against the Government of Uruguay; on page 10, explicit recognition by the U.S. State Department of a democratic improvement in the situation; on page 17, recognition of important social provisions in Uruguay; on page 19, precise data which completely refutes the information provided by Amnesty International about the liberation of political detainees and on page 20, documentation concerning the acceleration of political trials in Uruguay — on the other hand the text of the motion for a resolution is a clear, hard and irreversible condemnation.

It seems to me that the rapporteur has forgotten a number of vital facts. Firstly, the recent free plebiscite on the new constitution in Uruguay; the vote was so free that an apparently totalitarian government was defeated, which means that the vote can only have been delivered freely and spontaneously.

It is also forgotten that political elections are due to be held in Uruguay in 1981. Above all it is highly imprudent to adopt at this particular juncture a position of this kind with regard to a Latin American country, thus disregarding the fact that the recent change in the U.S. presidency will have a decisive and, in all probability, rapid influence on events in South America. As in Italian Member, I wish to make one further point: it

is extremely disturbing to note that some leading figures — such as Mr Rumor — of the Italian Christian Democratic movement have taken up a position in this case by tabling and signing a motion for a resolution which heavily condemns Uruguay and calls for sanctions on Uruguay; they overlook the fact that a substantial part of the Uruguayan population consists of Italians and that there are a great many Italians who have retained their Italian citizenship while also holding Uruguayan citizenship. In that capacity, they have been able to vote freely in a 'totalitarian' State while they are deprived of the right to vote in democratic Italy which deprives migrant citizens who have retained their passports of the right to vote. We are told that Uruguay is totalitarian and must be condemned and isolated, although it grants its citizens the right to vote; Italian Members who have held important offices in their country ask for sanctions which would not harm the Government of Uruguay but the people of that country, including the Italian citizens who live there.

**President.** — I call Mr Van Minnen.

**Mr Van Minnen.** — (*NL*) Mr President, I wish to explain very briefly why I find it hard to vote in favour of this carefully camouflaged report. I say camouflaged, because a number of consequences have not been drawn by the majority in this Parliament from the vote last month on the amendments. Those who were present on that occasion, perhaps not the necessary quorum, will remember. The majority in this House has demonstrated quite clearly that it does not wish to deal with the Uruguayan problem. The question as to whether amendments were rejected is not really relevant in deciding whether to vote for or against the whole resolution. The issue is not, for example, whether an amendment by the Socialist Group, whose text was contained in the original report by Mrs Van den Heuvel, was rejected — that amendment dealt critically with the minifootball championships. The real issue is that one particular phenomenon has developed in recent months — I refer to arms deliveries. Those deliveries were not condemned at the last part-session, as is clear from the rejection of a text which specifically condemned deliveries of ammunition and machine guns from Belgium without referring in general terms to tanks and submarines.

Ladies and gentlemen, the vote on the motion for a resolution was postponed and we are now in a situation where the final declaration of the Bogota conference, surely an important document, condemned in no uncertain terms deliveries of armaments to Uruguay while a majority of Members of this Parliament decided that in practice such deliveries should be treated as perfectly normal. That is a hypocritical position. And the same majority is now basing itself completely on the Bogota decisions.

**Van Minnen**

The question now of course is what line are we to take: ultimately we are bound, and I hope Mr Bange-mann will be satisfied to hear this, to vote in favour of the resolution because it condemns the military dictatorship, although mainly in verbal form, thus giving support to the opposition.

**President.** — I call Mrs Baduel Glorioso.

**Mrs Baduel Glorioso.** — (I) Mr President, I am speaking on behalf of the Italian Communists and Allies. As you know, I spoke at the last part-session on the subject of Uruguay, but the vote was not taken because at the last moment a request was made to ascertain whether there was a quorum. Every Member of Parliament is entitled to do that, but this further delayed — and I want to stress the seriousness of that development — a statement by this Parliament of its position on a dictatorship with which we are all too familiar. We are now faced with a new situation. We should have dealt with this report more than a year ago by taking a vote which, with the faith I have in the democratic spirit of European political parties, I believe will be overwhelmingly favourable.

I would like to point out that a similar procedure — delays, obstacles, obstructions, even if only indirect — was followed in the case of the resolution on El Salvador which was ultimately referred back to the Political Affairs Committee; that committee then decided not to prepare an *ad hoc* report. We cannot continue to behave in this way towards Latin America. To do so would be to contradict our own representatives who one week ago in Latin America signed the Final Act of the Interparliamentary Conference condemning the regimes and dictatorships of Chile, Argentina and Uruguay.

I therefore declare my Group's support for this report and call upon all those Members who want Europe to play its role for freedom and democracy in the world to be consistent with themselves and vote against those dictatorships which are obstructing freedom and democracy in so blatant and apparent a manner.

**President.** — I call Mr Blaney.

**Mr Blaney.** — Mr President, I naturally wish to vote for this resolution and indeed any other resolution that might come before this House condemning the denial of human rights, but I do find it rather difficult to support this particular case in this Assembly, which has shown itself to be so concerned about human rights and civil rights provided they are very far removed from the boundaries of our Community. We can talk about those that are nearer to us than Uruguay: we can talk about Tokyo; somebody has already dealt with Afghanistan, Chile — where you

will; but is it not time we faced the fact that we have a denial of human rights within our Community? That we have a state of occupation of part of my country, a discrimination against much of the population over many years? That the basic human right of self-determination has been denied to the Irish people for eight centuries? We should further face up to the fact, unpalatable though it may be, that that denial is being perpetrated by another member of this Community. I say this with no great pleasure, but rather to bring to the attention of this House that we cannot, as we have been doing, forever run away from the problems within the Community simply because they may be embarrassing to some Members of this House in view of the people who are involved in the occupation of Ireland. So I will vote for this resolution but want to underline what, perhaps, is not so much this Assembly's hypocrisy, as I have named it before, but rather its reluctance to face the unpalatable fact that one member of the Community is in fact occupying the territory of another and thereby denying the basic human right of self-determination.

(Cries from certain quarters of the European Democratic Group)

(Parliament adopted the resolution)

## IN THE CHAIR: MR ROGERS

*Vice-President*

## 10. Fixing of book prices

**President.** — The next item is the debate on the report by Mr Beumer, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the fixing of book prices (Doc. 1-554/80).

I call the rapporteur.

**Mr Beumer, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, a French Prime Minister, Mr Faure, once said that one essential feature of a Parliament was that it provided a test of the social acceptability of technological and technocratic developments, especially through the attention given to the human aspect. I am convinced that this is a necessary task of Parliament and also in its dealings with the executive. That is part of the reason why I consider a parliamentary test of the application of competition policy to books essential. Competition policy is not desirable *per se* but derives its desirability from the services which it provides.

**Beumer**

Mr President, when the publishing and distribution of books is left solely to free market forces, the range of books offered narrows and publications intended for a limited public, including literary criticism, textbooks and poetry, are available less often or at all events less readily. The situation in the United States, Canada, Sweden, Australia and recently France, where resale price maintenance has been practically abolished or has disappeared, points in the same direction. This is a source of great concern to us.

In our democracies books are considered extremely important from the standpoint of communication, information and the dissemination of ideas. Books are the medium of our culture and important aids in education and training. I find it significant that the strict German cartel legislation makes a protective exception in the case of books. Living society is characterized by a broad flow of publications, so that competition for attention to written thoughts and ideas is as broad and manifold as possible. I am therefore disturbed by the increasing concentration of publishing houses and also in the distribution sector. This may be detrimental to the freedom of authors and small publishers, thus harming the interests of minorities. Some publishers will be prepared to issue one particular book to complete their list, so that cultural and economic criteria are sometimes combined; on the other hand, rigid application of competition rules would be tantamount to a form of censorship.

Mr President, this debate is connected with a test case referring to the competition criteria laid down in Article 85 (3). I want to emphasize that I am not concerned with the problems of the Netherlands' language area as such and also do not wish to advocate a particular form of protection for books. In regard to the nature of this decision as a possible precedent, I believe it is necessary to carefully weigh up the economic and cultural aspects which can be discussed here, as is only appropriate, since this is a matter of great public interest. It is surely appropriate that this Parliament, which has always taken a keen interest in all aspects of competition policy, should give special attention to the situation on the book market.

In brief, Mr President, I believe it is important for the Commission to examine to what extent Article 85 in its present form can be applicable to goods which have an essentially cultural aspect. I should like to hear the views of the Commission on this, especially now that it maintains that national frontiers must prevail over language frontiers. This implies that the Commission might at some time consider taking certain measures which could result in the unwelcome phenomenon of parallel imports and reimports. I am afraid that excessive rigidity on this point could create a precedent and ultimately be most detrimental to the cultural aspects of publishing.

**President.** — I call Mr Beyer de Ryke to speak on behalf of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport.

**Mr Beyer de Ryke, draftsman of an opinion.** — (F) Mr President, I obviously cannot tell Mr Beumer what the Commission thinks of his report. On the other hand, as draftsman for the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, I have great pleasure in informing him of the views of that committee. The attitude of our committee is determined quite naturally and legitimately by a wish to protect a certain cultural environment. We consider that books are not an ordinary commodity. To put it more accurately, books are not a commodity or a product at all; they are an act of creation. Culture cannot be treated in the same way as a grocery store. In the view of our committee, the simple principle of respect for the law of supply and demand, the law of the market, must be corrected by a form of protectionism designed not to stifle but to consolidate and above all increase the possibility of access to culture. I believe, Mr Beumer, that we are in agreement on this. We have both noted that when total price freedom is allowed, it results in the disappearance of a great many small bookshops leading to the risk of a monopoly situation which contradicts the principle of true economic liberalism.

Supermarket methods are harmful to the true interests of culture. I would not go so far as to say that you will only find mediocre literature in the big stores and supermarkets. That is not true. You will find some interesting titles, but they are books which sell readily, while other titles are excluded from these stores. In Belgium, the country from which I come, there is a whole range of literature, in particular Belgian poetry written in French — and there is of course our literature in Flemish which is also very rich — that deserves wider recognition. Some remarkable authors are not known because their books are not sold in the big stores; they are excluded for economic and not for cultural reasons. On the other hand the statement that every small or medium-sized bookshop is also a cultural adviser needs qualification. That is not true. Some bookshops are and others are not. What is undeniable is the fact that the big stores cannot be cultural advisers. It may seem paradoxical to you coming from someone who has worked for 19 years for television — and I certainly would not wish to play down the importance of television, which is an extraordinarily valuable instrument in a civilization where pictures often take precedence over thought and reading — but we consider that everything which can help to develop the reading habit must be encouraged. That is why the policy of controlled liberalism recommended in your report was welcomed by the Committee on Culture. I personally can understand the value of certain amendments which may be tabled by members of my group, but my role as draftsman is to defend the main lines of this report which, in fact, reflect my own view that true liberalism, giving

**Beyer de Ryke**

priority to intellectual quality, must be preferred to a simple free market approach, although I certainly recognize the value of a free market. In conclusion I would say culture first, profitability second. That is our basic view, Mr Beumer.

**President.** — I call the Socialist Group.

**Mrs Van den Heuvel.** — (NL) Mr President, I shall speak very briefly on the Beumer report, which has our full support. Rigid application to the book market of Article 85 (3) of the EEC Treaty is liable to set in motion catastrophic developments for the citizens of Dutch-speaking countries. The Commission's answer to Mr Beumer's questions shows that it tends to favour rigid application.

In his report, and in the verbal explanatory statement given today, Mr Beumer has clearly shown the consequences to, among others, Dutch-language readers if resale price maintenance for books is abandoned.

If sales of a book are expected from the outset to be limited, that book will quite simply not be published on the Dutch market. In addition, there will be fewer bookshops in our smaller towns because they will simply be driven out of existence by the big supermarkets, which will add popular and fast-selling books to their range of other consumer goods. And, as Mr Beyer de Ryke clearly stated on behalf of the Committee on Youth and Culture, books are not an ordinary commercial commodity.

A book is a product which touches directly on the interests of citizens in the area of culture, education and information. In our view the Commission should give evidence of its vocation, which is to serve all the interests of our citizens; book prices should therefore not be determined solely by economic criteria.

I await the Commission's answer with interest. In my view it has not yet managed to indicate whose interests will actually be served by putting an end to fixed book prices. The study and proposals requested by Mr Beumer in his resolution therefore deserve the full support of the whole House. We very much hope that the report by Mr Beumer will convince the Commission of the need to review its policy on book prices and change its position.

**President.** — I call the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

**Mr von Bismarck.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Group of the European People's Party greatly appreciates the fact that it has been entrusted with this report and will naturally support the report drawn up by our colleague Mr Beumer. We see this as

an example of a reasonable approach to a controversial issue. We believe that competition is not an end in itself but that books are. The question then arises as to how competition can help to increase the distribution of books and thus serve the particular aim of making books on a wide range of topics readily available. In our view that aspect is not fully covered by Mr Beumer's report. I particularly appreciated the words of the two previous speakers. Mr Beyer de Ryke rightly said that we must distinguish between the possible forms of competition. For clarity I should perhaps add that the aim here should not be to eliminate competition but to organize it in such a way as to serve our ends. We are not concerned with resale price maintenance or price control by the State. Competition in the book trade is of a very special kind, and we would ask all our colleagues in Parliament, in the debate which we hope will soon be held on this topic in connection with the Commission's report, to adopt a flexible approach to the objectives, which are sometimes controversial, so that we do not become the defenders of rigorous competition while not at the same time rejecting all forms of competition, profit and even — I apologize for saying this — economic viability.

Mr Beyer de Ryke concluded by saying — or at least that was how it sounded in the interpretation — that the issue was not one of profitability. Nevertheless the aim must be to keep books as cheap as possible, so that the largest number of people can read the largest possible number of books at their income level. I would like to point out that we should take this opportunity to make our aims perfectly clear, so that when the report is available we can calmly discuss the matter and consider how to attain our objectives. We believe that this matter deserves urgent consideration by the Commission. It should make the facts clear and then recognize the controversial aspects before going on to make proposals as to how a reasonable and harmonious conclusion can be reached.

We consider it most important for this matter not to be postponed, since nothing can be more important for European cooperation in the broader sense than for us to adopt a unified approach to our cultural situation — and it seems to me that each one of us is in a specific cultural situation; in other words, we must return to the culture which has made Europe what it is today. We therefore support this motion and hope that it will be adopted by the whole House. It would be highly desirable for Parliament to put as soon as possible and with the largest possible majority this request to the Commission for a proposal on a differentiated approach for the benefit of all our citizens who have elected us to this Parliament.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call the European Democratic Group.

**Mr Balfour.** — Mr President, we are deeply concerned on this side of the House to ensure that the Commission and Parliament generally refrain from erecting fortifications around particular industries and sectors, fortifications against the onslaught of intra-Community competition and of Article 85 (3) in particular. We believe strongly that the implementation of a robust competition policy is an essential precondition to the fulfilment of a free and unified market and that it is an essential weapon in our campaign to bring about greater freedom of movement in the European Community for persons, goods and services. Whilst, however, declaring our firm belief in a free market and in the rules of competition as a means to this end, we recognize, or at least a large number of my Group recognize, that we should not necessarily be squeamish or uncompromisingly dogmatic about identifying certain exceptions to these rules. The difficulty in these cases, of course, is to know to what extent such exceptions are necessary or desirable.

It is to this extremely difficult task that Mr Beumer has devoted so much attention and effort in his report. The purpose and scope of this report is not to take the whole of the publishing or retail book industry out of the constraints of the European competition policy: it is intended rather to permit certain retail trade or distribution practices without which the cultural and educational interests of the Dutch-speaking minority in the Community could be adversely affected to a serious degree. It is easy, as a member of a predominantly English-speaking group, to disregard the call for special treatment of the book trade in the cultural and ethnic minorities of the Community.

For these reasons I have urged my colleagues in the European Democratic Group to look upon Mr Beumer's report with sympathy. In our view, there are one or two phrases in the resolution which need to be amended, both in order to make it more precise and therefore less likely to set a major precedent for abuse in the future, and in order to remove the impression that somehow a social, free-market economy can lead to élitism. For these reasons we have tabled three amendments. Incidentally, it is worth noting that this motion was adopted by our committee without even the chance of putting amendments there; otherwise we would have put these to the rapporteur, who, I know, would have accepted them without criticism. All of our amendments, then, support the main thrust of Mr Beumer's arguments. I understand he finds these amendments acceptable in principle, and I can accordingly support his efforts in this report to delineate a particular and limited economic activity and to place it outside the strictest application of Article 85 (3).

**President.** — This debate will now be adjourned until Wednesday.

## 11. Question Time

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is Question Time (Doc. 1-842/80).

We begin with questions addressed to the Commission.

Question No 1, by Mr Adam (H-436/80).

Has there been any joint discussion between the Commission and the British Government regarding the proposals to modify regional status within the United Kingdom and in particular the proposal to downgrade the regional status of the North-East of England?

**Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission.** — (NL) Discussions have indeed taken place between the Commission and the British Government about proposals to modify regional status within the United Kingdom. These discussions covered the proposal to downgrade the status of certain parts of North-East England with a more favourable social and economic position to enable support to be concentrated on areas where the problems are most severe. As a result of this redistribution which began in August 1979, the working population of the assisted areas in the United Kingdom will have fallen from over 40 % to about 25 % in August 1982. The coordinating principles for the 'special development areas' and 'development areas' lay down a maximum support level of 30 %; the Member State itself may give support of 30 % and 20 % respectively. For 'intermediate areas' the Community maximum is 20 % and the Member State may give 10 % aid. In the North-East of England the major population centres Tyneside and Wearside, which are to remain special development areas, and Teesside, which will remain a development area, are not affected by these changes. The areas actually concerned are as follows: the Alnwick travel-to-work area and the Darlington and Newton Aycliffe employment office areas used to be development areas but were downgraded to intermediate areas in August. The Bishop Auckland employment office area lost the status of special development area and is to become an intermediate area. Downgrading to development area took place in August 1980 and it will become an intermediate area in 1982. The central Durham travel-to-work area was downgraded in August 1980 from special development area to development area.

Finally the Barnard Castle, Berwick, Haltwhistle and Hexham employment office areas are to lose their development area status and be classified as an unaided region.

**Mr Adam.** — I understand the changes that have been made; I know about them. Is the Commissioner satisfied that these changes have not disturbed the arrangements for the Regional Development Fund

**Adam**

rules, which had been drawn up before they took place?

**Mr Andriessen.** — (NL) There is no reason to suppose that these changes are incompatible with the Regional Fund rules.

**Mr Boyes.** — That was the most appalling statement I have heard from a Commissioner while I have been in this Parliament. You are just acting there as a parrot for Sir Keith Joseph, a member of the most vicious, anti-working-class government that we have known this century in our country. Unemployment in Durham, the area you have tried to talk about, is higher than it has been known for centuries . . .

*(Protests from the right)*

**President.** — Mr Boyes, without entering into an argument on the substance, I must ask you not to direct personal remarks to the Commissioner. Please proceed.

**Mr Boyes.** — Mr President, I should get round to my questions a lot quicker if those silly b-s over there would keep quiet while I am speaking.

The Commissioner has to understand what is happening to our industrial base in the North-East and in Durham. My question to him: will he give us an assurance that he will reopen talks with the Conservative Government as a new Commissioner, because whatever his predecessor did was absolute rubbish?

**Mr Andriessen.** — (NL) I cannot help it if the honourable Member is not interested in a detailed answer to a specific question. However, I was not speaking for his benefit but to the Member who put the question. I cannot give the assurance for which he has asked. The Commission has discussed these matters with the UK Government, and if the honourable Member thinks that there must be changes he should make representations in a different Parliament.

**Mr Welsh.** — Would the Commissioner accept that we could all be spared the amazing performances we have just seen from Mr Boyes if the Commission, when reviewing the Regional Fund Regulation, would decide to apply Regional Fund criteria to industries or areas of industrial decline such as textiles or ship-building, or to structural problems such as land dereliction or outdated sewage systems, and not insist on merely applying the geographical regional policies of the Member States? Would he further agree that this sort of reform is essential if the Regional Development

policy is to exist as a Community policy and not merely as the creature of Member States' governments?

**Mr Andriessen.** — (NL) Clearly this debate is not the occasion for a full-scale discussion of new rules for regional policy. But the observations made here will be recorded in the Report of Proceedings, and we shall take account of them when the time comes to review the rules.

**Mr Seal.** — I am sure the Commission is aware that the decision the UK Government has taken on regional assistance has been taken purely on unemployment figures. Unfortunately, these figures were based on 1979 data, and since then employment patterns are changing in the UK. In my constituency in the North unemployment in certain areas has increased by well over 100 %, and youth unemployment in Bradford is now the highest in the whole of the United Kingdom. Is the Commission aware that the UK Government should not be using completely out-of-date figures but considering trends in unemployment, and will it press the UK Government to reconsider the areas to which they are going to give assistance and to consider areas where Commission and Tory policies have forced industries such as textiles into permanent decline and make these areas, irrespective of whether they are now assisted, eligible for grants from the EEC?

**Mr Andriessen.** — (NL) As far as I know, it is the intention of the British Government to reconsider by 1 August 1981 whether the classification of regions should be effected in a different manner than at present. Changes in the regional classification may be made at any time when the social and economic situation shows a fundamental change. I believe that this has recently been the case. It is well known that unemployment figures have risen sharply in the United Kingdom, but this increase has occurred right across the board and the question is whether there are then any grounds to make incidental changes — this will, of course, have to be considered on the basis of individual cases. In the Commission's view regional policy must be used to give the necessary support to regions which have relatively severe problems, and the support must not be used to solve national problems.

**Mr Price.** — Will the Commission accept that Community regional aid has been dispersed too widely in the past and will they confirm that in any discussions they have with the United Kingdom Government, or any other Member State government, they will use their influence to ensure that Community regional aid is made more effective by being concentrated where it is most needed?

**Mr Andriessen.** — (NL) I feel it appropriate to consider whether the Commission has in the past used Community funds in a manner which was not the most effective. However, the Regional Fund implementing provisions are now in force again, and account is naturally taken of past experience.

**Sir Peter Vanneck.** — I will not imitate Mr Boyes' emotional outburst because I for one feel that this sort of catharsis in the Assembly is boring and counter-productive.

What I want to know for Teesside, the constituency I represent, is whether joint discussion between the Commission and the United Kingdom is to continue in order to take account of changing and worsening circumstances. Can I have that assurance?

**Mr Andriessen.** — (NL) I cannot give a specific answer to that question. I shall gladly give the honourable Member written information as soon as possible.

**Mr Griffiths.** — The Commissioner has shown that he has some knowledge of the fact that we have a deepening unemployment crisis in the United Kingdom. As we are considering a question concerning the last set of proposals by the Conservative Government to reduce the number of areas to which Community regional aid can be given, has the Conservative Government approached the Commission during the last six months — particularly during the last two months — regarding the areas excluded or downgraded under their regional assistance schemes? In many of these areas — like, for example, the Neath Valley — unemployment in the last year has more than doubled. By any criteria, whether we look at unemployment or earnings rates, we will see that the situation there is now far far worse than it was when the area was able to get this assistance. Can the Commission tell me whether the Government has approached the Commission in the last month or two with a view to reviewing the situation?

**Mr Andriessen.** — (NL) To the best of my knowledge that is not the case.

**President.** — I call Mrs Ewing to speak on a point of order.

**Mrs Ewing.** — As the representative of the largest region, apart from Greenland, in this Community, can I ask the Commission whether it is their fault that maps contained in their document of 7 January concerning the relative intensity of regional problems do not show the Orkney and Shetland islands?

**President.** — I am sorry, Mrs Ewing, that is not a point of order. If you want to check the cartographic knowledge of the Commission, you can do that outside the Chamber. I am not taking any more direct or indirect supplementary questions.

I call Mr Blaney to speak on a point of order.

**Mr Blaney.** — Mr President, I wish to ask whether the Rules of Procedure of this Parliament stipulate somewhere that each Member may, in fact, ask a supplementary question on the answer given?

**President.** — Mr Blaney, as a deputy leader of a political group you really should know the Rules of Procedure a little better than that.

Annex II of the Rules of Procedure states that

The President shall rule on the admissibility of supplementary questions and shall limit their number so that each Member who has put down a question may receive an answer to it and so as to afford an opportunity for a debate to be requested on the answer given to any question or supplementary question.

The President shall not be obliged to declare a supplementary question admissible . . .

I am sorry, Mr Blaney, unless you quote the relevant standing order we must proceed.

Question No 2, by Lord Bethell (H-578/80):

Is the Commission aware that my complaint against the fixing of airline tariffs for flights within the European Community, contrary to Article 90 of the Treaty of Rome, was issued under the Form 'C' procedure on 2 May 1980? Is it normal for the Commission to take more than six months to reply to such complaints; are they able to announce now when my complaint will be answered, what other discussions have they had on this question of air tariffs and what action do they propose?

**Mr Andriessen, Member of the Commission.** — (NL) Airline tariffs for scheduled services are approved in the final instance by the governments concerned. Such approval is preceded by consultations with the airline companies, sometimes within IATA. Bilateral agreements between governments on airline tariffs and the Paris Agreement of 1967 expressly state that there can be no question of infringement of Articles 85 and 86 of the EEC Treaty when tariffs approved by the governments are enforced. In such cases the Commission may challenge the decisions of the Member States if they create a situation prohibited by the Treaty. The Commission does not, for example, exclude the possibility that such situations may exist and that action may be called for under Article 90 of the Treaty, but the juridical possibilities offered by the Treaty must be weighed up carefully and the Commission has not yet been able to reach a final position on

**Andriessen**

this. The same applies to the economic aspects which must be taken into account in determining whether the conditions of Articles 85 (1) and (3) and 86 are fulfilled.

With that aim in view the Commission has, since July last year, been engaged in a study of airline tariffs at the request of the Council. We shall, of course, take account of the results of that study in deciding our position. In view of all the legal and economic problems bound up with this question, it is clearly not possible for the Commission to state at this juncture whether the particular complaint was justified.

**Lord Bethell.** — I appreciate that Mr Andriessen is not responsible for the sins of his predecessor, but will he not accept that nine months is far too long a period for a simple factual complaint to be under consideration by the Commission?

Is he aware, since he only assumed his portfolio a few weeks ago, that the Commission received a legal opinion about my complaint in October — an opinion which stated quite clearly that it was justified — but that in early December, at the request of President Jenkins, this legal opinion was sent back with a request that it be redone in a way which was more politically palatable to the member governments of the Community? Will he confirm or deny that this took place? Meanwhile the people of Europe are having to pay three, four, five times more for their air travel than they should do, and the unity of Europe is being delayed.

Will he accept three points: firstly, that the airlines are in violation of Articles 85 and 86 of the Treaty; secondly, that all ten governments are in violation of Article 90; thirdly, that the Commission is in clear violation of Article 173 through its failure to act? And does he know how many lawsuits he is going to have on his hands in a very few weeks?

**Mr Andriessen.** — (NL) I concede that a long time has been taken over this but, as I explained, I am still new to the subject. We are, of course, doing our best to make quick progress. I am not aware of any documents having been sent back. I cannot answer that question. As to the question of whether the Treaty articles concerned are being infringed by airline companies and governments, the specific point of interest to us here, I cannot draw any definitive conclusions at this stage.

**Mr Habsburg.** — (D) Without wishing to criticize the Commissioner, who is new to his office, may I also ask him whether he does not feel that the Commission has itself acted illegally by failing to answer Lord Bethell's question within the specified time?

**Mr Andriessen.** — (NL) I have already said that a long time has been taken and I am not trying to hide the fact. But when a matter is so complex that a long time is necessary, it would be even more inappropriate to give an early answer without due preparation than to allow a longer delay to elapse.

**President.** — I call Mrs Ewing to speak on a point of order.

**Mrs Ewing.** — I would like the Commission to explain why they have missed out part of the EEC Community from most of their maps.

**President.** — Points of order must relate to the procedure of the House. This could well be a question you could put to the Commission, either orally or in writing.

Question No 3 by Mr Price (H-607/80):

Are the Commission investigating the theory put forward by Professor Thomas Gold, Director of the Center for Radiophysics and Space Research and Professor of Astronomy at Cornell University, USA, that abundant supplies of methane gas could be found by deep drilling and, if so, will they consider proposing Community financial support for the cost of just over 30 m EUA required to drill 10 experimental deep wells?

**Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission.** — (F) There are two parts to that question. Firstly, is the Commission following up the work and theories of Professor Thomas Gold concerning the possibility of discovering methane reserves by deep drilling? The answer is yes, and in a few weeks time we shall be holding a meeting of experts with leading geologists and geophysicists to look into the matter further. Secondly, can the Commission provide financial support for drilling activities to test the validity of the theory? On the first point we are awaiting the results of an experiment now under way in Greenland. On the second point Parliament knows that we have proposed to the Council a policy designed to increase hydrocarbon exploration and research in the Community. So far the Council has taken no action on this, and the 1981 budget contains only a 'token entry' against this item.

**Mr Price.** — I am pleased to note that the Commission are convening a meeting of experts; that sounds most helpful. But would the Commissioner confirm that the possibility of finding large supplies of methane gas by deep drilling is one which is sufficiently important to press forward with with the utmost vigour, and will he do that both in relation to the proposals to Council and to the results ultimately of this experts' meeting?

**Mr Davignon.** — (*F*) The Commission always follows up its work carefully. In this particular instance it will continue a careful study, because there is a wide difference of opinion between geophysicists on this point.

As to the possibility of our continuing to drill, I can only refer the honourable Member back to my previous reply: the Commission has received no money for this purpose in the 1981 budget. We are therefore awaiting the outcome of the work by the experts and shall return to this matter in 1981.

**Mr Seligman.** — Will the Commissioner assure us that he is going to try and get a similar sum in the 1982 budget for this very important area?

**Mr Davignon.** — (*F*) I have not given up the struggle over the 1981 budget and still less over the 1982 budget.

Maximum use of our own resources is a priority for energy policy which we shall be considering in liaison with Parliament in coming weeks and months.

**President.** — Since they are on related subjects, I shall call together

— Question No 4 by Mr Patterson (H-609/80):

Will the Commission carry out a study of the interaction between the different nationality laws in Member States as they affect the transmission of nationality? In particular will it consider the possible effects of the proposed changes in British nationality law as they could affect 'non-patrial' children born in Belgium to UK parents (i.e. third generation born outside the UK)?

— Question No 5 by Mr Enright (H-622/80)

Is the Commission aware that the British Government has made proposals in a White Paper on Nationality Law which would deprive the children, born of British citizens living abroad, of British nationality and would also create five different forms of nationality?

As this is clearly against the Convention on Human Rights to which the British Government is a signatory and also against the principles of free movement and establishment as laid down in the EEC Treaties, is the Commission prepared to ask the British Government to reconsider these proposals?

**Mr Thorn, President of the Commission.** — (*F*) I could speak at great length on this topic, which is very interesting and indeed fascinating to a lawyer specializing in international law. I shall confine myself to saying, for the information of this Assembly, that the powers given to us by the Treaties do not, as you may well imagine, permit the institutions of the Community to intervene in legislation relating to the acquisition

or loss of nationality in a particular Member State.

As to the compatibility of the intentions — since this is only at the stage of a draft bill at present — of the United Kingdom Government with the European Convention on Human Rights, I would draw the attention of the honourable Members to the fact that only the Strasbourg authorities are competent to pronounce on this matter. May I add that so far the laws on the acquisition and loss of nationality have created no difficulty from the angle of application of Community law.

**Mr Patterson.** — You have answered Mr Enright's question but you have not answered mine, which was whether you are going to carry out a study. The Treaties give Community citizens certain rights, and Community citizens are defined as the nationals of Member States. In particular, you have not answered my question on the interaction of the possible British law and Belgian law. Certain provisions of the Nationality Bill now before the British Parliament could result in children born to British nationals living in Belgium being entitled automatically to neither British nor Belgian citizenship, something which has been modified but not entirely settled by recent amendments. This must concern the Community, because Community citizens are the nationals of Member States. Will the Commission therefore carry out a study of the interaction of nationality law in conjunction with the British proposals and secondly, will it be necessary to change the declaration of British nationality annexed to the Treaty of Accession by which the United Kingdom joined the Community?

**Mr Thorn.** — (*F*) I would first of all say that up to now we have experienced no difficulties. But my real answer to the honourable Member is in the affirmative, and I apologize for not making that perfectly clear from the start. Yes, we will of course follow developments to ensure that there is no incompatibility. Up to now there has been none. We are also informed that the views of the British Government are evolving and we are following up this matter very closely. Without wishing to fall back on conjecture, we may, as you quite rightly said, be confronted with a problem of incompatibility in the future.

As to the final supplementary question put by the honourable Member, my answer is no.

**Mr Enright.** — Does it not follow from the British Government's definition of nationality in the Treaty of Accession signed on 22 January 1972 that there really should be consultations with Member States if that definition, which is enshrined in the Treaty of Accession, is to be changed, in particular because of the effect it has upon the citizens of Gibraltar who

**Enright**

currently have free movement within the EEC? I apologize to the Commission for not giving advance notice of this line of questioning, but it has taken from 5 a.m. this morning until this present moment to get here today.

**Mr Thorn.** — (*F*) It is, of course, always preferable for our consultations to take place, but the Commission cannot ask every government to consult it on the desirability of changes in its legislation in every possible field. That would be going too far, but we are sure that Her Majesty's Government, once it has determined its position on this proposal, will consult the appropriate authorities to avoid any incompatibilities which we would all regret.

**Mr Kellett-Bowman.** — The President of the Commission has already virtually answered the question I intended to ask. I was merely going to indicate that the British Government has promised two amendments to this bill, which is the point that he himself raised in an attempt to deal with this particular problem.

**Mr Thorn.** — (*F*) The honourable Member has not put a supplementary question.

**President.** — Question No 6 by Mrs Fullet (H-617/80):

Why has the Commission not included the Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur region in its special five-year programme, since this region has to cope with the very problems used as selection criteria, namely vulnerability of the agricultural sector, weakness of the industrial sector, unemployment and a low level of economic activity?

**Mr Richard, Member of the Commission.** — The short answer to the question is that this region exhibits some but not all of the selection criteria. In its selection of regions for its proposal for a specific measure under the quota-free section of the ERDF the Commission took account of sectoral criteria and of the economic and social conditions in the regions. Three regions were selected — Aquitaine, Languedoc-Roussillon and Midi-Pyrénées. The Council confirmed this choice and adopted the Commission's proposal in July 1980. All three regions share certain features — low level of employment and industry, heavy dependence on Mediterranean farm crops, very high level of employment in agriculture, high rate of unemployment and low *per capita* gross domestic product. The region Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur exhibits some of these characteristics, it is true, but it is different in having a very low level of employment in agriculture and also a *per capita* GDP which is actually higher than the Community average. Further information on these criteria, if honourable Members wish it, may be

found in the first periodical report on the economic and social situation in the regions of the Community, which the Commission sent to the Council and Parliament in December 1980.

**Mrs Fullet.** — (*F*) Perhaps we do not meet your specific criterion, but those of us who come from the region appreciate the real problem. My question is this: what specific action does the Commission intend to undertake to assist this region which will be as severely affected as other regions by the enlargement of the Community? I feel bound to stress this aspect of enlargement of the Community.

**Mr Richard.** — It is a little hard to be asked in a supplementary not to discuss the selection criteria when in fact that is precisely what the question asks. On the rather larger point that is raised, of course I share the concerns that are being expressed in the House, but it is quite impossible, on a somewhat narrow question of this sort, to give the kind of comprehensive answer to the problems of a region that the supplementary question would seem to call for.

**Mrs Kellett-Bowman.** — Will the Commissioner confirm the promise given by the Commissioner for Regional Affairs on many occasions to consider very carefully indeed the inclusion of textiles in the non-quota section because of the very severe unemployment that has arisen in this particular industry?

**Mr Richard.** — Mrs Kellett-Bowman and I have both been members of another Parliament, and she will know that no minister or Commissioner answering a question on one issue would ever be rash enough to commit either himself or his government or indeed another Commissioner on a totally different one.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — Questions Nos 7 and 8 have been postponed until the March part-session at the request of their authors.

Question No 9, by Mr Remilly (H-621/80):

Has the Commission observed any progress in intra-Community industrial cooperation in recent months?

If so, in which sectors has this progress made itself most felt?

**Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission.** — (*F*) A proper answer to that question requires a clear definition of industrial cooperation. Are we referring to cooperation between industrial and economic operators themselves or to cooperation between public authorities on industrial matters?

**Davignon**

If we take the first definition, the Commission has no direct knowledge of this. Some developments relating to major companies are published in the press, but industrial cooperation is increasingly involving small and medium-sized undertakings on a growing scale. At the level of the largest undertakings, Community strategies sometimes enable the cooperation necessary for structural adjustments to be promoted, and the Commission is pursuing that policy; in the present difficult circumstances the concept of cooperation between undertakings obviously assumes a more important place.

As regards industrial cooperation organized by the public authorities, progress has been made through the meeting of Ministers for Industry last June in Venice. That cooperation has led to a series of studies by the responsible administrative bodies to define the best possible environment to facilitate new investments, particularly in certain areas where they are particularly necessary.

**Mr Remilly.** — (*F*) Do you consider that the agreements between the Japanese motor vehicle industry and certain European industries constitute progress towards industrial cooperation?

**Mr Davignon.** — (*F*) That subject would warrant a very lengthy reply, as I am sure Mr Remilly would agree. What I would like to say is that at this stage our assessment of contracts of this kind depends on our knowledge of the detailed provisions of the contracts. To what extent does advanced technology exist in the country which benefits from the cooperation and how will the research and development activities be ensured? There are a whole range of points which must be known before a subjective, qualitative, judgement can be passed on this type of cooperation.

**Sir David Nicolson.** — Would the Commissioner care to say that, in the consideration which is to be given to proposals for restructuring the Community budget in the future and obtaining a better balance, attention will now be given as a matter of urgency to the creation of an industry policy which will make industry as important in this Community as agriculture and that steps will be taken to secure the political will and the political interest in this subject, which is becoming so vital as Community industry slips further behind in development and technology when compared with Japan and America?

**Mr Davignon.** — (*F*) The problem of greater effectiveness of the common agricultural policy has nothing to do with that of more effective Community industrial policy. Each policy must be implemented on the basis of its own merits, and industrial policy cannot be improved simply by cutting the appropriations

earmarked for agricultural policy. Having said that, one of the absolute priorities of the Commission is to implement an industrial strategy which will promote the essential industrial restructuring; this implies adjustments in old established sectors and the implementation as a matter of priority by the Council of the various proposals which we have put forward and which we shall continue to put forward in the area of industrial innovation.

**Mr Turcat.** — (*F*) Following the Commission's answer to our colleague, Mr Remilly, I am not really clear whether the Commission has told us if it has noted any progress in the area of cooperation and, more specifically, in industrial coordination. May I now ask whether the Commission is simply waiting to see the strategy of the big undertakings or whether it has any new proposals to encourage industrial cooperation, particularly in the advanced technology sectors?

**Mr Davignon.** — (*F*) Since the rules of Question Time require brief statements, I may not have made it sufficiently clear in my answer to the first question that there has certainly been a favourable trend in industrial cooperation. Secondly, all of our action in the area of market information, i.e. in that of norms and standards, is directed towards the creation of the conditions necessary to facilitate and improve industrial cooperation to give an appropriate market for these new industrial activities, particularly in the sphere of advanced technology.

**President.** — Since they are on related subjects, I shall call together:

— Question No 10, by Mr Balfe (H-634/80):

Can the Commission state how many tonnes of beef are currently held at EEC intervention stores; what proportion do they expect to be exported with subsidies; and can the Commission state the comparable figures for one year ago?

Does the Commission accept that this meat could be better used by making provision for it to be supplied cheaply to those education authorities who provide school meals?

— Question No 33 by Mrs Clwyd (H-695/80):

There is reported to be 20 000 tonnes of beef in store in the UK alone. According to a statement of Michael Silver, President of the Imported Meat Trade Association, it should be possible to sell cheap meat from Common Market stores to schools, hospitals and to pensioners.

In view of the high cost of storage and the proportion of the common agricultural policy spent on storage, would the Commission care to take up the suggestion?

The Commissioner answering this question will be Mr Dalsager. May I, on behalf of the Parliament, give you

**President**

a very warm welcome, Commissioner, to your first sitting of the Parliament in your new function and wish you success in your period of office?

*(Applause)*

**Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission.** — *(DK)* Thank you, Mr President, for welcoming me so kindly.

As the President pointed out, I am answering two questions which are phrased in similar terms. As regards the intervention stocks of beef, the situation is that at present there are some 300 000 tonnes in store, which is approximately the same amount as at this time last year. In 1980, 360 000 tonnes of meat were sold from intervention stocks, two-thirds of which was exported to third countries. It is very difficult to predict how much will be exported in 1981, as this depends on the trend in the market and on measures that are taken in the commercial world.

The honourable Members also ask whether it is not possible for this intervention meat to be supplied cheaply to schools, hospitals and so on. I can inform them that there is already an opportunity for this to happen. Under the terms of Regulation No 2374/79, the Commission is prepared to make such beef available to social institutions, such as schools and hospitals, at a greatly reduced price, if requested to do so by the national authorities. At the moment only Italy is taking advantage of this opportunity, which has existed since 1974.

**Mr Balfe.** — Would the Commissioner state what publicity he intends to give to the scheme for selling off and, secondly, whether the institutions concerned will be able to obtain the subsidized stocks by direct application to the relevant authorities or whether they will have to go through government departments or other public authorities?

**Mr Dalsager.** — *(DK)* As far as I could gather, the first question, which I did not hear properly because of a fault with the microphone, asked how this meat has been marketed in various countries. I know that the United Kingdom has taken advantage of this scheme in the past, I believe in 1978. The position is that the institutions must apply through government departments in order to purchase this intervention meat at a reduced price.

**Mrs Clwyd.** — I thank the Commissioner for his answer and would ask him to confirm one or two assertions made in English-language newspapers recently. First, that Europe's taxpayers will pay a staggering 6 billion pounds this year for getting rid of food that we cannot eat; second, that there are more

than 6 million tonnes of wheat, barley and rye stacked away around the Continent. In addition to the 300 000 tonnes of unwanted beef he mentioned, there are 180 000 tonnes of refrigerated butter and 231 000 tonnes of skimmed milk. He mentioned the institutions to which some of the food is on offer at present — he did not mention extending the scheme to pensioners, some of whom in countries like the United Kingdom, because of the policies of the present government, are at present suffering a cut in their living standards. Will he please consider pensioners in addition to the institutions he has already mentioned?

**Mr Dalsager.** — *(DK)* I think the questioner will agree with me that it is difficult to answer this series of questions. I do not have the exact budget figures with me to show how much money will be used for this purpose in 1981. However, I would like to say that in 1980 the Commission made an effort to save money, as it will continue to do in 1981, in managing the organization of the market in agricultural products.

We do not have 180 000 tonnes of butter in store at present but, unless I am completely misinformed, 70 000 tonnes, for which there is currently a strong demand. At the moment there are admittedly stores of wheat, grain and rice, but these are extremely useful as buffer stocks in a situation where we know that grain prices are likely to rise in future. As regards skimmed milk powder and other products, the stocks were reduced substantially during 1980 and are now at their lowest level for some time. This is also a result of the way in which the Commission has managed these stocks in recent times.

As regards extending the scheme in question to pensioners in the United Kingdom — I assume that this also applies to pensioners in other countries — I believe it would be difficult to adapt the arrangements for individual purposes; however, pensioners living in homes or other institutions which fall within the terms of the scheme would, of course, be able to benefit from the system. May I also point out that the Community spends a considerable amount on supporting the sale of butter on the British market, in that British consumers benefit from a special system governing butter sales on the UK market.

**Mr Simmonds.** — How many days' consumption of beef in the Community does this storage of 300 000 tonnes represent? And in view of the fact that it is thought strategically necessary to store 90 days' supply of oil, does he regard this storage of beef as an embarrassment?

**Mr Dalsager.** — *(DK)* At the moment I cannot say precisely how many days' consumption the stocks of beef represent, but in view of the supply situation with regard to beef it is not necessary for us to have a stock

**Dalsager**

of the present size. For this reason, the Commission will continue to adopt a cautious attitude towards large-scale intervention buying and to see to it that the stock is sold off in a rational way.

**Mr Blaney.** — Might I just join with you in welcoming our new Commissioner here to day and ask him whether, in fact, it is not true that the 300 000 tonnes of beef about which there is such a song and dance being made this year, as there was about a similar amount last year, have been imported from outside in order to enable the manufacturing countries to sell some of their goods there, while being put down as a cost against the agricultural policy and the CAP? Might I ask the Commissioner whether or not it will be possible for him to try and have the accounting rearranged so that beef and all other agricultural products, such as grain and butter, that are imported over and above our requirements in the Community and then sent out at a loss, or an equivalent amount sent out, are not laid at the foot of the CAP and used as a weapon to destroy it or to condemn it as costing too much?

**Mr Dalsager.** — (DK) As far as trade in these products is concerned, I am bound to say that the Community has taken on certain international obligations and also certain political obligations concerning agricultural imports and exports. These world-wide obligations do indeed place a burden on the agriculture budget.

I would be very willing to consider how such expenditure could be separated from what is actually spent on agriculture, since it would also be in my interest to have a clear picture of how much expenditure is essentially political in nature, and how much is devoted to selling the Community's own products and to the other aspects of our agricultural policy.

**Mr Marshall.** — Can I join with those welcoming the Commissioner to this Parliament and say that one looks forward to questions from time to time?

When he is considering exporting food to the Third World or third countries, will he bear in mind the fact that Community taxpayers are very happy to send food to those countries where there is a threat of famine and undernourishment but are not happy to see subsidized sales to third countries such as Russia who are enemies of freedom and enemies of everything that this Community stands for?

(Cries from the left)

**Mr Dalsager.** — (DK) I am not sure, Mr President, that I caught the whole of that question, because the microphone was not working properly. However, I

would like to say that the Commissioner for Agriculture always bears the Community's taxpayers in mind when submitting his proposals and managing the market. It is essential that he should, because of the obligations which the Commission has in terms of the budget, including those in relation to the common agricultural policy.

When the point at issue is expenditure on exporting agricultural products to third countries and areas where there is famine, the Community has a clearly defined policy, which I support, namely, that the Community must take action in situations where there is great human suffering and an urgent need for food-stuffs. It could, of course, be debated whether such expenditure is strictly agricultural, a matter which I dealt with in answering the previous question. When the point at issue is exporting agricultural products from the Community to the Soviet Union, for example, or other countries of the Eastern bloc, the Commission's policy has also been perfectly clear in the past, and I intend to stand by it for as long as we consider it reasonable to pursue such a policy. That depends to a great extent on the course of events in the world outside the Community.

**Mr Fanton.** — (F) Many months ago the Assembly delivered a favourable opinion on the new grading scale for beef carcasses. Unfortunately it would seem that the scale has still not been adopted. Does the Commissioner not think that this failure may have serious implications for the meat market?

**Mr Dalsager.** — (DK) I can inform you that this matter is still the subject of technical discussions and that it will be proceeded with as quickly as possible.

**President.** — Since they are on related subjects, I shall call together:

— Question No 11 by Mr Vie (H-638/80).

Can the Commission explain the criteria on which the introduction of freedom of establishment for medical practitioners, and more particularly gynaecologists, was based?

Is it aware that by this action it is causing the disappearance of the speciality of general gynaecology, which numbers 900 practitioners in France and does not exist in all other EEC countries?

— Question No 49 by Mrs Roudy (H-733/80):

Hitherto gynaecology has been an independent area of specialization in French medicine distinct from obstetrics. However, France, interpreting the principle of harmonization in a highly individualistic manner, may well delete gynaecology from the list of specialisms recognized in France.

### President

Could the Commission say what position France adopted on this matter when it forwarded the list of specialisms recognized in France and whether it does not consider it necessary to maintain gynaecology as an independent specialism distinct from obstetrics?

**Mr Narjes, Member of the Commission.** — (D) On 16 June 1975 the Council adopted two Directives designed to facilitate the freedom of doctors to provide services. This Directive No 75/363/EEC is designed in particular to coordinate the conditions for specialized medical training in the Member States. Quantitative and qualitative criteria are defined for each special branch of medicine and in particular for gynaecology/obstetrics. The quantitative criteria include a provision on the minimum duration of training. The qualitative criterion is a full theoretical and practical training which must be monitored by the competent authorities.

Directive No 75/362/EEC on the other hand defines the special areas which, in the view of the Member States, satisfy the qualitative and quantitative training requirements set down in Directive No 75/363/EEC and in respect of which mutual recognition of diplomas is therefore necessary.

The national designation given by France for the general heading of obstetrics and gynaecology was *obstétrique et gynécologie médicale*. That designation is now contained in the Directive. Later on France asked for this designation to be replaced by *gynécologie obstétrique*. That change is now being effected through an amendment to the directives which date from the year 1975. I hope that this answers the wishes of the authors of these two questions, Mr Vie and Mrs Roudy.

In general terms, the system introduced by these directives does not prevent a Member State from retaining on its own territory qualifications which do not coincide with the provisions of the coordinating directive. That applies to *gynécologie médicale* in France. That qualification does not entitle the holder to freely provide services elsewhere.

**Mr Vie.** — (F) I am sorry to have to ask for a clarification. If I have understood correctly, the Commission said that France renounced of its own accord a speciality of medical gynaecology on its own territory — since the first designation of the speciality, if I heard the interpreters correctly, was 'obstetric and medical gynaecology'. France itself subsequently left out the adjective 'medical' to retain the designation of 'obstetric gynaecology'.

**Mr Narjes.** — (D) I shall repeat what I said before: France initially indicated the designation *obstétrique et gynécologie médicale* to correspond to the general title of gynaecology and obstetrics. After the directive had

taken effect, France asked for this designation to be replaced by *gynécologie obstétrique*. That subsequent wish will be reflected in the foreseeable future by an amendment to the Directive.

**President.** — Question No 12 by Mr Israël (H-645/80):

How does the Commission account for the fact that, within the context of the Euro-Arab Dialogue, no committee has been set up to deal with the crucial problem of energy, either as a general issue or more specifically in terms of energy supply?

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (F) When the Euro-Arab Dialogue began, energy was obviously included as one possible area of cooperation. In their memorandum of 11 June 1974 the Nine expressed the view that cooperation could be exercised in areas such as industry, agriculture, energy and raw materials. It was decided in Abu Dhabi in November 1975, at the request of the Arab partners, that energy would not be included in the Dialogue with the exception of the refining and petrochemicals industry; that is the reason why no committee was set up in this area. When the Euro-Arab Dialogue was resumed on 13 November last in Luxembourg, the European and Arab partners looked into the possibility of widening the framework of discussion. I represented the Commission at that meeting and I specifically mentioned energy, with the proviso that the discussion should not be limited to hydrocarbons. The Arab partners neither approved nor rejected this proposal. The subject will be examined in contacts between the two parties which are due to take place during the next few weeks and months to organize the work of the new dialogue.

**Mr Israël.** — (F) Since the Euro-Arab Dialogue is no longer confined to economic matters but also takes in political questions, is the Commissioner responsible for development not afraid that political pressures may be brought to bear when Europe is trying to ensure its energy independence, specifically through this Euro-Arab Dialogue?

**Mr Cheysson.** — (F) The honourable Member's question does not relate solely to energy. Everyone knows that from the commencement of the Euro-Arab Dialogue until the time when it was suspended, our partners wanted political discussions to take place. The Nine always refused and, as you know, the ministerial meeting demanded from the start by our partners has not yet taken place. That meeting may be held next summer, and we shall then see to what extent a political discussion is possible; the subject is still entirely open.

**Mr Blumenfeld.** — (*D*) In view of the great importance of this matter, will the Commissioner say whether the Commission is prepared to inform Parliament and its responsible committees of the progress made in the working committees of the Euro-Arab Dialogue, and if so when?

**Mr Cheysson.** — (*F*) The Commission is always ready to give Parliament, either in plenary sitting or in committee, full information on work falling within its terms of reference. In the case of political cooperation the Commission, as you know, is required to observe a certain reserve, and it is preferable to put questions direct to the President of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation. But you also know that matters touching on political cooperation have frequently been dealt with in the Political Affairs Committee.

**Mr Seligman.** — The Commissioner made an important remark to the effect that these talks will not be confined to hydrocarbons. Does this mean that they will therefore concern investment in alternatives to oil in the Community and in the Third World? Also, will they concern the provision to OPEC of Western technology? I feel that these broader talks are what are needed now, not just questions of supply of oil.

**Mr Cheysson.** — (*F*) The answer is yes.

**Mr Doublet.** — (*F*) I would like to ask Commissioner Cheysson whether the ministerial meeting to which he has just referred is actually scheduled for July, and can he give us an assurance on that point?

**Mr Cheysson.** — (*F*) The meeting is due to be held in July, but I can give no assurance that it will actually be held then.

**President.** — Question No 13, by Mr Turcat (H-647/80):

What results have been achieved by the Commission's measures to promote energy-saving in industry, either through waste heat recuperation or through the use of new, less energy-consuming processes and the modification of existing processes?

**Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission.** — (*F*) The Commission is attempting to draw up overall and specific assessments in this area. A general assessment will centre on the report which it has asked a group of leading figures chaired by Mr Saint Jour to compile; that report will outline the requirements for economic growth in energy. A second group of experts, which Mr Saint Jour has also agreed to chair, will go on to examine in more detail the investments which would

be necessary to implement the strategy. So much for the general aspect. At the more specific level we have had a Community pilot programme for energy saving since 1979. That answers more specifically the question about ways of determining how heat can be recovered and processes modified for this purpose.

We have made available financial support of 45 million EUA for this purpose — against a total investment programme of 150 million EUA — and we shall be examining the replies to the tender which we issued in 1980. Finally, an interesting experiment modelled on a Canadian scheme is also being tried. The idea is to have buses equipped with measuring equipment and computers in order to indicate specifically to small and medium-sized undertakings, on the basis of information provided by them, how their overall energy consumption can be improved. The Commission is to provide logistic support for national buses through a centralized evaluation service at the Ispra Joint Research Centre. In 1981 we shall be assessing the results of the programme begun in 1979; we shall be verifying the initial practical achievements, and I have indicated the conditions necessary to change the situation locally.

**Mr Turcat.** — (*F*) I am grateful to Commissioner Davignon for his precise answers. We are aware of these projects to which the Community is contributing. We welcome this positive action in which the Commissioner is playing such an important role, while deploring the arbitrary ceiling set on measures of this kind — but we shall have occasion to return to that aspect.

My supplementary question concerns the energy content of standard materials such as paper or cement and comparisons between these standard materials and substitute materials, or the use of additives which are less costly in energy terms. Could not the Commission begin by publishing a catalogue showing the energy content of standard materials and then go on to extend its work on energy saving to pilot projects relating to substitute materials?

**Mr Davignon.** — (*F*) Those two questions are linked, and I shall see how we can act on the lines suggested by him which fit in with our own views, i.e. we wish to make available information to enable users to make the desired savings more readily. I shall examine this question; I cannot give a direct reply, but the suggestion made by the honourable Member seems to accord with our own strategy. I shall give a more detailed answer to Mr Turcat personally later.

**Mrs Ewing.** — May I thank the Commissioner for the EEC-aided prototype windmill on the island of Papa Stour in the Shetland archipelago, even though

**Ewing**

the Commission cannot find that on their own maps otherwise?

May I ask what the Commissioner sees as the future of wind-power, as it is a very serious thought that this could be used for domestic energy in very many of the islands of the Community — certainly many scores of islands I represent?

**Mr Davignon.** — (F) May I reassure the honourable Member that we should never have given our support for a project whose precise location was not known to us. In 1981 we shall be effecting a general assessment of the results of these pilot programmes to determine how to continue the experiment in liaison with national investment programmes or else to find that the results are not as promising as we might have hoped. As regards the use of wind energy, possibilities do exist under highly specific geographical conditions, notably on islands to which the honourable Member has referred which often have more wind than raw materials. That is a point which we shall be following up closely.

**Mr Moreland.** — Would the Commissioner agree with me that the most effective, if not the most popular, way of achieving energy-saving in industry is a proper pricing policy which reflects the scarcity of our energy resources, and will he pursue that policy a little more quickly than the previous Commission did over the Dutch gas-for-agriculture issue?

**Mr Davignon.** — (F) Specific energy saving programmes can, of course, only be effective in the context of a more general energy strategy, and within that energy strategy the need to reflect the true price of energy in overall prices is one point to which the Commission is giving close attention. The honourable Member knows that the previous Commission submitted a detailed document to the Council of Ministers for Economic and Financial Affairs. We are continuing our action on these lines at the general level and at that of the countries which are not following our recommendations, whether in agriculture or other sectors.

**Mr Herman.** — (F) Following that answer, can the Commissioner indicate whether it accords with the Commission's price policy in the area of energy savings for oil price rises to be compensated in full by automatic index-linking arrangements?

**Mr Davignon.** — (F) That question concerns first and foremost the repercussions on the economy not of the prices themselves but of the inflationary effects of those prices and more generally the maintenance of purchasing power.

**President.** — Question No 14, by Sir Frederick Warner (H-662/80):

What is the approximate proportion of money committed under the above headings, in 1980, to non-associated territories, ACP countries, French Départements d'Outre Mer, areas of Europe within the Community?

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (F) In 1980 the Community intervened several times following the damage caused by hurricanes in the Indian Ocean — on Mauritius and Reunion, on Fiji in the Pacific and in the Caribbean when damage was experienced by six associated countries, two non-associated countries and two overseas departments.

The total emergency aid made available to these countries in 1980 amounted to 7 300 000 units of account — 4 750 000 in the ACP states, 550 000 in the non-associated countries and two million in the French overseas departments; this represents 65 % for the ACP countries, 7.5 % for the non-associated countries and 27.5 % for the French overseas departments. In addition, emergency food aid was made available to the same countries, i.e. to four Caribbean countries following hurricane Allen, for a total of 3 250 000 units of account, 63 % going to four ACP countries and 37 % to a non-associated country: Haiti.

The total burden of this aid on the Community budget in 1980 was 10 550 000 units of account. To the best of our knowledge the European territory of the Community was not affected by hurricanes.

**President.** — Question No 15, by Mr Pearce (H-606/80):

In view of the difficulties currently being faced by the cane-sugar refining industry in the United Kingdom, which could lead to their no longer being able to refine imports into the Community of ACP sugar, would the Commission be willing to make proposals for the price which the UK cane-sugar refiners pay for imports of raw sugar to be reduced and for payments to be made from the European Development Fund to producers of raw cane-sugar to make up the difference between such reduced UK import price and a reasonable return for producers, bearing in mind the STABEX system, which is designed to meet somewhat similar objectives?

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (F) It is perfectly correct that, in the application of the February 1975 protocol on ACP sugar, the bulk of the 1 300 000 tonnes of our purchase commitment from those countries was consumed in the United Kingdom. However, 110 000 tonnes were taken by Ireland and France.

Is there any reason for anxiety for the future, as the honourable Member suggests? We have heard about

**Cheysson**

the closure of refinery installations. That has not yet been confirmed, but it is true that given the growth in sugarbeet production in the United Kingdom — now totalling 1 100 000 tonnes of white sugar — there are problems. It may be difficult to place some 100 000 tonnes, or at most 200 000, of ACP sugar.

I would remind you, however, that the commitment was given by the Community and not by a single Member State. If necessary therefore, the sugar which we have undertaken to buy might be sold elsewhere in larger quantities than at present or taken into intervention. Is there any possibility of changing the price arrangements? My answer is no. We cannot grant a subsidy on imports or a refining subsidy to lessen the burden on the importer or refiner. Similarly we cannot subsidize exports from the ACP countries; the only possible intervention from the European Development Fund would affect the actual production of sugar cane, if that formed part of the outline programme submitted by the country concerned.

**Mr Pearce.** — Will Mr Cheysson accept from me that one of the refineries in the United Kingdom will close in April of this year with a loss of 1 570 jobs directly involved, and a whole lot more in subsidiary trades, unless something is done to solve the economic difficulties of the company concerned? And in the light of that information, what would Mr Cheysson propose that the Commission do, on the one hand, to continue to guarantee that the Community is capable of refining the sugar that we import from ACP countries and, at the same time, to deal with the unemployment that will be caused by this measure in an area where unemployment is already very high?

**Mr Cheysson.** — (F) The Lomé Convention does not guarantee imports of raw sugar but refers to white sugar. We have therefore given no undertaking in respect of the refining capacity corresponding to the imported quantity of 1 300 000 tonnes.

My second observation is this: jobs will be lost in this refining unit if it closes, as the honourable Member has pointed out. But may I remind you that at the same time jobs will be created in the United Kingdom through the ever increasing production of sugarbeet. We thus have a problem with the structure of sugar production in the United Kingdom, and that does not fall within our responsibility. It would seem that the UK economy is moving at present towards an increase in local sugar production, i.e. sugarbeet cultivation, with a corresponding reduction in the production of sugar refined from imported sugar cane.

**Mr Enright.** — Will the Commissioner confirm that the principal obstacle to the Commission's eminently sensible proposals of last year for sugarbeet quotas was, in fact, the British Minister of Agriculture, Peter

Walker, who is now complaining? Secondly, would the Commissioner undertake to look into a situation whereby the British Sugar Corporation is rapidly acquiring a monopoly and, contrary to Articles 85 and 86 of the Treaty of Rome, abusing a dominant position in the market? I would urge the Commission to look into this most seriously.

**Mr Cheysson.** — (F) I cannot honestly claim that the new quotas proposed last year by the Commission, representing a sharp reduction on the previous figures, have elicited enthusiasm anywhere. Reticence has been particularly strong in the country which is at present increasing its national sugar production, i.e. sugarbeet cultivation: the United Kingdom.

We have not yet had occasion to consider whether any one or more undertakings hold a dominant position on the sugar market in the United Kingdom. I have not gained the impression that the situation has changed significantly with the transition from sugar cane to beet sugar but, in view of the honourable Member's comments, we shall certainly look into the matter.

**Mr Marshall.** — Is the Commissioner not aware that the unrealistically high price paid for sugar imports has placed an intolerable burden on Tate and Lyle and has distorted competition by imposing different cost structures on the sugarbeet industry and the sugar refiners?

**Mr Cheysson.** — (F) I do not see how a guarantee given to our ACP partners that their sugar will reach the Community at the same price as Community sugar, i.e. at a price which is well balanced with the market price, can represent an intolerable burden on refiners. May I add that on 5 February the world price for raw sugar was 45.82 EUA per 100 kg, whereas Tate & Lyle was paying 35.89 EUA for raw ACP sugar.

**Miss Hooper.** — I can assure the Commissioner that closure of the Liverpool refinery has been announced and blamed fairly and squarely on EEC policy. What can he therefore suggest to help the sugar cane producers, since most of the replies so far seem to have been somewhat negative? How can we help the sugar cane producers of the ACP countries whose jobs and livelihoods are being affected by the sugar regime of the European Community?

**Mr Cheysson.** — (F) I think that the Community sometimes provides a useful scapegoat for decisions in respect of which it has no responsibility. I have just reminded you of the world price of sugar and pointed out that sugar imported by us has always been adjusted to the domestic price level.

**Cheysson**

As to the guarantee which we have given to our ACP partners to purchase 1 300 000 tonnes at a price corresponding to the domestic Community price, that guarantee is maintained in full. We shall continue to import the equivalent of 1 300 000 tonnes of white sugar at the domestic Community price. There will thus be no change for the ACP countries, regardless of whether the Liverpool refinery closes or not. The problem of the Liverpool refinery was referred to just now in terms of employment. If jobs are lost there, others are being created elsewhere through the rising production of beet sugar. But this has no bearing on the interests of the ACP sugar-producing countries.

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

**Mr Hutton.** — Mr President, may I draw your attention to the fact that although Question Time has lasted 1½ hours, only one new question has been asked and answered. Fourteen of the questions were holdover questions. This is obviously raising a particular problem for anybody trying to put down a question, and the position will undoubtedly arise where questions will roll on and on until no matter how far ahead you put in a question there will be no chance of it being answered. May I ask you to convey to the President and to your colleagues this difficulty and see if there is not some way in which either the procedure can be speeded up or some extra time given or some other way found to improve the Question Time procedure so as to allow Members to put down more topical questions?

*(Applause from the right)*

**President.** — With respect to those to whom my remarks do not apply, I am surprised that you should be applauded by those who have prolonged Question

Time. I try very hard to keep the list as short as possible, but when I preclude questions I receive complaints from Members who want to put supplementaries. One of the problems is that, unlike a national parliament, there are different countries with different traditions involved. There are also various political groupings, and it would be unfair if I allowed supplementaries from one side without trying to achieve some balance. So a difficulty exists, but most certainly I will take it up with the President and with the Bureau. But it is for the Members themselves to exercise discipline. I think the Commissioners today have given very succinct replies to the original questions. One of the problems is that Members continue to ask questions even though they have already been answered in the reply to the original question.

The first part of Question Time is closed.\*

#### 12. *Agenda for next sitting*

**President.** — The next sitting will take place tomorrow, Tuesday, 10 February 1981 with the following agenda:

*9 a.m. to 1 p.m. and 4.30 p.m. to 7 p.m.*

- Maij-Weggen report on the position of women in the Community
- Prag report on linking work and training for young persons in the Community
- Pruvot report on youth activities

15 h 15' Plenary sitting: Address by Mr Anwar El Sadat, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt.

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 8.05 p.m.)*

\* See Annex to the Debates of 11 February 1981.

## ANNEX

*Commission action on opinions delivered on its proposals by the European Parliament at its January part-session*

1 As agreed with the Bureau of Parliament, the Commission informs Members at the beginning of every part-session as part of the consultation arrangements of the action it has taken on opinions delivered at the previous part-session.

2 At its January part-session the European Parliament delivered 7 opinions on Commission proposals in response to Council requests for consultation.

3 At the part-session 4 reports were discussed in connection with which Parliament delivered favourable opinions on or did not request formal amendment of the following proposals:

- report by Mr Dolorozoy on the proposal for a Directive on aid for the shipbuilding industry;
- report by Mr Carossino on the Directive on the application in respect of vessels of international standards for transport safety,
- report by Mrs Majj-Weggen on the decision introducing Community information arrangements for the prevention of oil pollution of the sea;
- report by Mr Louwes on the proposal for the conclusion of a framework agreement between the EEC and Brazil.

4 In three cases the European Parliament asked the Commission to amend its proposals under the second paragraph of Article 149 of the Treaty and adopted proposals for amendments.

During discussion of:

- *the report by Mr Albers on the decision establishing a sectoral environment research and development programme*

and

- *the report by Mr Combe on two proposals for the laying-down of maximum levels of pesticide residues in foodstuffs*

the Commission explained why it wanted to maintain its proposals.

In the case of:

- *the report by Miss Hooper on the recommendation concerning the recovery and re-use of old paper and paperboard*

the Commission said it was prepared to accept some of the proposed amendments.

An amended proposal is being prepared and will be sent to the Council and, for information purposes, to the Parliament as soon as it is formally adopted.

5. The Commission also expressed its view during discussions concerning it and took note of the European Parliament's opinions on the

- resolution on the Parliament's place of assembly;
- report by Mr Aigner on the action taken on the observations made in the resolution accompanying the decision giving discharge in respect of implementation of the 1977 budget;
- report by Mr Battersby on the action taken on the observations made in the decisions giving discharge for 1978,
- report by Mr Bonaccini on the situation of the European car industry;
- resolution on the composition of parliamentary committees;
- two resolutions of the Community's fishery policy;
- resolution on Community cooperation with Chad following the 'unification' of Libya and Chad;
- report by Mrs Walz on prospects for and limits to decentralization of energy production: soft technologies;

- report by Mrs Maij-Weggen on the prevention of disasters in off-shore oil and natural gas fields,
- report by Mrs Spaak on measures to combat disasters producing oil pollution of the sea or coasts,
- report by Mr Schall on the European Community's information policy;
- interim report by Mrs Pruvot on the social conditions of workers engaged in cultural occupations.

6 At the December part-session Parliament expressed its concern at the closure in Italy of frontier-crossing points used for the customs clearance of steel products. It asked the Commission to approach the Italian Government with a view to the re-establishment of free movement for these goods

Numerous representations having failed to produce results, the Commission has now initiated the procedure provided for in Article 169 of the Treaty and sent the Italian Government a letter constituting formal notice.

## SITTING OF TUESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 1981

1. <i>Position of women in the Community — Report by Mrs Maij-Weggen (Ad Hoc Committee on Women's Rights) (Doc. 1-829/80-I and II) and oral question by Mrs De March and others to the Commission (Doc. 1-881/80):</i>		<i>Mr Lomas; Mrs Ewing; Mr Galland; Mr Langes; Mr Kellett-Bowman; Mr Paisley; Mr Tolman; Mrs Roudy; Mr Pannella; Mr Van Minnen; Ms Clwyd . . . . .</i>	67
<i>Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur . . . . .</i>	34		
<i>Mrs Kraaijeveld-Wouters (Council); Mr Richard (Commission) . . . . .</i>	36		
2. <i>Welcome . . . . .</i>	39		
3. <i>Position of women in the Community (continuation):</i>			
<i>Mrs Hoff; Mrs Lenz; Miss Roberts; Mrs Hoffmann; Mrs von Alemann; Mr Vié; Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Macciocchi; Mr Bourmias; Mrs Roudy; Mrs Krouwel-Vlam; Mrs Gaiotti De Biase; Miss Hooper; Mrs Cinciari Rodano; Mrs Martin; Mr Lalor; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Dekker; Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul; Mr Michel; Mr Johnson. . . . .</i>	39		
4. <i>Approval of minutes:</i>			
<i>Procedural motion: Mr Boyes; Mr Pannella;</i>			
		<i>5. Agenda:</i>	
		<i>Mrs Pruvot . . . . .</i>	70
		6. <i>Position of women in the Community (continuation):</i>	
		<i>Mrs De March; Mr Calvez; Miss de Valera; Mr Pasmazoglou; Mr Enright; Mrs Boot; Mr Forth; Mr Kappos; Mr Maher; Mrs Spaak; Mrs Fuillet; Mrs Lentz-Cornette; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Seligman; Mr Zighdis; Mrs Lizin; Mr Glinne; Mrs Schleicher; Mr Clinton; Mrs Vayssade; Mr Coutsocheras; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Richard (Commission); Mr Enright . . . . .</i>	70
		7. <i>Urgent debate . . . . .</i>	89
		8. <i>Membership of political groups . . . . .</i>	90
		9. <i>Agenda for next sitting . . . . .</i>	90
		<i>Annex . . . . .</i>	91

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

*President*

*(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)*

**President.** — The sitting is open.

1. *Position of women in the Community*

**President.** — The next item is the report by Mrs Maij-Weggen, on behalf of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Women's Rights, on the position of women in the European Community (Doc. 1-829/80 — I and II).

Also included in the debate is the oral question by Mrs De March and others to the Commission:

Subject: Position of women in the nine countries of the Community

In the light of such provisions and directives on equality as:

- Article 119 of the Treaty of Rome,
- the Council Directive of 10 February 1975,
- the Council Directive of 9 February 1976,
- the Council Directive of 19 December 1978,
- the judgment of the Court of Justice of the Communities of 8 April 1976:

Twenty-two years after the founding of the Common Market, what is the effective position of women as

### President

regards employment, earnings, vocational training and family, social and health policy in each of the nine countries of the Community?

Does the Commission think that there is a direct link between the inequalities and discrimination which women continue to encounter and the Community directives on austerity, restructuring and European integration inasmuch as they affect sectors employing women?

Lastly, is it not to be expected that the coordination of these austerity policies in connection with the second enlargement of the EEC will result in a levelling-down of these social rights and advantages which women have had to struggle so hard to obtain?

I call the rapporteur.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, we always begin at 10 a.m. on Tuesdays, which is why all the political groups are holding their meetings between 9 and 10 a.m. today. I wonder whether the groups should not be warned that the sitting has begun . . .

**President.** — I am sorry Mrs Maij-Weggen. The political groups no longer meet on Tuesdays from 9 to 10 a.m. For some time now Tuesday's sitting has begun at 9 a.m.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen.** — (NL) . . . I see, Madam President, but I can assure you that all the groups are now meeting.

Madam President, almost all the groups in this Parliament promised in their political programmes before the first European elections in 1979 to take action to improve the position of women in Europe. We are therefore particularly pleased that after a year of intensive work in our special parliamentary committee we are able to submit to Parliament, the Commission and the Council a report in which a significant proportion of the assurances given by the various groups has been translated into practical proposals, which we are asking this Parliament to approve today. Before going into these proposals, I wish to emphasize that both the resolution and the extensive explanatory statement contained in the report are the result of a joint effort in which admittedly the chairman and the rapporteur played an important part. The report could not have been drawn up without the contribution and cooperation of many Members. I should like to stress this.

The disadvantages suffered by many groups of women in many sectors of our society have resulted in this report becoming a lengthy document in which very many subjects are discussed. Before I take up each of these subjects, I should like to say something about the background to the disadvantages women suffer in our society. The explanatory statement that accompanies the resolution begins with a brief review of women's

work in Western Europe. This review leads to two important conclusions, which you will also find in the preamble of the resolution. It must first be said that the historical and cultural development of Europe has resulted in a division of labour between men and women in which women have been made largely responsible for unpaid work, while men are principally engaged in paid work. This division of labour has left many women in an isolated and disadvantaged position. If, then, the position of women is to be improved, it is essential for there to be a fundamental redistribution of paid employment and unpaid family work between the male and female citizens of Europe.

Secondly, the economic history of Europe teaches us that women act as a labour reserve in the employment market. At times of economic growth women are encouraged to go out to work and at times of economic recession they are sent back to unpaid family work. There is an urgent need for this immoral mechanism of our economic system to be recognized and for social measures to be taken to control these processes. At this time of economic recession women therefore are in even greater need of our support and our solidarity.

In our report we set out firstly to take a close look at the policy the Commission has so far pursued in favour of women. We would begin by thanking the previous Commission and in particular the former Commissioner for social affairs for the initiative they have taken in the last five years: three Community directives, special provisions for women under the European Social Fund. This is no mean achievement. We feel that a satisfactory start has been made on the road to an improvement in the position of women, particularly in the work process. We are less happy with the way in which these initiatives have been followed up in the various Member States. Our investigations, on which the explanatory statement reports, have revealed that not enough has been done, with the result, in particular, that the directives have not contributed sufficiently to the achievement of the objective.

Women workers still earn substantially less, even when they do the same work as their male colleagues. Hundreds of complaints are still received about the unequal treatment of women at work. We therefore propose that the implementation of these directives should be improved by means of better information, compulsory checks and a compulsory registration system. We also propose that a preventive sanction should be introduced whereby Member States not prepared to implement the directives in the proper way will no longer receive credits from the Social and Regional Funds. This is a tough step, but we feel that Member States which are not willing to make the effort to ensure the equal treatment of their male and female citizens should forfeit their right to European solidarity.

## Maij-Weggen

In the first part of our report we have principally dealt with the policy that has so far been pursued. In the second part we have set out a number of proposals for new Community action. In this we have concentrated on five main points: the social and economic involvement of women, education and vocational training, health care, the position of special categories of women such as migrant women and women working in family firms, and the way in which we can influence the position of women in developing countries. I should like to make a number of remarks on each of these points.

The traditional division of labour between men and women, with women doing the unpaid work, has resulted in the subordination of women in employment and of men in family life. This situation could be substantially improved if working hours were shorter and arranged more flexibly. Shorter and more flexible working hours would enable women and men to combine housework and work outside the home better. This would make for a better distribution of paid and unpaid work. But it would also mean that workers working shorter hours, on a part-time basis, for example, should have the same rights as regards working conditions, social provisions, vocational and in-firm training and promotion prospects as full-time workers. We therefore call on the Commission to draw up a directive on this aspect. It must also be ensured that part-time work is not used as a means of relieving the tension on the labour market or as a short-term economic policy instrument. An alert trade union movement must keep a critical and constructive eye on the process of the redistribution of work.

The *ad hoc* committee also looked into the problems connected with work in the home. We found that the social services engaged in family care are in difficulty in all the Member States as a result of the economic crisis. These services are being abolished or cut back, making the work both of full-time housewives and of working women in the family home more difficult. We consider it unacceptable that the consequences of the economic crisis should be unloaded on to the unpaid workers, on to the family, on to women in this way. And we make an urgent appeal to the Member States to check this process.

The development of modern technology causes the *ad hoc* committee considerable concern. On the one hand, many women are being forced out of occupations which are becoming superfluous as a result of technological innovation, on the other, not enough women are being employed in the occupations being created by modern technology. This is increasing unemployment among women. There is an urgent need to help women to adjust themselves better to the changes in the work process. Better oriented vocational information and training is urgently required. The European Social Fund has already taken welcome

action in this respect. It is particularly important for this action to be extended and for it to be echoed on a large scale in the Member States.

Education and vocational training are an important key where the position of individuals in society is concerned. In the section on the position of women in education we point out that women generally have a lower level of education than men and that the education they do have is also more one-sided. We have put forward many suggestions in our resolution for ways of improving this situation, suggestions concerning lower education, intermediate education and higher, university education, suggestions concerning vocational and in-firm training and permanent education.

I do not intend to refer to all the details, but I should like to stress that there is a need for a policy at all levels and in all sectors of education aimed specifically at improving the level of training of girls and at helping them to choose less one-sided courses. We are aware that the Commission has already developed various activities in this field, and we call on it to intensify and extend these activities as a matter of urgency. To this end, a special conference of the Education Ministers should be convened at an early date to discuss ways of incorporating all the suggestions included in this report in the national education programmes. If this type of conference is held regularly, education policy to the benefit of girls and women can be stimulated and coordinated by the European Community.

The third main theme of our report concerns the health of women. It goes without saying that the health problems women face in their role as mothers play an important part in this. Every day millions of women are confronted with the problems associated with birth control. Although our generation occupies a privileged position in this respect compared with the women of previous generations, there is still considerable uncertainty about birth control. The *ad hoc* committee therefore feels that more research is needed to enable women to use the safest and most reliable means. We call on the Commission to introduce Community research programmes in this area, if only because it is evident that the situation differs widely from one country to another.

The *ad hoc* committee also discussed the question of abortion. We cannot simply pass by a problem that hundreds of thousands of women face every year. Investigations have shown that in countries where abortion is not governed by legislation or where it is completely banned, clandestine abortions still occur on a wide scale, with serious consequences for the women concerned. On the other hand, where there is some kind of superficial legislation, the differences are often

**Maij-Weggen**

such that many women are forced to seek help in other countries. We therefore call on the Commission to urge the Member States to make arrangements that render these emergency journeys, which seriously hamper social care and lead to unacceptable commercialization, superfluous and to ensure that any woman in difficulty in her own country can count on being given the necessary help. In this the emphasis must be placed on prevention and social assistance, an area in which I know many countries are very backward. The resolution also calls in this context for the improvement and harmonization of national arrangements for leave for family reasons, such as maternity leave, parental leave and leave when children are ill. Some Member States have favourable and extensive arrangements in this area, while others hardly match up to the minimum standards laid down by WHO and ILO.

The fourth main subject of our resolution concerns a number of special categories of women. We propose, for example, that a European social statute should be drawn up to cover the large number of women working in family firms. There are millions of women of this kind in the European Community. We call for the recognition of their professional status, a right to vocational training, a right to participate in the activities of professional organizations and above all a right to a reasonable system of social provisions and particularly to replacements when they are sick or pregnant. We wish to emphasize that the many women working in family firms, such as the millions of farmers' wives, make a very important contribution to the social and economic development of our Community.

This group in particular therefore warrants additional attention. Additional attention should also be paid to the large and vulnerable category of wives of foreign workers. These women are amongst the most disadvantaged in our society and therefore need our support. We similarly call for a European social statute for this category, setting out their rights and obligations and offering them protection against all forms of discrimination.

The fifth main subject of our resolution concerns our responsibility towards women in developing countries. The European Community has links with many Third World countries and plays an important role in their economic and social development. The recent UN Conference in Copenhagen revealed that in many cases this development has scarcely improved the position of women. We therefore appeal to the Commission to align its development aid policy and its external economic relations more closely with this category. Economic development must be prevented from resulting in women losing their traditional jobs in agriculture and trade, for example, and the involvement of women in new employment areas must also be encouraged. At the same time, a situation must be avoided in

which these women, many of whom also have a great deal of housework to do, are exposed to long working hours, poor working conditions and deficient social provisions. This must also be said to the Western multinational undertakings active in South-East Asia. Social development aid must be attuned more closely to the basic requirements of the people concerned: good housing, food, clothing, education and medical aid are more important than prestige projects. It is important for our policy towards the Third World to incorporate control procedures so that we can establish what effect this policy has on the position of women in developing countries.

Madam President, I have tried to present to this Parliament the gist of this resolution in as balanced and conscientious a manner as possible. To conclude this introductory statement, I should like to make a personal comment. Many women in our Community are in a particularly isolated and disadvantaged position. For many this situation is harmful to them as individuals, economically, socially and also mentally. But this disadvantaged position also represents a considerable loss for the European Community as a whole. As a result of this position, women form a minority group in all bodies that determine policy: in governments, parliaments, political parties, employers' organizations, trade unions and even the governing bodies of the churches. This means not only that they are unable to exercise sufficient influence over the improvement of their own position but also that their voice is not sufficiently heard in any of the sectors of policy concerned with the development of present-day society.

The European Community faces major problems: the threat to peace, the shortage of energy, economic crises and unemployment, environmental pollution, growing disparities between the rich industrial countries and the poorer developing countries. If these problems are to be solved, the creative involvement of every available talent, the talents of men and women, will be required. If these problems are to be solved, the broad and loyal support of all citizens, both men and women, will be required. To this end, the disadvantages suffered by women should be eliminated, and balanced and just relations between European citizens must be created. That is the aim of this report. We hope that it will also be the aim of today's debate.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call the Council.

**Mrs Kraayeveld-Wouters, President-in-Office of the Council.** — *(NL)* Madam President, as a member of the Government of the Member State now holding the

**Kraayeveld-Wouters**

Presidency of the Council and also on my own behalf I should like to welcome the initiative and activities of your Assembly. Your aim has been to provide a new impulse to the contribution the Community can make to the solution of the problems connected with the position of women in our societies. In this context, I would also refer to the World Conference for the Decade of the Woman held in Copenhagen in July 1980. In my present capacity I should like to begin by recalling, possibly unnecessarily, because you are already well aware of what I have to say, the principal contributions the Council has so far made at the Commission's instigation to Community action aimed at achieving the equal treatment of men and women.

I will begin with the measures that have already been taken to introduce into the legislation of the Member States this principle of equal treatment in such important areas as pay, working conditions and social security. The principle of equal pay for male and female workers for the same work as laid down in Article 119 of the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community was regarded as an integral component in the creation and functioning of the common market. On this basis the Council adopted in February 1975 the directive concerning the approximation of Member States' legislation on the application of the principle of equal pay for male and female workers. The Council's aim was to strengthen existing legislation in the Member States by setting standards aimed at the practical application of the principle of equal pay, in such a way that all workers in the Community might enjoy protection in this area. This directive is designed to eliminate any form of discrimination on the grounds of sex in all standards and systems concerning pay for the same work or for work to which the same value is attached. In its resolution of 21 January 1974 concerning a social action programme the Council had already recommended that efforts should be made to achieve equality between men and women as regards access both to the labour market and to vocational training, promotion prospects and conditions of employment, including pay.

To give effect to its resolution, but independently of the Directive on pay I have just mentioned, the Council has adopted two other Directives, known as the second and third Directives, the second concerning access to the labour market and vocational training and the third social security. The particular value of these second and third Directives lies in the fact that they draw attention to both direct and indirect discrimination with regard specifically to the married or family situation. In addition, they stipulate a subjective right for those concerned by requiring Member States to ensure that they can enforce their rights to equality before the courts. The second Directive is designed to ensure the equal treatment of men and women with respect to access to employment, vocational training and higher positions, and conditions of employment.

This means the elimination of any form of discrimination on the grounds of sex, that is the elimination of any direct or indirect discrimination from all legal acts and the practices of both the authorities and private individuals. The third Directive, which concerns the application of the principle of equal treatment with regard to social security, the deadline for its introduction into national legislation not yet having been reached, relates to the statutory social security systems in the following areas: sickness, disability, parenthood, unemployment, industrial accidents and occupational diseases and prohibits discrimination on the grounds of sex.

Apart from these statutory instruments, I must also refer to the other areas in which various types of measures have been contemplated with a view to eliminating obstacles women encounter. As regards education, particular attention was paid at the last Council meeting, held on 27 June 1980, of the Education Ministers of the Member States to the problems involved in giving girls equal opportunities in education and to the relationship between education and work. In this context, it was pointed out that the measures contemplated must be aimed principally at complementing the measures that have already been taken. This concerns the provisions of equal opportunities in education and employment by making specific efforts in education to overcome the outdated stereotypes and encourage girls to choose from among a wider range of occupations and prepare them for this choice. Where adult education is concerned, the Commission has made a start on preliminary studies on basic education and the fight against illiteracy. It is obvious that women in the rural areas of the Community and in the countries wishing to join the Community are among those who are hard hit by illiteracy.

It is also appropriate to say a few words about the contribution of the European Social Fund in the areas of employment and vocational training. This Fund gives priority in certain specific ways to the problems faced by women. Under the Council decision of 20 December 1977, the period of validity of which was recently extended, it is possible for the European Social Fund to be involved in finding solutions to the problems women encounter in the labour market, where these problems concern the vocational training and employment of women over the age of 25 with few or no skills who want to go out or go back to work or who are unemployed.

Apart from these specific measures, it should be pointed out that, within its own framework and limitations, the Social Fund is an instrument which in principle opens the way for effective account to be taken of the problems faced by various categories of women where they come up against various obstacles as young

**Kraayeveld-Wouters**

unemployed people, in backward regions or as migrant workers. This brief summary prompts me to make a number of comments and remarks. Although the Community can take a pride in having developed rights and guarantees for the equal treatment of men and women in the areas I have just mentioned, it cannot, of course, be claimed that this contribution extends to every aspect of the situation as regards the social structures that have been handed down and are characterized by a division of labour and the casting of men and women in set roles.

The report that has been submitted has the merit of explaining these problems comprehensively and placing them in the present economic and social context, offering a full range of possible solutions within that context. The report indicates the roles and responsibilities of the authorities at both Community and national level and also of the social partners and those directly involved, in other words primarily women themselves, but in general all members of society. Apart from the gaps which may still occur in present Community legislation, the report refers to the work that remains to be done to ensure the more effective implementation of the principle of equality. The possibility of finding ways of overcoming the obstacles women face will be the more effective if full account can be taken of the context in which appropriate solutions can be put forward. It seems to me that such an approach fits in with the ability to be guided by clearly translatable indicators. After all, it is principally by discerning the development of the structures of employment that we are able to understand in our own countries the additional obstacles standing in the way of the employment of women.

This is also true of the possibility of tackling the glaring problems raised by certain situations, and I am referring, for example, to the wives of migrant workers, who are confronted with all the aspects of their disadvantaged position. These women have to contend with serious handicaps as regards economic, cultural, educational and training possibilities, to name but a few.

The Council will shortly have an opportunity of taking careful account of the ideas set out in the report, since it will soon have to discuss the report which the Commission has just submitted to it on the application of the principle of equal treatment with regard to access to the labour market and promotion prospects, employment opportunities and the choice in this respect and vocational training as well as equal conditions of employment. This important contribution from your Assembly, to which I pay tribute, will not fail to help with the ultimate development of the Community's efforts and activities to improve the position of women, ensuring a reasonable allocation of roles in our countries, which must be regarded as a

basic principle for the balanced development of our society.

Permit me to add a few personal remarks. From a document your *ad hoc* committee has produced it is evident how important a facet of many policy areas emancipation is. It seems to me extremely significant that opportunities are being developed within the organs of the European Community to give more concrete shape to the beginnings of this policy. In this context, it seems worth recommending the establishment of national plans of action for emancipation, based partly on this report. I would call in this connection for particular attention to be paid to the position of women in developing countries. I willingly endorse the conclusion drawn by the *ad hoc* committee that the improvement of the position of women should form an integral part of the development strategy of the European Community and the ACP countries.

To conclude, I would say that if one thing has become clear in recent years, it is that the emancipation process will remain at a standstill until men become involved. Men will have to be involved in emancipation and will sometimes have to give way a little to create room and opportunities for women. Men must also support and contribute to the policy of emancipation, which must also be directed at men. Emancipation requires a joint effort. I wish all those concerned a great deal of perseverance and creativity.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call the Commission.

**Mr Richard, Member of the Commission.** — Madam President, I should like to thank you for giving me the floor at the beginning of this debate. Equally, I can promise that at this stage I shall be brief.

On behalf of all the Members of the Commission, I would like to congratulate the members of the *ad hoc* Committee on Womens' Rights, particularly their chairman, Mrs Roudy and their tireless and indefatigable rapporteur, Mrs Maij-Weggen, for their most excellent report. I should also, if I might, like to congratulate the distinguished minister, speaking on behalf of the Council, for the speech she gave us, which I found stimulating and hopeful at least in intent.

I did not have the challenging experience of appearing before the *ad hoc* committee. Nevertheless, I am fully aware from the dossier of the immense amount of dedicated and painstaking work that has gone into

**Richard**

fulfilling the mandate given to the committee in October 1979. I am also aware — indeed, Madam President, who could not be? — of the extraordinary expectations that have been raised by the work of this committee amongst women throughout the Community. It is perhaps a tribute to the committee and to their work that there are so many distinguished visitors here today to listen to this debate.

My sole purpose in intervening at this stage of the debate is to underline the importance that the Commission attaches to this issue. In our view, it is right that Parliament should be devoting a full day to the discussion of this report. It does, after all, directly concern at least half of the population of the Community.

There are only two points that I would wish to make now, and I will, if I may, reserve my detailed comments on the report until after I have had the opportunity of hearing contributions from the floor. The report is certainly comprehensive. It advocates sweeping social and economic changes. We should be under no illusions at all as to the difficulties which face us in attaining those objectives. The changes needed to bring about equality must be paid for by society. They do not come easily, particularly in the current period of economic recession. Indeed there are some signs of regression in relation to what has already been achieved. The areas where these dangers are greatest will be unemployment, work-sharing and the opening of the labour market to new entrants. Now, more than ever, the Commission will have to see that what it has striven for at Community level is not lost or undermined, so that in the present crisis women are not compelled to pay a higher price than other groups. We have in the past organized our societies in a way that deliberately, almost capriciously, neglected the skills and the potential of half our population.

But, Madam President, we should be under no illusions that rectifying this position will be easy or quick. It will, moreover, be difficult to match the progress made in the 1970s at Community level and in the Member States. I should like to pay tribute to my predecessors, Dr Hillery and Mr Vredeling in this respect. At Community level, the most significant step was the Council Resolution of 1974 on a social action programme, which expressed the political will to ensure equality as regards access to employment. I do not wish to go into detail now about the achievements of the Community to date. They have been adequately described in the document especially prepared for the Parliament last year, and I will, if I may, return to this aspect of the matter later in the debate. I should simply like to stress at this stage that the Commission already has a number of instruments at its disposal. We can, and we should, build from what we already have.

I note that the motion for a resolution contains several proposals for further action. Together with my colleagues from the Commission, I will listen to the debate with close attention. Your suggestions, thoughts and reactions will, I am sure, give us the guidance required to help establish our priorities in the years that are to come.

*2. Welcome*

**President.** — I wish to welcome the presence in the official gallery of Mrs Sadat and the interest she is showing in the European Parliament's debate on the position of women in our society.

*(Applause)*

Mrs Sadat has played an important role in improving the position of women in her own country and has also headed the Egyptian Delegation at the United Nations Conference on this topic held in Copenhagen last year.

I also wish to thank Her Royal Highness, the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg, who has just taken her place in the official gallery, for her presence here which is an expression of her interest in the problems entered on the agenda of this sitting.

*(Applause)*

*3. Position of women in the Community (continuation)*

**President.** — I call the Socialist Group.

**Mrs Hoff.** — *(D)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, in October 1979 the Socialist Group unanimously called for a committee on women's rights to be set up. We were convinced that the European Parliament must pay more attention to the continuous development and acceptance of women's rights in the European Community than it has done in the past. The *ad hoc* committee has now completed its work, and the results we now submit are far from flattering. We owe the committee's chairman, Mrs Roudy, and the rapporteur, Mrs Maij-Weggen, a vote of thanks for the great work they have done and for their attempt to blend the different political views expressed in the committee. My thanks also go to the Commission, without whose help so comprehensive an investigation would not have been possible.

**Hoff**

The explanatory statement accompanying the motion for a resolution shows that the position of European women in present-day industrial society is still marked by an outmoded view of women's role and by the general opinion that women have an allegedly natural task to perform in the home and the family. This results in the allocation of set roles in public life, at work and within the family. In all aspects of life women have to contend with prejudice, disadvantages and discrimination. The adoption of legislation has done nothing to alter this. The motion for a resolution may be just another piece of printed paper, but anyone who takes the trouble to read it will come across demands hitherto unprecedented in intensity and scope in any previous document of the European Community. The 54 paragraphs of the motion for a resolution contain at least as many proposals and demands aimed at improving the position of women. The demands are largely aimed at the parliamentary committees, but also at the Commission and the Council of Ministers. Of central importance for us Socialists in this was the disproportionately high rate of unemployment among women, equal pay, educational questions and social inequality.

Other points, on which other members of my group will be speaking and which also played a part in the discussion, were the problems faced by women working unpaid in small and medium-sized family firms and in agriculture, programmes of research into women's problems and information campaigns which carry our concern outside this House to those actually affected by these problems. The first section of the motion refers once again to the three European equality directives, which call for equal pay for equal work, equal opportunities in employment and equal treatment by the social security services.

Although these directives have set in motion appropriate basic legislation in the Member States, in some cases they have also resulted in an improvement of legislation. But there is still a great deal to be done to ensure that this legislation is actually enforced. It is particularly annoying to find some Member States translating the aims of the directive into reality hesitantly or only in part. The Commission is urged to be more consistent than hitherto in taking appropriate action.

To find a yardstick for the discussion of this subject and to ensure that patience is not lost, it is worth while casting a glance at history. I would to take the example of equal pay, although other examples, such as the right to vote, could be taken. In 1869 the demand for equal pay for men and women was first voiced at the General German Social-Democratic Workers' Congress in Eisenach. Two years later, in 1871, the first German Weavers' Congress adopted a resolution tabled by August Bebel, which called for the admission of women working in the factories and workshops to the trade union on an equal footing and for equal pay for men and women. The situation in France was simi-

lar. In 1882 the programme of the French workers' party was supplemented by a demand for the abolition for all statutory provisions which subordinated women to men.

The Community Directive on the principle of equal pay follows on from this tradition. Today, 112 years later, this demand has become law, but in practice the situation has changed little. Women still have to go to the courts to fight for their right to equal pay. This shows how slowly progress is made with any measures and demands that concern women. This is clear in education and vocational training more than any other sector. Equal treatment and equal opportunities are not simply a legal problem. Although there are legal safeguards to ensure that girls are admitted to all State schools, there are still many factors that favour unequal development. Many school books, for example, still refer to the traditional allocation of roles to the two sexes, there are still different curricula for boys and girls, and the appointment of counsellors and teaching staff is guided by the traditional allocation of roles and above all by the divided employment market. A study made by the Commission on equal education and vocational training opportunities for boys and girls reveals that there is still a need for improvement in the education of girls in all Community countries.

*(Applause)*

Nevertheless, it must be said that there has already been a considerable improvement in the position of girls in primary and secondary education as compared with past generations. In theory, this ought also to put girls in a more favourable position with respect to university education or vocational training, but this is not true. Boys continue to prefer technical courses, girls courses in the social sector. Three times as many women drop out of courses in medicine and the natural sciences and twice as many from courses in economics and the social sciences as men. In the case of vocational training girls continue to opt primarily for clerical and other so-called typically female occupations, especially in administration. In career terms, such occupations are a dead-end. In addition, clerical jobs are particularly insecure as a result of technical advances. From this it can be deduced that this is a major cause of the disproportionately high rate of unemployment among women. The training of girls in the craft and technical trades is not yet far enough advanced.

Nor is there any sign of progress. For example, in 1979 girls were being trained in 106 of the 126 recognized craft trades. In 1970 girls could get a training in only 76 trades, as against 95 in 1976. Nevertheless, the prejudice of firms, parents, schools and even girls themselves still means that the number of girls being trained in this sector remains small. An increase in this number will depend on girls themselves being willing to break new ground. This is also true of all the other

**Hoff**

sectors. As long as women and girls fail to act and take up their own cause, progress will be very slow.

Particularly important in this context is the subject of further education, to which greater attention should be paid. For many women wanting to take up employment again and those in jobs without a future further education is the only path to a new job. In the debate on the position of women in society education is a key issue. It was not for nothing that the question of education and earnings formed the basis of the women's movement last century.

As a supranational organization, the Commission has a special task to perform here. To foster European understanding, it must ensure that the Member States recognize each other's school-leaving certificates and that disadvantages suffered specifically by girls, and particularly by foreign girls and women, are eliminated. The Commission's efforts are still in their infancy, and the Council has so far taken little action worthy of the name as far as the public and Parliament can see. The Council has a great deal of ground to make up. The 138 million citizens of Europe have waited far too long for equal opportunities and justice. The Socialist Group will not back down. We will keep a very close watch on further developments and we will ensure that progress is made.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group).

**Mrs Lenz.** — *(D)* Madam President, the question of equal rights undoubtedly has many facets, and I will confine myself to a few general remarks, leaving other members of my Group to discuss individual issues.

There can be no disputing that there have been some changes since last century, when a German author wrote in the best known family periodical of the time, the *Gartenlaube*:

And women stand protected not only by their own husbands, nay, by every stout man.

They may not be molested, they are not allowed to walk the streets alone at night — in other words, everything possible is done to ensure they are not molested and do not feel discriminated against.

But — and this is where the threat begins — this ceases to apply as soon as women leave the protection of men and join them, or rather face them, on an equal footing. Courtesy and assistance now shown to every lady with pleasure are something we can and must no longer expect. Do women want to give all this up? Do they want to exchange the love and care of a man for what is for them an unnatural position and for complete independence, still on the very doubtful

assumption that they are in fact able to occupy such a position and in particular really carry it off. They may try their luck, but they themselves are responsible for the consequences. Ladies, we have voluntarily assumed responsibility for the consequences, and through wars and emergencies men have put us in a position of not only wanting but also having to be able to do this. But at the time we did not know how many obstacles would have to be overcome on the way, and even today, in 1981, the report of the European Parliament's committee, into which Mrs Maij-Weggen has put so much work, is proof of this.

*(Applause)*

The report is very thorough in examining every area of discrimination against women and proposing solutions. I once counted up for my Group how many committees of this Parliament should be involved in this and I arrived at the figure seven, in other words every other committee of this Parliament should really be dealing with this subject. I will come back to this in a moment.

My Group, the Group of the European People's Party, certainly sees no alternative to women, like men, being given every opportunity to develop fully and to enjoy complete freedom of decision so that they can combine paid work and work in the home. Employment and family duties are equally valuable spheres of activity for men and women. Women should and must be given an opportunity in the present-day working world, but women, like men, must be left more time to shape their family lives. The report therefore refers logically, as we see it, not only to the many labour policy measures, but also to a large number of measures which allow the combination of family life and employment.

The Group of the European People's Party has taken up the cause especially of women helping in family firms and women in agriculture, who frequently have to work longer hours than many female employees and workers in the towns. But we are opposed — and I should like to make this very clear on behalf of my Group — to everything being divided into paid and unpaid work. We are also opposed to pay being taken as the only yardstick for achievement and recognition in society. We must refrain from rigid patterns in this respect.

Ladies and gentlemen, my Group has tabled a motion for a resolution which refers back to the original motion setting up the *ad hoc* committee. As Part I says, the committee was set up to prepare a debate, to establish the bases for a discussion. This process has been completed today. We are conducting this debate here and now. The motion for a resolution states setting up the *ad hoc* committee — and I believe many of us have forgotten this:

Instructs its relevant committees to draw up, on the basis of the results of that debate, proposals to achieve equality

## Lenz

for women in all areas and to forward these proposals to the Council and Commission for their opinions;

My Group feels that this motion for a resolution provides the necessary basis, and we should therefore like to see it referred to the appropriate committees. We should also like the committees to join with the Commission in drawing up a list of priorities within a limited period of three months and to establish which proposals can be implemented first and most effectively. From the outset we have advocated that the policy for women in the Community should be a comprehensive policy and not the policy of a special committee, a single committee of this Parliament. If we make policy for half the population of the Community, we have a duty to establish and implement this policy here. But we must not assume that each individual issue is of equal importance for each country. Working in the home or on a part-time basis has a different meaning depending on whether you are in Italy or in Germany or the United Kingdom. A middle course must be found here, and improvements will undoubtedly have to be made. It is not simply a question of the fate of women working at home in Naples, the lack of future and employment prospects of young girls in Ireland or the poor economic prospects of farms in frontier areas such as the Bavarian Forest. Nor is it simply a question of better working conditions for farmers' wives in Normandy or in Brittany. Incidentally, these examples are interchangeable from one country to another. Nor are we simply concerned with housewives in Greece. We are talking about us all, our families, social relationships and ties, the future of us all, when we speak of the improvement of the position of women in the Community. The Christian-Democratic Group also intends to propose possible solutions in this respect.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Christian Democrats took a particular interest in the protection of expectant mothers and their unborn children in the amendments they proposed in the *ad hoc* committee. This is for us an extremely important matter and, let me make this quite clear, we shall oppose any amendment that attempts to include in this list of measures for easier abortion in Europe.

(Applause)

We have in our countries religious, ethical and cultural traditions which cannot and must not be made to conform. These matters are not least something for which we all are very much responsible as citizens and, for us Christian Democrats, most certainly as Christians.

Solutions must be found to what is undoubtedly the most delicate of all human problems, which must not be regarded merely as a woman's problem. There is no doubt about that. We therefore support any move aimed at allowing responsible decisions to be taken on child-bearing. We should like to see further positive steps being taken, but we do not overlook the fact that

our society is undergoing radical change. I should like to make that clear too.

Research, information and assistance should, in our view, receive special emphasis in this programme.

Ladies and gentlemen, in 1981 we have entered the last fifth of this century, but we are undoubtedly far from thinking in the way I described at the beginning of my statement. And we certainly do not share the view expressed by a present-day authoress that 'they (that is the women's organization to which many of us here belong) underestimate the imminent nature of the male alliance in our institutions. The State, economy, political parties, press and universities are not impartial institutions where the sexes are concerned: one of their basic functions lies in relentlessly creating the male identity for themselves and enabling it to prove itself'. We still share the view, I believe, expressed at an American congress of futurologists at which a feminist called for not only the 20th century but the last five thousand years to be forgotten, in other words the whole of the patriarchy, because in their eyes both capitalism and — as I am now addressing the lady members of the other groups — Socialism are merely perpetuate patriarchy. The future of women, she said, cannot be a future as slaves to men, but so perfect a future that we are at present completely unable to describe it.

No, ladies and gentlemen, we really do not believe that. But we are aware of the lack of opportunities, we are aware of the efforts of many women to do their duty responsibly along with men. We see women in need in the Third World, and we also see the great differences between us in Europe and the women who come to our countries to earn their daily bread and find a home. We also see the many thousands and millions whose work contributes to the prosperity of our national economies and without whom they could no longer exist today. We also see those who, because of a deficient education and social pressure, do not have the opportunity of taking on paid employment. But we also see those who suffer a crisis of conscience when they have to decide between their families and employment, and I believe that many men are also very well aware of these problems today.

We therefore call on everyone here, the Commission, the Council and ourselves, ladies and gentlemen, to decide on the political line to be followed. We cannot allow the Commission, the bureaucracy, to decide whether we should adopt a future course and what this course is to be. We can criticize the bureaucracy, we can keep a check on it, but it is for us to set the political accent, to decide the political line.

And for this reason I should like to make a slight change to the slogan of the futurologists' congress I have just mentioned. This slogan was: Think globally — act locally. What we should be saying here is, I feel:

**Lenz**

Think comprehensively and act realistically. I therefore call on you to support our amendment, which calls for the compilation of a list of priorities, so that we can decide what long-term goals we intend to set for the women of the Community.

And I should also like to thank all the members of the committee. We discussed many different items, and our views often differed, but I should like to make particular reference to the friendly atmosphere in the committee, even though — and I say this quite openly — we were for the most part all women.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call the European Democratic Group.

**Dame Shelagh Roberts.** — Madam President, I should like to join with previous speakers in paying tribute to the work of the chairman and rapporteur of this committee. They have both worked with true dedication and vigour. I express a number of criticisms and reservations about the content of the report, I want to make it clear that it reflects in no way whatsoever personally on either the chairman or rapporteur who I think, as I say, have worked extremely hard in order to prepare for this debate.

But I think a number of us will have criticisms and reservations and indeed I see no purpose in having a debate in this Parliament if all we are going to do is to pat one another on the back and say what a jolly good job we have all done in the *ad hoc* committee. That is not really what the Parliament is here for, and it would be surprising if 434 Members of the Parliament were to agree with every line that is contained in this rather voluminous report.

I certainly subscribe to the objectives which the *ad hoc* committee were set to by this Parliament, namely to identify areas of discrimination against women; areas of inequality where women are concerned within the Community and to propose remedies.

I entirely subscribe to the ultimate aim which would be to bring about a greater degree of fairness and justice for women within the Community and to bring about a compassion which pays regard to the particular problems which women encounter by virtue of being women. I subscribe to those objectives and aims.

But I have tabled, in the name of my Group, a number of amendments, none of which would detract from the substance of the aims and objectives of the committee. I believe that, if adopted by this Parliament, they would make the report more susceptible to practical implementation.

Now it is difficult for us to deal with amendments, Madam President, when none of us have seen the

amendments that any other Group has tabled. But I want to make reference to one amendment which has been tabled by my Group in the name of Mr Forth. It is Amendment No 35 and it relates to deleting the final part of paragraph 1 of the report. I would like to make it clear to the Parliament that I totally dissociate myself from that amendment. I have been asked by my colleagues, Lady Elles and Mrs Kellett Bowman, to say that they also dissociate themselves from that amendment and it would not surprise me if some other members of my Group do so as well when we come to the voting stage.

(Applause)

In examining this report, I have asked myself, firstly, how do we not help the cause of equality in this report? And I put to the Parliament two aspects of this report which I think do not help to further the cause of equality within the Community.

I do not think that it helps to overstate one's case. You simply alienate the sympathy of reasonable people. I think that in stating that the majority of women in the Community are lagging intolerably far behind in almost every sector of society is to overstate one's case. It is demeaning to women; it ignores the invaluable contribution which women make to the life of our Community. It ignores in particular the invaluable contribution which women make to the family within our Community which is after all the foundation upon which our society is built.

(Applause)

I do not think you help to further the cause of equality by trying in a report from a committee whose terms of reference were to deal with the situation of women in the Community to embrace within it the position of women in the developing world. I do not think we can put to rights all the problems of women all over the world in one report. And in embracing the position of women in the developing countries, we seriously weaken the case for doing something for women within the Community. Because where are your priorities if you try to embrace the position both of women in the developing world and of women within the Community? I think one has to reconsider what the objectives of the committee should be. I do not think we ought in this committee to be trying to preach to the developing countries as to what their culture should be. The mandate of the committee, and indeed the title of the report, is the position of women in the European Community. I believe we ought to be addressing ourselves to the areas where discrimination still exists. I think we should be reviewing, as indeed the report does, the progress that has been made in implementing the existing directives, and I think we should be looking to see what further directives are needed in order to achieve our aims and objectives.

**Dame Roberts**

There is another area in which in my opinion, the committee has strayed outside its terms of reference and that is in seeking to try to redefine the conditions in which support is given from the Regional and Social Funds. I was interested to note this morning that the distinguished Minister from the Council of Ministers, although making reference to the Social Fund, did not comment on this particular recommendation. It is my considered view that the Council of Ministers would reject it out of hand and I think it is a pity to have in the report a recommendation which is not going to be taken seriously by so important a body as the Council of Ministers.

We are in the process in this Parliament of trying to increase the amount of spending which goes into the Social and Regional Funds, and a recommendation of this nature would do the opposite. It would hurt those countries within the Community, and particularly the newer countries who are coming in, it would hurt the very people who need help in order that they may move towards a fairer and more just society with equality of opportunity for men and women. I welcome many of the practical proposals contained in this report in the field of education and training and I think that this is the key to equality of opportunity for women. It is a sad fact in my own country that whilst boys and girls have pretty well equal records of ability up to the age of 16, less than half as many girls as boys continue on to higher education. Now that cannot be right. We are not developing the full potential of the girls. Some of the problems arise in the attitudes in the school — I think some of the problems arise from the fact that girls are directed into the sort of subjects for which there is no great career future and therefore it is perhaps thought there is not much purpose in their continuing to receive higher education.

Without any doubt, some of the trouble arises from the attitude of parents who do not encourage their girls even though they may have just as good a potential as their boys — they do not encourage them to continue on to higher education. Some of the difficulties arise from the fact that boys' schooling is directed towards the opportunities that are available in the world. I would like to see the curriculum for boys including some aspects which would help them to share the domestic responsibilities in adult life. Indeed some of my amendments, on behalf of my Group, are directed towards that end. But I do think, as I say, that the practical proposals for education and training are very valuable.

It is also a matter of regret to me that in the United Kingdom 68 % of all married women go back to work after the age of 35, and between the ages of 35 and 54 68 % of all married women are at work; but their opportunities for promotion and retraining do not compare with those of men in similar industries. So I welcome these proposals.

I do not think we should impose burdens on industry, particularly at a time of economic recession, which industry cannot bear. I think we need to look very carefully at the proposals for providing the same benefits for part-time workers as are provided for full-time workers. I also think we need to look very carefully at the proposals for job-sharing. If you cut a job in half you do not in fact increase the employment potential; you just employ two people at a lower standard of living than if you had employed one. In the process you may make particular businesses economically non-viable.

I do not agree with the references in the report to shift work and to the growing incidence of shift work as inimical to the interests of women. On the contrary, I think that shift work, which enables both parents to share in the domestic responsibilities, can be a great help in enabling women to take a job outside the home, and with advancing technology and the new and very expensive machines which that entails, I think we shall see employers wanting to have more shift work to make the best possible use of those machines. I think we should grasp this nettle and not shy away from it and in the process, perhaps, undermine the viability of a particular industry.

There is one respect, Madam President, in which I think that the report gives a somewhat unbalanced view. It does seem to be based on the assumption that every married woman wishes to go out to work. Now, I do not believe that this is the position, I think we should recognize, firstly that when a married woman wants to go out to work, then she ought to be given every opportunity to do so. There ought to be nurseries, day-care facilities, there ought to be parental leave for both husbands and wives to look after the children, as appropriate. I believe that if a woman wants to go out to work she would be a better wife and mother for being able to fulfil those aspirations. But there are many married women who do not wish to go out to work and I think the report should be careful not to give the impression that they are in some way second-class women in the community.

*(Applause)*

They are not! What we ought to be doing is finding ways to improve the economic status of the woman who wants to stay in the home. In my own country there has been a fairly recent substantial improvement in that respect in that all child benefits are now paid to the mother, and that includes the tax allowances that were previously set against the father's earnings. I should like to see further reforms in the field of taxation, in terms of personal allowances which would be available to the wife and mother who wishes to stay at home and thus to improve her economic status in the community.

I welcome the attention which the report gives to health care for women. In the United Kingdom, some

**Dame Roberts**

4 % of all cancer deaths are due to cancer of the cervix. Since 1967 we have had a national programme of screening, under the auspices of the National Health Service, and the statistics have shown that this can reduce the incidence of death by detecting the presence of cancer at a stage when it is still capable of cure. Perhaps I would be inclined to think that 1967 was not soon enough, but at least we have done that and we have reduced the incidence of death from cancer of the cervix.

In the United Kingdom breast cancer accounts for 20 % of all cancer deaths among women and we still do not have a national screening programme in this area. Experiments are under way at present to assess the value of a screening programme, but in my view there is a case for speeding that programme up considerably, and I hope that the member governments and the Commission and Council of Ministers will do what they can in that respect.

I think we ought in this report, Madam President, to limit our aspirations, and I am firmly convinced that more will be achieved if we do limit them to matters which are capable of practical implementation. I should like to see us putting forward a few firm proposals in this report that we could, all of us, confidently badger and pester the Commission and the Council of Ministers to adopt within the lifetime of this Parliament.

*(Applause)*

If we set them an impossible task, we set them innumerable escape holes and loopholes, and I do not want to do that. I believe that the responsibility of the Commission and governments is to lay down the legal framework where appropriate; to make provision in the field of education and social services; to enable us to move towards equality of opportunity within the Community; to encourage and to exhort a change of attitudes on the part of schools, employers and trade unions.

Finally I think that it is the duty of government and Commission to practise what they preach; and one has seen in the latest appointments to the Commission that somebody is not practising what is being preached in the field of equality of opportunity for women. But let us limit our aspirations to what is practical. I believe that we can then move forward to achieve a more just, equitable and more compassionate Community. If this Parliament can say that it has done that by the end of the lifetime of the first directly elected parliament, we should all be proud.

*(Loud applause)*.

**President.** — I call the Communist and Allies Group.

**Mrs Hoffmann.** — *(F)* Ladies and gentlemen, now that it has completed its work, the *ad hoc* committee, even though we do not dispute the personal effort that went into that work, seems to me to have failed in its basic task, which was to prepare this debate on the position of women in the European Community with a view to giving practical help to its development. I feel this is so because throughout its work the majority of its members refused to speak openly and frankly about the lives of the women in our various countries, to analyse the causes, to name those who bear the responsibility for this situation and to propose the necessary solutions.

If we talked about the lives of women in our various countries, we would find ourselves saying that, since this Assembly first sat, unemployment among women has risen substantially, that more than three million women are denied the basic right to work, we would talk about the trend in insecure employment, the rise in prices, low wages — 78 % of women in my country earn less than FF 2 800 a month — about unequal pay, which accounts for 33 % of the total, about inadequate family allowances, the absence of social facilities, the refusal of loans for contraception and the voluntary interruption of pregnancy. To talk about the lives of women is to talk about attacks on health and education, on our agricultural industry, on the independence for our respective countries, the increasingly hard life of women workers trapped in the least skilled and most repetitive jobs and attacks on their dignity and freedoms, in short an increasingly hard life under an inhuman capitalist system which wears out women at work just as it saps their daily happiness. There is no denying that this assessment is a real indictment of the European institutions. Women, like everyone else, owe this worsening of their living conditions to the domination of Europe by big money. That is the principal obstacle to their equality, to a better way of life.

Reading Mrs Maij-Weggen's report, it might be thought that there is no such thing as capital or exploitation. Nevertheless, these words do reflect the reality experienced by millions of women. For women nothing good will come of your policy of austerity and integration, which the Communists alone condemn.

The experience of 22 years of the EEC proves this. It is this policy which prevents the implementation of the Directives, justified though they may be. Far from alleviating the inequalities, it can only aggravate them. You do not have the courage to say this unambiguously: by putting forward a whole range of measures relating to employment, working hours and education, you are preparing to clamp down once more on the living standards of families. To do this, you must remove every obstacle to the exploitation of women, because after all what do we need to know about the lives of working women to realize that equality is achieved by removing from our national legislation rights which have been fought for and won,

**Hoffmann**

such as the ban on night work? Who can claim the contrary here? In France we are experiencing this in the case of various bills on part-time work. It is true of the bill wrongly presented as favouring the equality of men and women at work. In fact, these two bills have the same objective, which is to allow employers to exploit women even more while claiming that they are granting women equal treatment. Let us be quite frank about what the report proposes: legislating on part-time work and harmonizing legislation said to be too protective by doing away with it would mean putting back the clock one hundred years for women.

The new development, on which the report says very little, is that increasing numbers of women — and this is particularly true of France — do not accept the fate you have in store for them: they are fighting against it. They no longer accept the inequalities, the injustices, they want to work in freedom and dignity, to have time to live, they want equality and are crying out for it loud and clear. And they are right to do so. It is a demand that scientific and technical progress can satisfy, but above all this presupposes a political choice, an attack on the superprofits of the capitalists. If women in the Community are to be ensured the right to work, the destruction of our industries must be opposed and any further enlargement rejected. But the text that has been put to you to vote on says nothing about these basic questions. Quite the contrary, by proposing the creation of a European Social Fund for women, you are seeking to speed up the redeployment of the multinationals and to have the tax-payer bear the burden of the credits that will be required. Let me make it quite clear: do not count on our Group to support proposals as dangerous and disastrous for the future of women and of our peoples as this. We call on them to join with us in the fight to put a stop to these proposals and force through genuine solutions. Thanks to the development of technology, the way is also open for work to become less and less hard, to be done in different ways.

That is why we are in favour of the 35-hour week and retirement at 55. We are, after all, deeply attached to national traditions and national independence and we are opposed to the levelling down of legislation on education, health and social security, because we are the true supporters of women's liberation, and we shall go on fighting for a democratic Europe characterized by progress, cooperation and peace.

While attacks on human rights as serious as the ban on access to certain professions in the Federal Republic of Germany and repression in Northern Ireland grow in number, this Assembly continues to refuse to set up a committee of enquiry into this question, as Georges Marchais has proposed.

We advocate genuine cooperation among the nations, based on mutual interest and national independence.

To conclude, I would say that, when the diagnosis is bad, the remedies are incapable of curing the disease and in fact tend to aggravate it. That is what these proposals amount to, the accelerated integration advocated by the resolution by means of a whole range of measures of a supranational nature. No, that is unlikely to make for an improvement in the position of women, and that is why my Group will abstain in the vote on the report and will be tabling several amendments during the debate.

**President.** — I call the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mrs von Alemann.** — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the work of the Liberal members of the *ad hoc* committee was principally aimed at helping to improve the position of women in the European Community through a new division of labour between men and women. We cannot talk about a new allocation of roles without looking at changes in family life.

In the pre-industrial era the tasks of men and women in employment, the family and education were linked. In the craft trades and agriculture, which accounted for most employment, all difficulties were faced and overcome together. In ordinary society employment and the household split in the industrial age. Out of differences in emphasis in the work previously performed jointly grew the allocation of set roles. This allocation of roles became consolidated in ideas on the value of the various tasks to be performed. The husband alone became responsible for supporting the family and, it might be said, for representing it externally.

With this division, the women's role in the family became more inward-looking. Her mission in life was to be willing to make sacrifices, to show patience, to work untiringly for her husband and children. As a result, the husband lost a great deal of his direct influence over the bringing up of the children, while the wife lost her influence over society. This gave rise to — and I quote — the 'fatherless family and the motherless society'. This is a quotation from a speech made in 1973 by the former Vice-President of the German Bundestag, the Liberal Liselotte Funcke. Since that time there have been some changes in European law, but the allocation of roles has not changed in any way. That is what we are concerned about. Let us change society. For thousands of years the standards have been set by men, but if there is to be balance in our hostile, insecure and restless world, it also needs our standards, the standards of women.

But we Liberals do not want to add yet another model to all those that already exist. I should therefore like to explain just one fundamental idea in Liberal policy on women, which is also the keynote of Liberal responsibility in general, this being the achievement of the grea-

### Von Alemann

test possible freedom of the individual in any given or changing social situation. This support for human dignity through self-determination represents the first basic difference between Liberalism and every other political line and complexion which is based on the belief that generally valid and generally binding answers to the question as to the purpose and the object of man's existence can be offered or even prescribed from outside and from above by reference to certain religious or secular philosophies — whether they have their roots in Christian or Marxist traditions.

We Liberals in Germany said this years ago in the Freiburg proposition, and it is still true. We do not want to tell anyone how he should live. But we do want to remove the obstacles standing in the way of every woman when she wants to live her life as she personally thinks fit and not as perhaps society or the village or anyone else around her proposes she should live. The basic demand of Liberal policy on women is that women should be given their freedom and that they should have, or again have the opportunity to shape their lives on their own responsibility.

But this demand for self-determination entails not only liberation from restrictions but also the courage to assume responsibility for oneself. It represents opportunity and risk at the same time. Liberal policy on women does not therefore mean a guarantee of prosperity and security at a uniform level but individual freedom of choice with all the opportunities and consequences that that entails. This is a difficult and arduous course. There is no ready made safe route and no generally valid ultimate objective. Evelyn Sullerot once said: with freedom we have gained time, but we have lost some security as regards our role and the tasks associated with it and its advantages. Women have primarily become consumers. The youngest among us were born and brought up as such. Although we have benefited by this change, we have been the targets of economic change rather than its instigators. What has been achieved has not given us women the taste of a victory gained. Evelyn Sullerot put it his way: we have achieved progress but not acquired it. That is correct, but it should not frighten us. Liberals do not want to replace one set of roles with another but to open the way for each individual to be largely independent in shaping his life.

What, then, are the topical problems raised in this report by Mrs Maij-Weggen, on which a committee consisting of two-thirds women and one-third men worked for more than a year and with great diligence? We who were members of this committee tried to find compromises, conscious that we wanted to submit to the House a report which a majority of its Members could approve. We consider that very important. As in the debate on hunger in the world, we Liberals feel that this report must be adopted because it signifies a very important step forward for women in the Community. I do not share Shelagh Roberts' view that

the report covers too much ground because it also refers to women in developing countries.

Ladies and gentlemen, the world looks to our Community. The world expects something from our Community, a Community of wealthy countries compared with living standards in the Third World. We therefore felt we had a moral duty not to adopt a know-it-all attitude by telling women in other countries how they should shape their lives but to try to look critically at the resources and assistance we provide for women and families in the Third World to see whether they are in fact in women's interests.

In the coming months we will have to discuss many of the problems that have been mentioned today. The implementation of the existing directives must be checked and better supervised. We must really find out where equal rights in fact end even though legally they already exist. We must find out how access to employment can be facilitated. This we consider to be one of the central issues, access to employment for women, by which we mean access to all occupations, not only those allegedly designed for women. How can women earn equal pay for equal work if they do not have the same vocational training? I believe this has largely been accepted, in the committee at least.

We should ensure that the resources we of this Parliament have to allocate go where our directives and our resolutions are heeded. One of our most basic rights is surely to allocate resources to places where we have previously made it clear what our views and basic values are. I call on you, ladies and gentlemen, to give this report your critical endorsement. We should try to adopt it tomorrow. My Group would consider it extremely dangerous if this serious report, which for the most part deals with the situation as regards employment, training and health care for women, should suddenly develop into a debate that centres on abortion.

Ladies and gentlemen, I will say here quite openly that we believe paragraphs 35 and 36 should remain in the motion for a resolution unchanged because this report is, in our view, an acceptable vehicle for this. Of course, not everyone finds it ideal. I see Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti is shaking her head, but I do believe that the report is generally acceptable, and I would ask you to vote in favour of it tomorrow. My Group is prepared to do so.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call the Group of the European Progressive Democrats.

**Mr Vié.** — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, should I apologize for being the first man this morning to speak, on behalf of my Group, on the posi-

Vic

tion of women in the Community? Perhaps some feminists in this Chamber are smiling with commiseration at my natural incompetence. I do not think so, nor do I think that it would be reasonable to expect a cancer specialist to have cancer himself if he is to speak knowledgeably on the subject. Let there be no misunderstanding: I do not mean that women are some kind of malignant growth threatening the human family.

Having said this to anticipate any objection to my incompetence, I am sorry to say to Mrs Maij-Weggen, who I know has put a great deal of work into this report, that in my opinion this is a poor document. It is poor in form and in content.

Allow me to begin with the form of the document. It is less a report than a jumble of ideas. It is the family trolley at the supermarket on Saturday. You find everything in it, useful and useless, indispensable and superfluous, gadgets and essentials. My impression is that the rapporteur set out to place a defender at every foot of the ramparts. I apologize for this warlike comparison, but the report itself has an aggressive slant, referring on several occasions to oppression, a term which I do not much like. And here, I feel, we have the link between deficiency of form and deficiency of content. I very much regret that, in a Chamber where we often listen to speeches on material and technical problems, the one time we have a major subject to discuss, the approach adopted should be so petty, so cramped and so off the point. Off the point and cramped because I feel it arbitrarily simplifies human existence. There are not two kinds of human being, men and women involved in class warfare to gain power — productive power, because that is really all that is involved. There is this very strange human being with its unity and its duality at one and the same time: unity because on a personal basis there is strictly no difference between a man and a woman, and I completely endorse everything the report says on the need for equality at this level. Duality because physiologically there is a fundamental difference men and women, a difference which is the source of everything humanity has desperately sought since it first began: happiness. A difference which is at the root of everything which must be called the poetry of existence, not in the lyrical sense of the word, but in its etymological meaning, that is everything which is creation.

The problem with men and women is that they remain different by fully assuming their dual roles. In each era the way in which satisfaction with life is experienced itself changes. In our own age — whether this leads to happiness or not, that is not the question — work is often included in this satisfaction. Less often perhaps, if we believe the surveys, than the intellectuals would have us believe. It is a fact all the same, and the only major problem is not women's right to work, it is the right to be a woman in a civilization largely characterized by industrial work. And that is by no means the same thing. For all practical purposes, it is in fact the

opposite. The organization of our Community must help women to live, in all their freedom to live. Employment is important for this freedom, but it is incidental compared with the primary objective. It is not far from the truth to say that according to Mrs Maij-Weggen's report women do not achieve their identity as women until their productive capacity is the same as that of men.

It would be easy to say that my criticism is negative and unimportant because it is not accompanied by any precise plan. It is not my fault if the allocation of speaking time in this Chamber is such that my Group has more time to discuss the cutting up of beef carcasses during Question Time than I am allowed to devote to a debate on so important a subject as the infinite complexity of the future of women in the European Community. If I were a teacher, correcting pupil Maij-Weggen's essay, I would therefore put in the margin: 'has not dealt with the subject.'

I am therefore left unsatisfied, and I conclude my speech with the ardent hope that we will not leave it at these truncated prospects. I hope that another time, another day, we will tackle the real problem connected with men and women. The men and women of our Community are not disembodied beings to be manipulated by the statisticians as they will, dividing them into consumers, electors, workers, or at the moment, unfortunately, more often unemployed workers. They are our electors. They are made of flesh and blood and are involved in a personal adventure, hoping that we will fulfill their expectations soon, undoubtedly by offering material solutions, but above all by meeting their basic needs.

In his book *Citadelle*, Saint-Exupéry meditates long, and in splendid language, on the destiny of man and on the problems connected with the construction of the world. The symbolic king who talks with his son says somewhere that his role is to build for man 'a house in which his steps have a purpose'. What point is there in a house, however functional and modern it may be, if neither the meaning nor the use of a dwelling place are understood? That is what, I feel, we have to construct in Europe: a human house in which life has a purpose. I have not found this purpose of life — and I am quoting from another book by Saint-Exupéry — in this report, and I personally very much regret this.

(Mixed reactions)

**President.** — I call Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul on a point of order.

**Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul.** — (D) Madam President, all I really wanted to do was to ask a question. It is undoubtedly true to say that men and women are the same and have the same soul. But perhaps the speaker

**Wieczorek-Zeul**

can explain to us how it happens that our governments have nevertheless appointed only men as Commissioners. What could be the reason for this? Unemployment among women is, after all, far higher than among men. Perhaps we could have an answer to this question.

**President.** — I am sorry Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul, the debate is not open at the moment.

I call the rapporteur on a point of order.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Madam President, I would just like to make a brief remark to Mr Vié. He has compared me with a student, which only goes to show how mistaken he can be about women: I have children who are almost of university age.

**President.** — I call the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — (I) Madam President, I wish to respond immediately to Mr Vié's important speech — important because in a way his voice was the voice of truth raised in this Assembly, reminding us that ours is a minor role, a role of traditional inferiority.

I think it is a good thing that a man has spoken, expressing out loud what many others in this House may think. This corresponds to the present global trend, for I believe that we are witnessing an evolution of woman's status in the world. We are living in a time of powerful women's rights movements. However, with Mr Reagan and John Paul II, a reaction has set in against all the women's demands of the 70s, and the women's movement itself is in the throes of an acute crisis. Women are seeking individual solutions within the intimacy of the family unit, where today there are more possibilities for mobility.

Nevertheless, they are attempting to play a new role as women not only within the family but also within society. When Mr Vié speaks of a home where women have a meaningful position, he is repeating what has been said for centuries, and Saint Augustine said it far better.

Madam President, after having answered Mr Vié on these points, I will go on to say that the resolution we are at present examining suffers too much from the tyranny of political and group hegemony. Our parliamentarians have been too timid; they accepted the role of voluntary servitude which is often assumed by women, especially in political matters. We have been elected by the will of the political parties, and we are obliged to please the leaders of those parties, at least from an intellectual or political standpoint; we must be gentle and understanding towards the whims of party

chiefs and group leaders. Madam President — I turn to you, for you have always understood the difficulties of the woman's political role — there is a system in the European Parliament which — let us be frank — relegates women to a lower level which they themselves accept, a system apparent in a whole series of more or less minor situations, from relationships with officials to the furnishing of cars, etc., etc. In any case, this system is perhaps less important than the bureaucracy which creates and distributes the roles within Parliament — the same bureaucracy which performs this function at the level of important European decisions on political, economic and social affairs. These decisions are male prerogatives, say what you will. I am completely in favour of equality between men and women, but I cannot help asking why, if this equality does in fact exist, the Commission does not include a number of women commensurate with the size of the female European electorate, despite a parliamentary vote requesting a national commitment to this effect. I think we will have to wait ten years or more before this type of representation, which would be a true act of equality and not merely empty words, can become a reality.

To my colleagues I will say that the problem is compounded by their readiness to accept a subordinate position: I urge them not only to escape from the forces of intellectual and political discipline but also to bring with them into the political sphere their unique feminine sincerity. Here as well, inside this Parliament where too often women still see themselves as political minors, I recently witnessed a demonstration of how difficult it is for women to assume personal responsibility for their actions, even though they are elected on an equal basis with men. I am referring to what occurred in connection with my motion for a resolution on the trial of Chiang Ching and her co-defendants at Peking, a political resolution which raises a problem on which we all agree, namely the death penalty. All of us, or at least the majority of us, are against the death penalty. This morning, however, the women who had originally signed the resolution withdrew their signatures, saying that they were afraid to sign, that they were worried about what their Group would say, that they had to consult their Group leaders, and so on. I wonder why we should not condemn the death penalty in China when we condemn it here in the West, where the accused is at least entitled to be defended before a real court; either some sort of racism or barbarism is involved, or my colleagues are merely afraid because the motion concerns not feminism but rather the legitimacy of a mock trial. And yet, this is the way the system functions. How can one expect, therefore, the adoption of a more courageous attitude when it comes to such burning issues as those relating to women? The will to exercise this courage is lacking, and in my opinion, the necessary clarity of ideas as well.

As for the resolution on the trial of Chiang Ching in Peking, I present it alone, Madam President. I do not

**Macciocchi**

present it with melancholy, but rather as an act of courage, stressing once again the need to act decisively in this manner, individually as well as collectively.

Now, in regard to the report, the other element I have noted is an unfortunate cultural vacuum, which leads us to underline — and in a positive way — the value of education and training for women. The report does not mention women's contributions to the highest levels of culture, to the current trends of theoretical thought, to journalism, to the arts, to research. This is tantamount to saying that no prospects exist in these fields, as if here too women, having left domestic life only a short while ago, were expressing only a modest desire for a little female training, for a little education, but not so much as to enable them to appropriate the robes of university professors, or judges, or any of those who have high positions in all the institutions of our European States. I wonder why there is so much diffidence here, and if we are being confronted yet again with a sort of self-censorship.

Among the amendments I presented one is especially pertinent here. It raises the question of a European Prize, a sort of Nobel Prize for women. I suggest, Madam President — if you will support the project — that the Prize be offered beginning in 1983, to a woman who has been active not only in the highest cultural fields but also in all cultural sectors, and even in areas of direct action — towards the Third World, for example.

Regarding the Third World, I do not think that this resolution is strong enough yet to handle the question as it was presented in our debates on world hunger. I mentioned that, out of 122 million children born in 1979, 12 million died from malnutrition in the Third World, and this figure will continue to increase. This makes me wonder whether the problem of maternity — here we cannot speak of voluntary abortions, for in this case abortions are simply a result of extreme poverty — should not be included in a paragraph to be added to the resolution.

Also, the point concerning sexual mutilation is one which, in my opinion, should not be approached from a Eurocentric point of view. I am pleased that Mrs Sadat is present at this debate, for she also attended the Congress at Copenhagen and knows how this question created a schism there. The delegates from the Third World felt that the women from our great and civilized West, so to speak, were too eager to take charge on all feminist questions. I wonder, therefore, whether the reference to this issue included in the resolution should not be modified in the manner suggested in one of my amendments.

**President.** — I call the non-attached Members.

**Mr Bournias.** — (*El*) Madam President, colleagues, I am the second man to speak in this debate and I

regret that I am not able to agree with the previous male speaker and with his unadulterated conservatism. On the contrary, in my opinion the committee's report and the rapporteur's speech have provided us with a full explanation of this social phenomenon and I thank them for their efforts as this subject is one which has attracted the interest of women all over the world for many decades, if not for a century or more. I understand that it was mainly women who were involved in the committee, and today in Parliament it is mainly women who have spoken. This contradicts Mrs Wouters' statement that we men, in line with current developments taking place in the world, ought to take up this matter and give it our support.

In my country men from the world of science, letters, and trade unionism work alongside women, who have concerned themselves since the beginning of the century with equality of the sexes, in order to help further the development of the numerous achievements made by women over the years. Therefore it is essential that we play an active and positive role in supporting this movement for female equality. I do not think that there is any need for me to add anything to the report, but I can give you some useful information about what has happened in Greece: Since 1955 we have had complete equality between men and women in the public and private sectors, as well as in education. In 1951 we gave women the right to vote and the right to stand as candidates in municipal elections.

In 1952 we gave women the right to vote and to stand as candidates in the national elections. In 1953 women became jurors and notaries. In 1955 women joined the ranks of diplomats and judges, and we are continuing with this policy of complete equality in all matters. Complete equality, of course, does not come about overnight, but this is our programme and our aim. In the public sector there is no discrimination between men and women as regards entrance requirements into the civil service, pay and promotion. Women enlist voluntarily in the security forces and the army, pursue full-time studies, and enjoy all the same legal and economic benefits as men. Finally, since 1980 women have been employed by the harbour authority which is essential for port security in a country of islands like our own.

In wartime these voluntary recruits, who study in various military schools, are subject to compulsory service. I come now to the private sector. Ever since 1975 Greece has approved and gradually implemented the international agreement on equal pay for equal work. I say gradually because unskilled women who work in factories achieved a progressive equalization of their pay between 1975 and 1978. Today the unskilled female worker receives the same pay as the unskilled male worker. As far as skilled female workers are concerned, this process is happening in stages but we already have equality of pay for skilled female workers in, amongst others, the chemical, plastics, and timber industries. We have taken some important

**Bournias**

revolutionary steps in Greece in the field of family law. After the 1975 constitution was implemented a committee of experts was set up under the former professor of family law, Mr Gazis, to study this subject and it outlined a plan to give entirely equal rights and obligations to husband and wife in respect of their children. The dowry, an age-old institution in my country, is to be abolished and the housework which the woman does is to be seen as her contribution to the wedding expenses. The woman is to have full parental rights over any illegitimate child of hers. Both parents have equal rights and obligations towards their children. This bill is soon to become law. The area, however, where our progress is most significant is in education. I shall give you a few figures which I want you to note, as these will convince you just how rapid the improvement has been in the field of education in Greece. The percentage of female staff employed in infant schools is 48 %, in primary schools 48.2 %, in secondary schools 49.2 %, in secondary technical schools, which constitute a branch of secondary schools, 17 %, in higher technical schools 27 %, in vocational schools 42 %, in higher general schools 63 % and in further educational institutions 38.7 %. At one time, colleagues, Greek women used to study either literature, law or sometimes medicine; today they are also entering the professional world of applied science and advanced technology. For example, there are women who study to qualify as ships' captains and wireless operators, and today 400 such women are employed by the Greek merchant navy. This development, as I said, has taken place not just as a result of the efforts of women alone, but also through the help of all those educated men in the professional and political world who wanted Greek women to make progress. And progress they shall. For this reason I assure you on behalf of the party which I represent, New Democracy, that we will adopt and implement whatever is decided and adopted by this Parliament.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call the Ad Hoc Committee on Women's Rights.

**Mrs Roudy, Chairman of the ad hoc committee.** — (F) Like many of my colleagues, I too should like to say a few words to Mr Vié. I am happy to see that he has returned to the Chamber. I was very pleased to hear what he had to say because, although he was, as far as I know, a member of our *ad hoc* Committee on Women's Rights, this is the first time I have had an opportunity to listen to his ideas. And I would have been very sorry not to have heard them. Not that this is anything new for me. We have heard this kind of argument before, dear Mr Vié, but I feel it is rather a pity that you did not come and see us more often. It is rather a pity that we were unable to discuss the subject at greater length. Once again, I do not believe that we

would have learnt much from you, but, who knows, perhaps you would have learnt something from us, as you may now, for example, if you listen to what I have to say. But the ability to listen to others is not something which can be taught.

What I want to say is that in the debate which we are now having and which is the culmination of fourteen months of work, I believe what we should all try to do is to listen and try to understand each other, if possible, not to brush aside this or that argument on the grounds that it does not fit in with everyone's scheme of things, but to try and understand. To understand, firstly, why this Parliament wanted to set up an *ad hoc* Committee on Women's Rights a short time ago. Is it not curious that for the first time there should be this desire for reflection, which has gone on for fourteen months? There is something new behind this: there are a few more women in this Parliament than in the other parliaments. They rightly wanted the first act to consist in thought being given to our position. Those who have followed our work — and it is true that the committee included ten male members, some of whom attended, while others were seen less often, but that is not so important — those who have followed our work will know that we have not been idle for fourteen months. As chairman I feel it is my duty to give you a few statistics, which will not be exhaustive. We have had 11 meetings, all open to the public, so that they could see what we were doing. We have had a public hearing on the position of women in small and medium-sized undertakings and a number of meetings with the Commissioners who agreed to come and talk with us. We thus had the pleasure of listening to Mr Jenkins, Mr Cheysson, Mr Davignon and Mr Natali, and we were able to conduct a genuine dialogue with some of them, in other words we listened to what they had to say to us, and they listened to what we had to say to them, and some of them did not conceal the fact that we had taught them various things which they had not known up to then, which makes it all the more regrettable that the new Commission we have now still does not include a single woman. In a way, therefore, we are being governed by, as it were, a one-eyed body, since there will obviously be a whole range of subjects, a whole aspect of everyday life which our Commissioners — none of whom I see here at the moment — will never be able to consider. The Commission will now be deprived of this additional and enriching view of things, which is essential for a true assessment of every aspect of our lives. This is extremely regrettable. It cannot be said that you speak on behalf of all humanity.

We have done a great deal besides this. We have met representatives of the Economic and Social Committee, we attended on 28 and 29 May 1980 the Manchester Conference arranged by the Commission of the European Communities on the impact of new technologies on the employment of women, and we also attended the United Nations Conference held in Copenhagen. We have produced a questionnaire,

### Roudy

taken up by Euro-barometer, on discrimination against women, and we have also produced 16 working documents and about 100 notices to members. We have received a great deal of mail, and we have personally experienced the hopes placed in us by hundreds of thousands of women in Europe.

The resolution before you covers no fewer than 11 directives, 6 regulations, 2 enquiries, 6 reports and 22 various measures. These are obviously very specific things, which may nevertheless appear rather petty — I believe that was the word that was used. We apologize, but these are daily facts of life for women.

This text represents a first in parliamentary work. It is the first time that a document of this kind has ever been produced. Of course, there is no point in looking for a literary legal work. The document is a collection, and I would point out — with some pride — that the final version, produced by a drafting committee, has been established from six working languages. Such as it is, it represents a genuine programme of work for the Commission and the Communities.

This resolution is exactly what we need. The Commission has just submitted its report on progress towards the implementation of the second Directive in the Member States. This report, which we have just received, confirms something which our work revealed, which is that, although our Directives represent considerable progress as regards our principles on equal treatment, they have not been implemented in the Member States by a long way. There is still an enormous amount to do, and we know there will be no shortage of work in the future.

I should now like to add a few words on my own behalf. What I have to say is important and particularly serious: it would be a mistake to ignore the fact that this motion for a resolution comes at a time of acute crisis, with women principally bearing the brunt, and this puts the structural nature of the second employment market, the employment of women, into perspective.

And yes, dear Mr Vié, we do still speak for the employment of women. You must forgive us: to be able to live, you must have a wage, and we need it if we want to survive. We are therefore well aware that we live in a world dominated by money and that people really have no right to a say unless they have some economic independence. I did not make the laws. The laws govern us, we are subject to them, we must live with them. The 35 million women in paid employment, representing 35 % of the total working population, therefore represent in our societies a genuine reserve army which is called up or demobilized according to the needs of the economic cycle. Consequently, it is not surprising that, since they are treated as a reserve army as soon as there is a crisis, they represent the weakest link in this army and today account for the majority of the unemployed. In Germany and France

over 60 out of every 100 unemployed workers are women, and this is not the result of mere chance or fate. It corresponds to some kind of established order, some kind of world economic order based on the protection of certain privileged people who trample mercilessly on the minorities or those who are treated as such in our society.

I therefore regard as positive and important the demand made in our resolution for a reduction in working hours for everyone. And that is why I personally very much distrust anyone who talks about part-time work, flexible hours or work at home. Though extremely tempting at first glance, such measures are, in my opinion, traps at a time when work is becoming scarce and when women have an increasing need for a proper living wage, a real occupation capable of allowing them to assume responsibilities. Full-time employment is what they need. They will then make the choices they want to make, but let them not be deprived of the choice at the outset. Let them, I beg of you, decide for themselves. There is no real choice when there are no opportunities, when the way is not wide open before you.

I should like to add, very briefly, a point on which all of us agreed in committee. We deplore the absence of women from the bodies in which the decisions are taken. And, as I said just now, I regret that the Commission does not include any women. It is obvious that while there are few or no women in the bodies where the decisions are taken, the problems and questions they may raise will continue to be overlooked and it will regularly be said, oh yes, we shall have to draw up a special report on these questions we keep forgetting. And committees will be set up and it will be said that they must be mixed, and it will inevitably be found that once again it is the women who do the work. That is in the nature of things, and we cannot do anything about it. It is not our fault if these matters are not dealt with properly anywhere else. Until women are equally represented everywhere, at all levels, there will therefore continue to be a need for special places where these problems are settled. It is in the nature of things, it is not fate, but we cannot do anything about it. If we want to change the system, there is no point in closing our eyes and seeking protection in philosophy or poetry. We must tackle the problems and try to solve them. That is what we have tried to do to some extent, because we feel that the general position of women is not a neutral one. It forms part of a hierarchical order, a power structure, and to change it would be to change all the rules of mankind, which is why so much passion is aroused when it is announced that some of these rules may be changed. It may also be necessary to change mentalities, and Einstein said that it was sometimes more difficult to change a prejudice than to split the atom. It may be thought that the splitting of the atom was not perhaps easy for Einstein. He felt it was even more difficult to change prejudice, and I believe he was right.

**Roudy**

I shall conclude with a few words in explanation of a number of points in the resolution which some people were surprised to find here. I am referring to voluntary abortion, the fight against procuring — the organization for profit of a form of slavery — to sexual mutilation, which many people still confuse with cultural practices and which is to be found today in some countries receiving Community aid.

These areas form part of the living conditions of women in general and should not therefore be overlooked. They have direct or indirect implications for the lives of every one of us, and while the official spokesmen of certain States refuse to discuss them, we have heard what women in these countries have to say, women in Ireland, women in Africa, and we must speak for them here.

This text is a compromise, which means that no one will be satisfied with it, but we have tried to ensure that everyone can find in it something that he is looking for. I do not know if we can all accept it. There will be amendments, and some of us will have to make a choice.

What I can say is that some of us, including myself, feel that this text is really the very least we should do. If we cut it back or weaken it, it will be very difficult for many of us to agree to it. Let us therefore try to ensure this document retains some purpose and that it continues to mean something to the women who expect a great deal of it and that the hopes millions of women have placed in this Parliament are not dashed.

*(Loud applause)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Krouwel-Vlam.

**Mr Krouwel-Vlam.** — *(NL)* Madam President, in the wide field of health care women have always occupied a completely different position from that of men. From time immemorial women have also followed the traditional pattern of roles in health care, being those who wait on, look after and help others. In addition, in their role as mothers, women come into contact more than men in their role as fathers with all kinds of people and institutions involved in health care such as general practitioners, centres that advise on babies and children, hospitals, out-patients departments and specialists. On the one hand, she is an independent woman, on the other, she is the wife of a sick husband and/or the mother of sick children who need her care. In many cases, she is also the one who joins the doctor and various health institutions in looking after sick members of the family.

Women are in many ways deeply involved in health care, as patients themselves undergoing medical treatment, as consumers, in that they still determine the family's pattern of consumption as regards food and

medicines that are not on prescription, as unpaid workers, in that it is above all women who do a great deal of voluntary work in health care, and also as paid workers in many sectors of health care. Now that the wages and working conditions of the largely female staff of all sectors of health care have been substantially improved, we find men taking an increasing interest in these occupations. It is disappointing that, because of the large turnover among female workers in health care, for whatever reasons, the small number of male workers, being more career-minded, have over the years gained control of the managerial posts, particularly in in-patient health care.

Measures must be taken in the area of part-time work and shorter working hours to enable men and women fair shares of the many tasks in the field of health care. The joint assumption of responsibility by men and women can ensure optimum health care in and outside the home and may result in a significant improvement in the position of women.

My Group is therefore very pleased that the report on the position of women includes a section on women in health care and that it refers to ways of putting an end to the disadvantaged position of women. In general, my Group therefore fully endorses what is said in this section.

If the Commission is serious about improving the position of women, my Group expects it to put forward proposals on the following in the near future in view of the urgency of the situation. Firstly, incentives in the form of training and retraining opportunities, giving women good career prospects, even enabling them to occupy senior positions in health care institutions. Secondly, measures to initiate scientific research into the causes of what is known as the housewife syndrome with all its social and economic consequences. The results of such research may lead to practical measures in the form of prevention, assistance and supervision by social institutions. Thirdly, the introduction of courses of education and training to make women more self-confident. They must learn to stand up for their right to information on their own bodies, for example.

In addition, they must learn to speak out when they meet doctors rather than acting as patients with no right to a say.

As regards abortion, my Group is fully aware that the paragraphs in the resolution on this subject represent a compromise among the many different views on what is a very difficult and delicate question. But everyone should realize that the full development and independence of women also depends on their freedom to decide whether or not to have children. It is a grave misapprehension to believe that material facilities in the form of children's nurseries and additional facilities for the parents of large families will reduce the

**Krouwel-Vlam**

number of abortions. The decision to interrupt a pregnancy has deep-lying causes, and it is to misjudge women to believe that the causes are material. It is ultimately for women to decide whether and, if so, when they want to have children. That is their responsibility. Women who become pregnant without wishing to have the right to an abortion under proper medical supervision if they so desire, without financial obstacles being placed in their way. Each of the Member States will have to solve its own problems in this area, because if one or more Member States lag behind, the problem will only be increased elsewhere.

Realizing that this important and sensitive subject must be dealt with as thoroughly as possible, but that clear rules must apply to the female citizens of the European Community, my Group has tabled two amendments to this text, which seek to take account of social developments and what the many, many women in Europe want.

My Group also calls for particular attention to be paid to the foreign women in the Community. They have to contend with very serious problems in their relations with the health care services because of language and cultural barriers. They often live in very isolated circumstances and miss the traditions of their countries of origin, where they usually receive support and good advice from their grandmothers. My Group recommends that a proper medical service include interpreting centres, telephone interpreting services. This is a form of assistance which would require little in the way of financial resources, but could do a great deal to overcome the language problems experienced by foreign patients. In addition, a service of this kind would prevent a situation in which young children, who usually understand the language of the host country, have to act as interpreters between their mother and the doctor, for example, with all the misunderstandings and frustrations this entails. From my own experience I know that girls of 8 or 9 often accompany their mothers to the gynaecologist, for instance, where they have to translate difficult medical concepts and be present during the examination, which may have unfortunate consequences for the relationship between mother and child. Hence our recommendation that interpreting centres be introduced.

Finally, health care is also a political concern. The European Parliament would therefore do well to consider this aspect during this wide-ranging debate on the position of women.

The report is a good one, and my Group will therefore give it its whole-hearted support. We now expect the Commission to propose practical policy measures, so that it is not left at fine words, but something is really offered to the many women in Europe, because, Mr President, women deserve this.

*(Applause from the left)*

## IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mrs Gaiotti de Biase.

**Mrs Gaiotti de Biase.** — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, though this debate concludes the work accomplished by the committee on women's rights, it cannot and should not conclude the task of this Parliament, a task which, in some respects, is now only beginning, based on guidelines and options which constitute the first step in the development of an overall policy on the status of women.

The document on which Mrs Maij-Weggen has laboured so long concludes this initial phase and marks the beginning of the next. Much time and effort were needed to draw up the report, and linguistic problems often made the task more difficult still. The finished product represents an effort made by the various political forces towards mutual understanding and agreement. It is above all, as I have already said, a point of departure, and as such we approved it in committee.

The negative aspects of our work were only those which we had foreseen and which were to a certain extent inevitable: the disproportionate number of women present; their monopoly for the discussion; the fact that the document, because of its breadth of scope, is midway between a philosophical manifesto and a practical proposal, but possesses neither the theoretical density necessary in the former case nor the precision necessary in the latter; the need to exclude questions for which the Community is not directly responsible, despite their fundamental nature — I am thinking in particular of political participation, which our Group sacrificed in favour of the immediate effectiveness of our work. Beyond these limitations, which, I repeat, were unavoidable, the committee presents Parliament with a document whose basic strategy is sufficiently clear both on the points where general agreement was reached and on those formulated through compromise or majority vote. The latter represent an ongoing debate rather than a definitive conclusion.

The report presents some basic options which we share and which we consider a point of departure for further work.

First, the question of women is a central one, and it is explicitly put before this Parliament as a problem of social balance, a need for reorganization after the profound and irreversible changes which have taken place in industrialized societies. The expression 'women's rights' — accurate certainly, but somewhat dated — is inadequate in the face of the challenge of

Gaiotti de Biase

change, the liberation of energy, the resumption of responsibility which are all themes present in the problem of the status of women. The idea that this problem concerns only half of the European population is a fallacy. It concerns everyone — men, children, the old and the young — just as much as it concerns women themselves.

Second, the economic and employment crisis now prevailing in our society should not be paid for by women, in the vain hope of reproducing the patterns typical of the past. We mean to proceed not according to a philosophy of emancipation, but according to the facts. Even though the unemployment rate for women has been steadily climbing for years, we have no statistical significant data suggesting that today's and tomorrow's women are prepared to renounce salaried work. The lengthening of the life span and of schooling makes every woman a potential worker, while freedom of choice — which is and always has been the traditional slogan of our Group concerning the status of women — is now limited to only a few moments in a woman's life and can be exercised only with difficulty between the years of 18 and 60.

Though victims of the crisis, women are responding to it by exerting pressure on their own behalf in a manner which has no overtones of renunciation. Before the double challenge of aligning social organization with the changes which have already taken place and responding to the economic crisis, we must realize that a true answer can only be found at Community level. Without Article 119 of the EEC Treaty, the pressure brought to bear by women in the separate countries would have been insufficient, and progress towards equality, even as regards the question of free competition, would have been minimal. The problems we must face today are even more 'supranational' in character, and can only be dealt with by a supranational power. For this reason, women are one of the groups most deeply involved in and most firmly committed to the construction of Europe.

During the debate in committee, there was general agreement regarding problems relating the application of existing directives and the obstacles still to be overcome, and I do not feel it necessary to dwell on these aspects now. The principal fact to emerge from the debate was that the legal and egalitarian blueprint forming the basis of Community directives must be further developed in regard to certain fundamental questions.

We feel that the most important of these is a Community directive on maternity and post-maternity leave for women, and family leave for parents when their small children are taken ill. Such leave will undoubtedly give rise to comments on the increase in labour costs. Our society, however, pays huge costs every day in human and economic terms, costs attributable to maladjustment, emotional instability and inner conflict

and arising from the difficulty of making work compatible with family life.

The document calls attention to the proposals concerning the legal status of women in family businesses and on farms, of businesswomen and women exercising trades. We frequently assert that small and medium-sized businesses are the key to overall growth and to a technical evolution which does not result in unemployment. We must therefore develop commercial opportunities and technology, but this will not be possible unless the right of women to share equally in decision-making, profits, and responsibilities is affirmed at the same time.

We also support the Directive on tax equality, though we have presented an amendment on this subject as well, to the effect that this equality should not invalidate the principle of progressive taxation based on family income and family size. During the year's work by the committee, a comparison of the various political philosophies represented in this Parliament crystallized around two issues in particular. The first is the question of work schedules. The text finally decided upon still leaves now for improvement, but it already provides a sound working basis. A very serious problem, on which we will have to make a decision, concerns the nature of the workforce. For some, equality should be guaranteed through rigid and identical regulations, with age differences left out of account. I personally believe that flexibility is not a sin to be shunned, but rather an objective to be respected. A few moments ago Mrs Roudy denied this need for flexibility. I wish that her fellow party member Mr Delors could answer her, for he has produced an excellent text on the *Revolution du temps choisi* which can serve as a reference for Community policy on work schedules, a policy which requires different formulas for the elderly, for the young, for men and women, and for different phases of life.

We also believe that to stress the responsibilities of the family as a primary source of solidarity, as a meeting place between private and public life, as a model — we are addressing the Socialists here — of a society where each one receives according to his needs, is certainly not to set limits to equality for women.

Despite understandings reached on many points there remains a deep-seated source of disagreement which has been particularly evident in regard to the question of abortion. Our rapporteur, anxious to represent all opinions, felt obliged to include in her report the issue of the voluntary interruption of pregnancy, and other members of my Group have rightly raised the questions of conscience which are particularly involved with it. I would like to express my own reservations, based on the position of abortion in feminist strategy and in Community competence. Two centuries of industrialized society have radically changed women's relationship towards maternity. Behind the recent pro-abortion tendencies there is not only — as we women are

**Gaiotti de Biase**

well aware — a kind of individualistic egoism or a need to put an end to hypocrisy: there are also the basic contradictions present in our society. Often this reaction is not so much a rejection of maternity itself as it is the result of anxiety produced by the demanding, restrictive, and excessively burdensome concept held of maternity. We have reduced the mother-child relationship, which in the past was experienced collectively in larger families, to an isolated and separate relationship where mutual dependency can create a feeling of mutual slavery and lead to a reaction of refusal.

As women, we are well aware of all this. As women in politics, however, we have a duty to ask ourselves whether the answer to this problem is really to be found in legalized abortion. Too many political groups have seen in abortion legislation an expedient similar to that still adopted by many men, who free themselves from their obligations by urging their partners to abort. This is a justification which, as long as it stands, allows us to go on ignoring the fact that maternity is penalized in our societies to such an extent that the demographic future of our countries has become a matter for concern. The battle for the status of women is no longer to be fought on the theoretically uncontested ground of equal rights; we must advocate 'positive' maternity, developing male responsibilities and putting an end to isolation. If we do not intervene here, women may make the choice for equality in vain.

There can be no victorious feminist strategy if we do not oblige political forces and social leadership to act in this area. The Community level, which is the level of social change, is the only one where solutions too ambitious for national policies can be formulated. It is only too easy to say that changes in penal legislation are not provided for in the Treaties. The method of governing society by means of permission and prohibition is typical of the individual States. The method of guiding it by increasing and pooling stores of knowledge, by creating material conditions and ideal goals belongs instead to a supra-national community. Far from weakening our resolution, the inclusion of such positive aspects serves to strengthen it the more.

*(Applause from the centre)*

**President.** — I call Miss Hooper.

**Miss Hooper.** — Mr President, much has been said today about the problems faced by women in working life and in the family, and many solutions and suggestions have been put forward. I believe, however, that a most important function of this debate is to inform women fully of their rights, as well as to give the maximum publicity to these rights. Legislation alone is not enough. Law must follow opinion if it is to be observed and benefited from. I see no need therefore

to whip up a militant attitude or to talk fighting talk in order to improve the lot of women by introducing yet more legislation which will not be implemented.

I believe that education and social conditioning are of the utmost importance. Women must be encouraged to come forward. We must point to the fact that women are, in fact, achieving recognition in public life and in positions of authority. The first president of our own directly elected Parliament is a woman, and we certainly recognize that Madam Veil brings great distinction to this role. There are more women in this Parliament than in any other elected parliament in the world, and again in my own country we have a woman Prime Minister for the first time in history. Let us not forget that in many countries of this Community women have had the vote for far less than 50 years. So considerable progress has, in fact, been made. We must therefore concentrate on encouraging women to participate more in all areas, in trade unions as well as in executive and professional jobs.

As evidence of the way in which women are prepared to take advantage of their opportunities once they are fully aware of them, I would like to point to the work and achievements of the Equal Opportunities Commission in the United Kingdom. Mrs Roudy has already referred to the conference organized jointly by the Commission and the Equal Opportunities Commission last year, at which delegates were able to observe how in the five years' existence of this commission it has successfully dealt with complaints on inequality from both sexes and a number of test cases. As women become increasingly aware of what can be achieved, so they increasingly approach the Equal Opportunities Commission for help and support. It is this type of approach which I feel should be encouraged. However, I have no intention of sounding complacent. I believe that, although the principle of equality of opportunity is now largely recognized throughout the Community, in practice we have a policy of benign neglect. It is on this aspect of the matter that I believe we must concentrate in looking at the report and in working out the priorities.

I support therefore the general objectives of the report and the need to devise supplementary measures to implement fully the three Directives already in existence. I will not spend a great deal of time reiterating arguments that have already been made, but in addition to the comments made on the report by my colleague, Dame Shelagh Roberts, I would like to refer to two specific matters. One is the question of quotas. I don't believe that an insistence on having a certain minimum number of women in any particular job is the secret of success. Take the case of the Commission, which has already been referred to more than once. We know that the job of Commissioner was offered to a British woman and also to a German woman, both of whom refused it. Should we therefore force some women to take the jobs? What is the solution? Whatever we do, however, I believe it is not

**Hooper**

quite fair to blame men for our not having achieved success in this particular area.

The second point is the question of the continuation of the life of the *ad hoc* committee. This was discussed at considerable length by the committee, and I think it was generally agreed that to have a separate permanent committee would have the effect of creating a ghetto into which all women's affairs would be channelled; and we don't want that. I believe that women's interests should be considered in all the committees of Parliament and that members of the *ad hoc* committee could best serve these interests by fulfilling their functions seriously on their main committees. Paragraph 54 of the motion for a resolution is therefore a welcome compromise, since it discharges the present committee whilst ensuring that the whole subject of women's rights in the Community will not be forgotten by providing that the committee may be reconstituted in two years' time.

In conclusion, Mr President, I would like to say that I welcome the report and its pursuit of the goals of equal opportunity and greater choice for women. I welcome the opportunity for information and publicity afforded by this debate and I look forward to some positive results which I hope can be summed up by that useful little tag 'equal opportunity to be unequal'.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mrs Cinciari Rodano.

**Mrs Cinciari Rodano.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I think that the vast amount of work accomplished by the *ad hoc* committee, and by the chairman and the rapporteur in particular, must be fully appreciated. The Italian members of the Communist and Allies Group made an active contribution, offering ideas and proposals, and we are pleased that some of them were incorporated into the report.

It must be recognized that the task of the committee was not an easy one: we believe this is the first time in this Parliament that an attempt has been made to present a complete picture of the position of women in the Community, a position which varies from country to country and from region to region and which includes a multitude of problems.

Secondly, on many basic issues — that of employment, for example — there is no point of reference available; that is, there are no initiatives or programmes by the Commission, for in reality the Commission has no organic policy towards women at all. Even so, not all the Commissioners felt it necessary to meet the *ad hoc* committee. Mrs Roudy was very generous. Even when they did participate in the meetings of the committee, I don't think it can be said that they made an effective contribution to our work. I hope that the new Commission, which will introduce itself to this Assem-

bly tomorrow, will give more attention to problems which concern more than half of the citizens of the Community and whose solution will affect the future of Europe as a whole.

Although we appreciate the effort made by the committee, we are not, however, satisfied with the result. In our opinion, the resolution lags considerably behind the formulas developed up to now by the Women's Movement, certainly as far as our own country is concerned, but also, we believe, in other countries. To face the question of women today in the Community does not only mean to overcome delays, but above all to fight against new contradictions: those which arise from the distorted, inhuman, and unjust development of the so-called advanced nations. It is not a question, therefore, of obtaining sectoral or supplementary provisions for women. It is the mode of life and of production in society as a whole which must be changed if women are to be treated fairly, enjoying the right to work on an equal basis, without renouncing the free choice of maternity. This is necessary in order for women to be able to express themselves and to be represented at all levels and in all areas of social and political life.

The rapporteur stressed the fact that the burden of most non-salaried labour — that is, domestic work — is carried by women alone. We believe that it is not enough to call for a different and better distribution of traditional feminine and masculine tasks within the family. We must have done with identifying the family with domestic labour, with unpaid labour, with what is, in the last analysis, servile labour. It is not even a question, as Mrs Lenz has stated, of a different value judgment on unpaid labour. Servitude is servitude even when it is exalted by poetic themes of feminine self-abnegation. On the contrary, it is necessary to reduce this unpaid labour to a minimum, by means of an extended network of well-connected social services, substituting salaried work for the unpaid work done by women at home.

Secondly, in our opinion the resolution fails to indicate which, in this time of economic crisis in the European West, are the decisive problems for women, the ones which should be dealt with first. We had hoped for a resolution which would analyse the crisis in depth, paying particular attention to the problem of unemployment. It is true that the resolution calls for an employment policy for women, but in reality there are no concrete proposals and the emphasis is laid on part-time work. Some believe that part-time work is eminently suitable for women, and that it represents a means of solving the problems of the crisis. For our part, we believe that it is an emergency solution to be dropped as soon as possible, even though we agree that it should be regulated while it exists. We think that it is again necessary to turn to a systematic policy of capital investment, especially in agriculture. And because there is the belief that even a renewal of development, if it were to occur, would not bring about an

**Rodano**

increase in jobs in the productive sectors because of the introduction of new technologies, we are convinced that the way to increase job possibilities is to extend the network of public and social services directed towards satisfying the ever growing needs in health care, culture, and leisure, including those arising from women's desire to step out of their predetermined and subordinate domestic role.

Thirdly, the resolution makes no evaluation of Community policies. The Italian members of the Communist and Allies Group were anxious that mention be made in the rapporteur's first text of Community policies in general, and not only of the directives for the Social Fund. This was not done, however. It is as if women had only to make their demands and wait for others — men, the Commissioners, the Commission, the Council, whoever it may be — to satisfy them. This again is a subordinate position which I, as a woman and as a Communist, cannot accept.

We have presented some amendments relating to this question. Many of the resolution's proposals are acceptable taken one by one, but they are juxtaposed without any sense of internal order. The underlying premise is an old style vision of equality aimed at integrating women into the existing social order and not at changing the order itself. There are also many inconsistencies. For example, stress is laid on the political rights of women, but emigrant women are still refused the right to vote in administrative elections. Towards the women of the Third World the tone is paternalistic: there is no awareness of the fact that the problems of European women cannot be solved if the relationships between North and South, and between Europe and the Third World are not radically revised.

The section on contraception and abortion could be improved. Abortion, Mrs Gaiotti, is viewed within the framework of a policy on maternity. In any case, it is formulated with excessive prudence and timidity, for abortion laws should not be merely a way for society to appease its conscience. Such appeasement would be possible if legislation prevented abortion, instead of merely driving it underground. In addition, while going into such detail, even in regard to matters outside of Community competence, the report makes no reference to the problem of resources. It is clear however that as long as Community budgets are largely devoted to agricultural expenditure, like the one we have at present, and as long as these expenditures are earmarked for supporting prices and financing surpluses and no further effort is made to develop regional, industrial, and energy policies, nothing significant can be accomplished towards changing the condition of European women.

Finally, although there has been much talk about participation in political life, there are still some who believe that in a resolution on the problems of women there is no place for problems concerning disarmament

or international cooperation. In reality, this resolution represents a compromise picture of various concepts of the question of women. Though the entire committee was agreed that the present status of women was unsatisfactory, in the analysis made of the causes of this condition there is more attention paid to the subjective and individual causes than to the structural ones. As far as solutions are concerned, there are still those — as we have heard here — who believe that the real problem is how to restore women to their domestic and family role. On the contrary, from the mass of European women comes a strong objective impulse directed at the transformation of the Community. Women need a new development. It is no coincidence that they participated in great numbers in the direct elections: they wished in this way to express the hope that the European Parliament would be a force directed at solving their problems, at giving more unity to the Community, not under the banner of profit but in defence of the interests of the workers, the oppressed, and the alienated.

*(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Martin.

**Mrs Martin.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the 130 million or so women in the European Community deserved this debate on their position and their place in society.

We have a duty to react to the division of labour handed down by tradition to men and women. For us it is not a question of dyed-in-the-wool feminism: what we want to do is to put forward practical proposals for ways of reacting to the expectations of those who make up more than one-third of the working population in Europe because, particularly at this time of economic crisis and faced with the anxiety about the future which they share, although women are aware that Europe cannot be built on differences of attitude and arguments between the two sexes, they also know that our ability to meet the challenge we face depends on the opportunities they are offered of choosing their way of life, of assuming responsibilities and of becoming integrated into society. I join with my friends in the Liberal and Democratic Group in hoping that the text of the resolution before us will be tidied up a little so that the priorities are more clearly defined. Nevertheless, we endorse the gist of the document in its present form. And we hope that it will be adopted by a very large majority of this House.

Then all European women, and perhaps more specifically all those who are involved in organizations, associations and trade unions and who, it should be noted, have followed our work with a great deal of interest and attention will know that their struggle is echoed in this Parliament, and I should also like to pay tribute to the rapporteur for the way in which she has acquitted herself of what was often a difficult task.

**Martin**

At this juncture, and before I take up a number of specific points in the report, I should like to say to Mrs Hoffmann and to all the French Communist members how amazed we were by the remarks and criticisms which once again formed the basis of their statement and how much we would have liked to see them putting forward constructive proposals in the committee. But they contributed no proposals, they did not participate in the work of the *ad hoc* Committee on Women's Rights in any way, but of course they were systematic in their criticisms. Mrs Hoffmann, you have been the worthy representative of the French Communist Party I must tell you that for those of us who have in fact spent over a year producing a document of high quality, your statement was completely derisory. What we set out to do with this report was to reassert our will to strengthen the existing Directives, to ensure that equal pay, equal access to employment, vocational training and promotion and equal treatment as regards social protection become a reality.

That is why we have proposed that assistance from the Social and Regional Funds should depend on these Directives being implemented in each country. If this is done, we can hope that the age of fine words and promises is past. But we have given top priority to education and vocational training. We are convinced that, if women are to make up for the time they have lost so that they themselves are genuinely able to choose their way of life, to choose, as it says in this report, between a paid and an unpaid activity, they must first and foremost be given the opportunity of appropriate basic education and vocational training. Equality of opportunities begins at school. And that is why we have specifically proposed that age limits on access to education and to employment should be completely abolished and that half the members of the committees which should be set up to study teaching materials should be women. We also feel the need for a change of attitude everywhere, even within the family, in order to break with the traditional allocation of roles. All women realize that because they bear almost all the family responsibilities, these responsibilities represent one of the most decisive obstacles to their progress in working life. We therefore felt it necessary to put forward proposals for a better allocation of working hours, proposals aimed at ensuring that where women opt for part-time work, they are not handicapped, and proposals aimed at ensuring the family is a joint responsibility. That is the purpose of the introduction of educational holidays for parents.

We also placed a great deal of emphasis on the need for account to be taken of a category of women that has so far been overlooked: those who work in shops, craft trades and agriculture, in family firms, the important contribution they make to the economic and social development of the Community remaining unrecognized. This deficiency must be made good. A European statute must be drawn up to ensure their recognition as separate individuals legally, financially and socially. Similarly, we are very much in favour of

the introduction of Community aid, particularly in agriculture, to the services which find replacements for these women. Only if they can be freed from their daily work, will we enable these women to gain access to education and to participate and assume responsibilities in social life.

I now come to the proposal we have made that the *ad hoc* committee should be transformed into a full committee pursuant to Rule 37 of the Rules of Procedure. After a debate like this, after a report like this, which does no more than lay the foundations and is no more than the start of the real work to be done, it is inconceivable that a halt should be called for two years before stock is again taken, as paragraph 54 of the resolution proposes. If we adopted that course, we would be running the risk, it seems to me, of arriving at the same conclusions. It is inconceivable that suddenly, because it has been so decided, by a wave of the magic wand, things are going to develop by themselves. Nor is it right to say that a standing committee would become cut off and the other committees would refer to it all matters to do with women. That was what some people feared in my country when the post of State Secretary and of Minister for Women's Affairs was set up. But experience has shown that exactly the opposite is the case. If we have a standing committee in this Parliament, the other committees will find problems to do with women being referred to them, because the standing committee will be delivering, whether it is requested to do so or not, opinions on the implications for women of the proposals submitted. Whether they like it or not, these opinions should be considered by the other committees and incorporated in their reports. The Standing Committee on Women's Rights will thus make it possible for the subject to be discussed in the other committees. Any other method, for example working parties or supervisory groups without the same rights, would perhaps result in isolation. Furthermore, any solution not involving the setting up of a standing committee would result in Members who want to take part in this work finding their normal workload increased by additional tasks, the danger being that they could not then do their work properly. If it is to function properly, it is also essential for the committee to have a permanent secretariat capable of organizing its meetings at regular intervals, which is impossible if there is no standing committee. For all these reasons, but also because all women in Europe, whether or not they are committed to the cause, have placed a great deal of hope in us and in our work, and because they would not understand it if we left it at that, I call on all those who have already put forward proposals along the same lines to stick to their guns and to join us so that we have a majority in this Assembly committed to fulfilling the expectations of European women.

**President.** — I call Mr Lalor.

**Mr Lalor.** — Mr President, entering the debate at this stage, I feel very much like one of the fools that

**Lalor**

rush in where angels fear to tread. I want to assure you, however, Mr President, that in this instance I am, I hope, on the side of the angels.

I wish to compliment the rapporteur on her very comprehensive report. It is extremely obvious that she put a tremendous amount of effort and time into both her report and her resolution. I have no difficulty whatsoever in supporting the paragraphs of the motion referring to equal pay, equal treatment, equal opportunity for women. I also feel that her observations and recommendations regarding education and training of both young and more advanced women are very much to be supported. I should say, however, Mr President, that I am unhappy with many aspects of the section on health care. I was extremely conscious of the observations made by Mrs Macciocchi when she attacked my colleague Mr Vié in relation to his, if you like, male protectionism; and I want to say that speaking here on this particular subject, I do not like to feel that a finger may be pointed at me as speaking from an anti-feminist viewpoint. But it strikes me, looking at one of the paragraphs under 'Health care', where one of the recommendations is that the Commission be requested to 'initiate an inter-disciplinary research programme . . . with particular reference to natural methods', that that, I am sure, is intended to affect both the male and female equally, unless there is some inference that one side more than the other derives particular pleasure from it.

My colleague Miss De Valera is far better qualified than I to express the Irish women's view, and she will be doing this on behalf of our Group, but I would at this stage like to join with the only other male (apart from Mr Bournias) who spoke, and that was the Commissioner Mr Richard, in expressing a belated tribute to Dr Hillery, who during his time as Social Commissioner here launched the policy which has opened the door for the volume of progress that has been made up to now towards equality of opportunity. I am glad to note that the rapporteur does give credit for the progress that has been made up to now.

I want to say, however, that not all married women want to go out to work, as Dame Shelagh Roberts explained earlier on. I was rather surprised to note that in such an extremely comprehensive document, comprising 55 paragraphs, the *ad hoc* committee advocates no plan, nor makes any recommendation whatsoever, for any remuneration, wage, payment or compensation, to be provided for the housewife who stays at home and creates and looks after a family. We seem to spend more time taking steps and making recommendations to avoid the creation of the family, but as I see it there is not sufficient attention given to making provision for the home-loving housewife who, having created a family, should be encouraged to stay at home and look after it.

Irish society, in particular, has in the past put an extremely high value on the presence of the mother in

the home and this is still the case. However, I fully accept that we are going through a time of change and young wives themselves, on the one hand, and economic circumstances on the other, are bringing about a major change in this regard. As an Irishman I want to state clearly that I am opposed to the recommendations on health care.

I am worried also about paragraph 35, where the rapporteur says that there may be a tendency for abortion to be treated as a normal practice. I think that the whole bias of the health-care report is to treat and encourage others to treat abortion as a normal practice and this is why I am opposed to it. I am opposed, in addition, to a resolution asking the Commission to press the Council to provide abortion facilities at national level in each of our States.

I think it is unfortunate that Mrs Maij-Weggen's report is too comprehensive, excepting the fact, as I said earlier, that no reference is made to the mother wanting to stay at home and work in the house nor to any provision to encourage her to do so. I think that the health-care section needs to be separated from the rest. I would appeal to the rapporteur to leave it out of the resolution at this stage.

With some minor amendments, I can go along with all of the requirements elsewhere in the report. I have to point out here that I have moral objections to too many aspects of Chapter 4 on health care, and unfortunately, therefore, cannot support the overall resolution.

**President.** — I call Mrs Maij-Weggen on a point of order.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen.** — (NL) Mr Lalor has just said that paragraph 35 more or less means that we would like to encourage abortion. I feel Mr Lalor should read the text again very carefully, because what it says is exactly the opposite. I would recommend Mr Lalor to read these three paragraphs very carefully and not to express an opinion before he understands precisely what they mean.

**President.** — I call Mrs Dekker.

**Mrs Dekker.** — (NL) Ladies and gentlemen, approximately 355 years before Christ Plato recorded in his *Politeia*, or *The Republic*, a discussion with Socrates on the task and place of women in the State. One of the things Socrates said was 'all things in common'. Women should do the same work as men and should therefore be brought up and educated in the same way. The conclusion of this astute discussion was that nature has bestowed its gifts equally on both men and women and also that no one task has been specifically set aside in the State for women as women or for men

## Dekker

as men. Women should even be involved in military service. That was over 2 000 years ago, as I have said. To complete the picture, I must point out that at the end of this dialogue it is said, although no discussion was necessary on this point, that women must be subordinate to men in everything. A question of the onus of proof. Translated into today's language, men never need to prove that they are the equals of women. I do not intend to begin talking about the reverse.

The fundamental object of this debate, although the report does not say so in so many words, must in my view be emancipation, which I would describe as a personal and social process of change and growth, an essential process in which the authorities, including the EEC, have a stimulating and creative role to play. What is needed is the emancipation of human beings, in other words of men and women alike. But women have fallen so far behind socially that high priority must be given to measures aimed at eliminating the backlog. What I miss in this report is any mention of the emancipation of men. After all, their position has a considerable effect on the position of women, and we can therefore hardly disregard it. A future report should therefore look more closely at the part played by men.

From the enormous number of conclusions and recommendations included in the motion for a resolution it is clear that the continuing allocation of set roles to men and women entails disadvantages for women as regards their development, training, incomes, knowledge, power and leisure time. We need only look around us: a woman President cannot make up for the fact that all the Group chairmen and all but one of the Group vice-chairmen and the members of the College of Quaestors are men. I have not yet come across either a women driver or a male typist in Parliament. In 1981 it has again proved impossible to appoint a woman as Commissioner. Despite the equality which, according to the last Greek speaker, exists in Greece, the 24 new Members from the country do not include one woman. This is not, of course, just mere coincidence. I therefore think it a good thing that the motion for a resolution starts at home and calls for an improvement in the position of women within our own institutions.

A great deal of work has been put into this report, primarily by the rapporteur. Its preparation has been a useful exercise. Nevertheless, I should like to make a few comments on the outcome, although I must start by saying that some of my criticisms are due to the fact that all the amendments, several hundred in number, had to be processed at a late stage, with the result that it is only now possible to appreciate the final product. This was principally due to a shortage of time.

As regards the presentation, a clear distinction is not made between short- and long-term solutions, general and detailed requirements are jumbled together and no clear priorities are set. For example, no more than a

few sentences are devoted to the whole question of shorter working hours. This is, in my view, out of all proportion to the five pages of recommendations concerning education and health care. However important these matters may be, the EEC plays a far more limited role in these fields. In addition, the call for shorter working hours is discussed under the heading of part-time work, which is wrong. These are two completely different matters and in some respects they are even diametrically opposed. Shorter working hours each day are essential if there is to be a better division of paid work between men and women.

There must also be a redistribution of leisure time. Research by the World Watch Institute, for example, reveals that increasing employment of women outside the home has not resulted in any noteworthy reduction of the workload within the home, meaning that the woman's working week is on average some 15 to 20 hours longer than that of her husband. Women who go out to work remain housewives whether they are ministers or shoemakers, except that the higher her pay, the sooner a woman can afford help with the housework, which again is often done by women. Encouraging part-time work is, in the short term, the most obvious solution, but it must be ensured that unbalanced measures designed to promote a fair distribution do not result in fresh injustices. At present more than 90 % of women are engaged in part-time work. At this time of economic recession there is undoubtedly a great deal of involuntary part-time unemployment. The report itself indicates the disadvantages of part-time work today. An increase in part-time work must principally be achieved through men.

Mrs Spaak and I have drawn up a working document for the *ad hoc* committee on the new technological advances and the adverse effects they may have on the position of women. The Commission has recently submitted practical proposals for Community activities and programmes in this area. Its findings show that, although these advances may entail disadvantages for women, no policy has as yet been established. I therefore proposed an addition to the motion for a resolution, which was, I am glad to say, adopted by the *ad hoc* committee, calling on the Commission to indicate any adverse consequences for women and to state how these consequences can be offset. It is essential that the advantages resulting from the introduction of new technologies — and there are advantages — also benefit women. Retraining is the key here.

Mr President, on the whole I can endorse the resolution. Of course, compromises are needed here and there. I will mention some of the omissions. Firstly, there is temporary preferential treatment for women. This was mentioned in an earlier version of the resolution, albeit in a somewhat different form from the amendment I have now tabled, in that it called for measures to eliminate the unequal distribution between men and women of involvement in policy-

**Dekker**

and decision-making, plus the temporary application of preferential treatment for women, especially in sectors and at levels where they are clearly under represented. The Directive on equal treatment leaves the way open for preferential treatment. This must be a temporary measure, remaining in force until equal social participation is achieved. A more radical step would be to introduce quotas. This would undoubtedly be an extreme measure, but unfortunately perhaps the only way of achieving what will otherwise take too long. I am aware that this is still a controversial point, and we have not gone to this extreme, but I do see the need for an investigation into the possibilities of adopting quotas. In some Member States action along these lines has already been taken. The French Government, for example, has proposed a quota system for the 1983 local elections.

Another point that is now missing from the motion for a resolution is a call for an addition to the existing directives to cover pensions. I also feel the section covering equal treatment where tax legislation is concerned should include a reference to the basis we should adopt in this respect, namely individual and equal treatment in overall incomes policy. I have also tabled an amendment that calls for better social facilities such as flexible business hours in industry, institutions and shops and for the standardization of school hours and the introduction of continuous school time-tables. The recognition of the economic value of the work done by women in the home and of the voluntary unpaid work they perform is also worthy of attention.

The motion for a resolution also includes my proposal that, where it is claimed that the EEC Directives have not been adequately implemented, there should be a reversal of the onus of proof. Let me explain this. It must be possible to enforce rights if they are to be effective. The Directives provide for the possibility of an appeal. The point of my amendment was that, where an employee complains to the courts of discrimination on the grounds of sex, the employer must prove that there has been no discrimination or that his actions were justified by objective factors having nothing to do with the difference between the sexes.

Belgium's and Germany's Acts implementing the directive on equal treatment already provide for this. When checking the implementation of the Directives, the Commission must also consider the way in which employment opportunities are arranged at national level.

In the Netherlands, for example, the situation is still very unclear. Some Member States already have, or are preparing, general legislation designed to prevent sex discrimination. I do not see any insurmountable obstacles to an appropriate Community Directive. This will enable us to close present gaps in the legislation and also to coordinate existing and often unclear arrangements. I feel that a lack of political will in this

respect is on balance tantamount to saying that the present inequalities should be retained.

To conclude, Mr President, the Commission and Council and also Parliament itself will be principally responsible for following up this motion for a resolution. The report refers to the proposal for a European committee on emancipation. The motion for a resolution discusses this extremely briefly and refers only to the composition of such a committee. Not only do I not welcome the proposed wording of the text, because I feel the emphasis must be placed on expertise, but an opportunity has certainly been missed in that no proposals of any kind are made regarding the committee's mandate and terms of reference.

My proposal in this respect was not supported by a majority of the *ad hoc* committee, the reason being that the *ad hoc* committee had scarcely discussed the subject. Since an emancipation committee of this kind might be a very important instrument in the implementation of the demands and proposals for equality, I find it a great pity that we did not discuss this subject in the *ad hoc* committee.

The discussions on the follow-up to the *ad hoc* committee's activities has not yet been completed. I do not support the idea of continuation in this form. It is more important for all our parliamentary committees to take account of the effects of emancipation. I am therefore more in favour of each committee having an emancipation coordinator, through whom we consult together at set intervals. On balance this would not entail more work than having a separate committee. I am certainly in favour of a follow-up debate being held in a year or two, and there will undoubtedly be a need for other such debates in the future. Our work up to and including this debate is simply a dress rehearsal: the important thing now is that our work should give rise to tangible results.

**President.** — I call Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul.

**Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul.** — (*D*) Ladies and gentlemen, if the debate we are now having is to have any effect at all, the Members of this House must, I feel, ask themselves what we ourselves can do to change the position of women. I should therefore like to see each one of us thinking about the self-critical question: Is it not still true to say that the careers of male politicians are built on the tacit sacrifices of their wives? Is that not the situation we find in politics almost everywhere? And is not the at least threefold burden on women who go into politics the reason why women are under-represented in politics and in all sectors of the economy?

We must therefore start at home and not simply make demands of others. Starting at home also means taking a look at the pyramid of posts of the European Parliament's own officials. I can give you the following

**Wieczorek-Zeul**

figures: in groups A1, A2 and A3 there are 65 men and no women. That is a scandal for this Parliament and it should also lead to a commitment . . .

*(Applause from the left)*

. . . to see that changes are made. That must be one part of the follow-up to this report. At the Commission the situation is, of course, no different. The scandal of this new all-male Commission has been mentioned often enough. Mrs Roberts, I listened to you very attentively, but I must say one thing: when we see this situation, I would say that women have hitherto gone in not for too much overstatement but in fact for massive understatement, and we must really do something to change this. What else has to be done to change the situation in practice? Just consider how this vicious circle of discrimination, sexism, in other words discrimination against the female sex, is also perpetuated in the Commission. Appointments to the most senior posts, A1, A2 and A3, are made only by men, and it is, of course, logical that they should be correspondingly represented among the staff of the Commission. To be sure, we must make demands of others, but we must begin at home. That seems to me to be one of the conclusions to be drawn from today's debate.

The *ad hoc* Committee on Women's Rights also faced the task of combining the problems encountered by women in such a way that our Member States and the Commission itself would be forced to refrain from considering them individually, on a sectoral basis, but at long last to implement an appropriate, integrated policy to the benefit of women. The majority of women in this country and in the European Community — and they form a genuine majority of 130 million — can no longer be fobbed off with additional social gifts by this Commission and under this policy as they have been in the past. Here again, this debate must result in action being taken.

I am really rather surprised that greater emphasis has not so far been placed during the debate in this House on the question of unemployment among women, because I believe this is a central issue. We are a European Economic Community, a body which has the powers, and I will again quote the figures so that this is absolutely clear: women account for 36.8 % of the labour force in the European Community, but while the unemployment rate among men rose from 2.9 to 5.5 % between 1974 and 1980, the corresponding figure for unemployed women, proceeding from the same initial figure, is 7.5 %. In other words, women are disproportionately hard hit by unemployment.

Mrs Maij-Weggen rightly says in her report that there are a number of reasons for this, and she gives them in the report. I feel we should stress once again that we have a general reduction in the total volume of work. Look at the figures: by 1985 a further 6 million people in the Community will be looking for a job, while the

total number of jobs is decreasing because, of course, our governments are confining themselves primarily to monetary policies. The logical conclusion to be drawn from this is that the weakest are being pushed out of the labour market and, of course, that the attempt is being made to get rid of women first.

This social backward movement is accompanied — and this is a criticism I level at a number of male Members — by a transfiguration of the new role of the mother and housewife. I say this to some of those who have spoken here: the same interest groups which in my country, the Federal Republic, for example, fetched and enticed women into industry in the 60s as a willing and cheap labour force now contend that a better place for women is at home with their families. Economic interests are at the back of this. It is not a question of suddenly wanting to enable women to achieve this new self-realization and self-image.

We should make this very clear, Mrs Roberts, even in this House, because we are, of course, having a debate amongst ourselves. No one wants to force women to work, but they should be able to decide for themselves whether they want to work, and the same should apply to men. There should no longer be prescribed roles, forcing men in one direction and women in another. That is what this report set out to achieve.

A second point that is rightly referred to in the report is that one of the reasons for the disproportionately high rate of unemployment among women is that increasing rationalization is taking place in occupations and activities which have hitherto been principally the reserve of women. In my own country 55 % of all women are concentrated in 10 types of work very much threatened by rationalization. The relevant figures are known. What we are also experiencing is a movement of capital, which should be looked at very closely. Women in the industrialized countries are being increasingly forced to compete with the cheaper labour potential of the developing countries, the countries of the Third World, a process which is solely the result of the individual company concentrating on profits and profitability and which is moving certain industrial sectors out of our countries, even though this does not lead to really independent industries, independent development in the developing countries, because their labour force faces a similar situation. I therefore believe — and this is a conclusion to be drawn from this report — that, like the workers of the Third World countries, women must have an interest in the process of world-wide restructuring, the new international division of labour not being left to market forces. If you leave this to market forces, you can do away with women's right to work in the future. Then you will have even higher unemployment figures. One demand is therefore that the European Community should and must at last develop a forward-looking structural policy for the most important sectors of industry. It must submit a structural report which enables the establishment of a genuine economic and industrial policy.

**Wieczorek-Zeul**

Another point I wish to mention is that there are a number of initiatives aimed at bringing the process of rationalization under control. As jobs are frequently lost as a result of rationalization, I should like to take up a proposal put forward in this context by a Minister in the Federal Republic. He proposed that a company's contributions to the employees' social insurance fund should in future be related not to the total wages and salaries paid by the company but to its total net product. Where machines eliminate jobs, social insurance contributions should take account of them. That is one of the conclusions to be drawn from an assessment of this kind.

As the volume of available work is on the whole decreasing and as this principally affects women in the sectors in which they have been traditionally employed in the past, we must call for special programmes to help women and for legislation, such as that in Sweden and Austria, aimed, for example, at involving more girls in training, either by means of fixed quotas or by setting certain objectives. We would like to see more emphasis placed on this in Mrs Maij-Weggen's report.

I welcome the fact that this is the first report to say on behalf of the European Parliament that we advocate a general reduction of working hours and a redistribution of labour. After all, ladies and gentlemen, if there is a general decrease in the work available, this is the only way in which we can unite to create work for everyone, including women. I therefore welcome the fact that this has been included in a report for the first time. For my Group this is one of the main pillars of this report, and if it fell, it would affect the balance of the whole report. I should like to make that very clear.

The final point I should like to raise has so far been largely overlooked in the debate. This concerns the position of foreign women working and living in the European Community. They have to work in the worst of conditions. They are among the worst paid. They do the most unpleasant and most monotonous work. Many Member States stipulate a waiting period for women joining their foreign-worker husbands before they are granted a work permit, a period in which they have no legal status of their own since their status derives solely from their husband's residence permit. During this period they are exploited by firms which employ them illegally. As a specific marginal group, they suffer enormous problems over integration. These women, who are the worst off of all women in the European Community and are a result of the European Community, deserve our special solidarity because they have no lobby to represent them. I am therefore particularly pleased that Mrs Maij-Weggen's report calls for a social statute stipulating the rights of these foreign women workers and employees and that we are calling on the European Community to take appropriate action.

To conclude, I should like to say that this report must be followed by action, and I say this to the very few

representatives of the Commission present. Parliament will be discussing this matter again in committee in two years' time. We will check to see what has happened, because there may be reports, there may be printed papers, but we owe it to the women of the European Community, more of whom went to the polls to elect this European Parliament, not only to produce written documents, but also to ensure that they have practical consequences.

*(Applause from the left)*

**President.** — I call Mr Michel.

**Mr Michel.** — *(F)* Mr President, I feel that it would be a good thing for this chorus of female voices to be joined by a few male voices. I find that, while there have been thirteen speakers, I am only the fourth man to take the floor.

To begin, I should like to thank very sincerely the chairman of the *ad hoc* committee, Mrs Yvette Roudy, for the energy and tenacity with which she has directed the work of this committee. The problems raised were extremely numerous and, for some people, extremely controversial. They formed the subject of often delicate and sometimes passionate exchanges. On many basic aspects there was something like a meeting of the minds; on others views continue to differ, and this is inevitable in a pluralist society, and we must remember this and accept each other's views if there is to be mutual respect.

Then, I should like to thank our general rapporteur, Mrs Maij-Weggen, for the report she has laboriously drawn up with great attention to detail and for this resolution, which is unfortunately very long, but which has been submitted to us for consideration with no claim to perfection. I have four remarks to make.

My first remark is addressed to the men here. When we speak of women — not only of their status, but also of their role in the society — it is important to realize that this role is of decisive importance. As I have often said, and I will say it again here, man is formed three times in his life: once by his mother, once by his wife and once by his children. Consequently, the role played by women is of decisive importance even in a developing society. This must be appreciated, since even in the younger generation, if there are changes, I believe that at this level what is basic nevertheless remains unchanged. Women retain their essential role in the formation of men.

The second remark I should like to make is that, although changes are taking place, women, who have for too long been considered 'lesser' beings in our societies, are progressively taking their rightful place, even if they have not yet entirely achieved their goal. We must recognize this. The education of girls on the

**Michel**

one hand and the integration of women into working, social, economic, cultural and political life on the other entail changes which have by no means been brought to a successful conclusion. All this must progressively become a fact of human life. Women's rights must be recognized with dignity at the level of the individual, of the general public, of the institutions and of the structures. This is far more easily said than done unless it is preceded by a significant change of attitude among men.

The third remark I wish to make concerns the role of the married couple and that of the family. What is today known as the nuclear family, in other words the married couple and the children they have — there being in our countries very few families encompassing more than one generation — still has a basic mission to accomplish. Present-day society is not therefore one in which human beings are juxtaposed, men on the one hand, women on the other, and the children as well. What we have are homes, which are places of affection, of love, where children are born, where they must be able to develop, to mature, to find a niche in which their development is guided and conditioned, a place in which each member of the family shares.

The fourth remark I have to make is that in contemporary society, at national and Community level, it is not therefore a question of replacing this niche in which children develop, but of helping the family to recognize and assume its responsibilities and of supporting the family and assisting it in the tasks it has to perform. Every member of the family, the married couple, parents, children, must be helped to feel their house is a home, the place where they really belong.

Following on from this, I should like to make very briefly five proposals for action. The first is that, if what we have just said is to be achieved, not only must the task of the parents, the respective roles they have to play, be recognized: they must also be provided with the means to play their role. This raises the problem of family incomes, family resources, not only for employees, but also for craftsmen, farmers and all the self-employed. The development of social policy must take account of the family aspect and therefore of the part played by family allowances and social allowances.

My second proposal for action: in this society and in particular in its economic and social organization we face the danger, as a post-industrial society, of finding that, in the final analysis, the social facilities which should be installed are, overall, too costly and that the human being is too expensive to be kept alive, to be born, to be educated, to manage his own affairs. But if children are to be educated, the means must be provided, and for that it is necessary to develop the policy that is required from the point of view not only of resources but also of adequate socio-cultural facilities. In other words, crèches, nurseries, kindergartens, schools and so on.

My third proposal for action is linked to Article 3 and Article 117 of the Treaty, the latter stressing 'the need to promote improved working conditions and an improved standard of living for workers, so as to make possible their harmonization while the improvement is being maintained'. This means that all the proposals formulated in paragraphs 1 to 12 of the resolution should be not only retained but also referred to the appropriate committees so that adequate action can be taken by them. As regards pay, equal treatment and social benefits, this would also comply with what the International Labour Organization has called for. Furthermore, it is right to call for Social Fund intervention to finance vocational training for women, particularly those who are going back to work after completing their tasks as mothers for a period that has kept them away from such work — generally between the ages of 25 and 35.

My fourth proposal for action is more specifically concerned with paragraphs 13, 14 and 15 of the resolution, which refer to the redistribution of work and the reduction of working hours. I emphasize this merely to say that part-time work must be provided not only for women but also for a whole range of young people, adults, elderly people and men, who, for all kinds of reasons, must also be able to enjoy the benefits of shorter working hours. But let us not have fresh segregation by reserving part-time work solely for women. Then, paragraphs 19, 20 and 21 of the resolution, which concern maternity leave, social facilities and the possibility of resuming work after completing family tasks, are also deserving of our attention and in particular of the attention of the Commission and the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, which is more directly concerned with this area.

As regards immigrant women and women in developing countries, not only do I endorse what the resolution says, but I also feel that all the proposals must be reconsidered with those directly concerned, because it would obviously be pretentious and out of place for us to want to settle the problems that affect them without inviting them to the dialogue.

I conclude, Mr President, with a fifth proposal for action. This is a very delicate problem: the fight against the increasing number of abortions. This subject is covered by paragraphs 35 and 36 of the resolution in a quite delicate way, although certain translations have the paragraphs saying exactly the opposite of what was meant. What we must know and want as responsible members of society is the truth about abortion. There is no victory for anyone, not for the woman, not for the man and even less for the child that remains unborn. Abortion represents a failure for our society — at individual, family and institutional level. We must therefore do our utmost to prevent the sometimes tragic situations which lead to abortion. They are tragic from a material, social, moral and psychological point of view. There is therefore a need

**Michel**

for legislation, particularly at national level, to create an environment which protects and adequately assists all women, whatever their social position, who experience these tragic situations, because as a general rule they can come to terms with the situation with dignity if they are helped, and the action which must be taken will enable them to respect life. That must be our concern now and in the future.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Johnson.

**Mr Johnson.** — Mr President, as the last speaker has reminded us, the battle for women's rights must be fought above all in the minds of men. The position of women will never be improved until the way men think about women is radically altered. Now, Mr President, the European Parliament is not a confessional. It is not a place for baking the soul or indeed any other parts of the anatomy, but I have to tell you that the months I have spent as a member of the *ad hoc* committee on Women's Rights under the chairmanship of Mrs Roudy have been an educative process. I have learned a lot and I do believe that this kind of topic is properly of concern to the European Parliament. If we can raise the level of public awareness by reports and debates such as this, I think we will have done a great deal of good.

Women today are under intolerable strain. The more we realize this the more we are likely to seek solutions. Women are asked to be wives and mothers. They have to look after husbands and families. At the same time there are almost irresistible social and economic pressures on them to have jobs. I think the evolution in the role of women is probably the most important social development of this century, and it is right that the European Community should use all the instruments at its disposal to further this process.

The Maij-Weggen Report outlines the most important steps that need to be taken. It is an imaginative document. Some people think it is too imaginative, but that is not my view. It is absolutely crucial that legislation on equal pay and equal treatment be implemented. I warmly support also those sections of the report which deal with better work-sharing between men and women. Why, for example, can we not organize our social and economic lives so that men can actually be more active in bringing up children? Speaking personally as the father of four children, some of them grown up, I would have welcomed provision for parental leave for fathers, as proposed. More seriously, I do realize in retrospect that I could have done much more than I did.

There are apparently some controversial elements in this report, for example, those relating to contraception and abortion. Frankly I find those sections quite

acceptable. Indeed the report would be diminished without them. If the evolution in the position of women has been one of the most significant historical facts of this century, women's ability to control their own fertility has been crucial in this process. I have always believed that knowledge and information about family planning services should be widespread at all levels of the population and that those services themselves should be readily available. And let us be clear that that is not the case at the moment in several Community countries. By the same token I think we must recognize the intolerable damage — mental and physical — that can be produced by illegal back-street abortions where contraception fails. Any pressure which can be brought to bear through Community instruments on those Member States where abortion legislation is still unsatisfactory is, to my mind, wholly justified.

I have never taken the view that the EEC is narrowly concerned with economic policies. It is a dynamic construction. We are trying to build a Europe of citizens — men and women — and we have to be concerned with living and working conditions in the broadest possible sense.

By the same token we cannot focus exclusively on the position of women within the Community. It is not neo-racism or neo-imperialism to suggest that Community aid be also examined, amongst other things, from the point of view of whether or not it helps to improve the position of women in recipient countries. In all the sessions of Mrs Roudy's committee, I attended no single fact struck me more forcefully than the report given in evidence to us that Community money — EEC money, Lomé money — was being used to finance a hospital in Mogadishu where female circumcision was still carried out.

Now, of course, this is a wide-ranging document — it is a wide-ranging subject. We are dealing with half the population of Europe. The present economic situation does not provide us with an excuse for soft-peddling any of the measures proposed in this report on the grounds that the economy as a whole, or individual firms, will not be able to afford them. On the contrary, the present economic crisis is pushing us now into a radical rethinking of the type of economic and social structures we need. It is pushing us towards a revolution, aided by technology, in our working conditions and working attitudes, and I do believe that if we can actually incorporate into that new thinking a proper awareness of the role and potential contribution of women at all levels, we shall produce not just a healthier society but a healthier economy as well.

**President.** — In view of the time we must interrupt the debate.

4. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

I remind the House that President Anwar al Sadat will address the Members of the European Parliament at 3.30 p.m.<sup>1</sup>

We shall therefore resume our business at 4.30 p.m.

The sitting is suspended.

*(The sitting was suspended at 1 p.m. and resumed at 4.30 p.m.)*

IN THE CHAIR: MR GONELLA

*Vice-President*

**President.** — The sitting is resumed. I call Mr Boyes on a point of order.

**Mr Boyes.** — Mr President, I wish you as President of this Parliament to protest on behalf of some Members of this Parliament at the way they were treated this afternoon by what I can only call thugs in the Luxembourg security.

This afternoon a number of colleagues of mine were trying to get to this Parliament across the bridge from the Holiday Inn which at one stage was blocked by security forces. We produced passes to show that we were Members of the Parliament and also represented very strongly that Sadat was in fact coming to talk to Members of the Parliament and there was no logic to a situation where security forces prevented Members of Parliament from getting to this Chamber. If we had not been carrying our passes with photographs and description then one could understand security forces not taking any risks.

However, the security forces, I think, exceeded their brief with what I can only call violence. One of the people rushed at us with a rifle and in fact hit one of the female Members of this Parliament in the ribs with the butt of a rifle. I believe that that behaviour is not warranted, is not justified and is despicable.

*(Cries of Hear, Hear!)*

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

And I have said today that I shall have to think very seriously about whether I shall ever come to Luxembourg again for a meeting after being treated in such a way. I understand when someone like Sadat is visiting this Parliament that there has to be a certain amount of security, but that does not excuse thuggery and behaviour such as I and my colleagues had to experience today, and I want to protest to you, Mr President, about that behaviour. I hope that the President of this Parliament will protest to the security forces at the way they acted.

*(Applause from certain quarters)*

**President.** — Mr Boyes, I sympathize fully with your protest and I can only deplore the incident.

As you request at the end of your statement, I shall certainly inform the President so that the necessary steps can be taken to ensure that such incidents do not occur again.

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* Mr President, I too should like to protest against the tough and violent attitude adopted by the security services, whoever they may be, towards Members of Parliament. Mr President, I protest in particularly strong terms because we parliamentarians have been called on to listen to President Sadat without being consulted beforehand. We knew nothing about this. Everything was decided without any respect for parliamentary rules. We were faced with a *fait accompli*. Mr President, having heard President Sadat's excellent statement, I find it easier to say again that, just as we are not allowed here to summon taxi dancers, male or female, we cannot allow ourselves to be summoned like taxi parliamentarians. Not only have we been summoned without being consulted, without even being informed, but some of us have also been beaten up by those who have no understanding of the seriousness of parliamentary ritual and what it entails. The police, whether they be in Strasbourg, Brussels or Luxembourg, must ensure that parliamentarians are able to do their duty with dignity. And if that is not yet accepted, Mr President, either the Presidency should change its way of doing things or Parliament should change its Presidency.

*(Mixed reactions)*

**President.** — Mr Pannella I have already stated that the chair deplores incidents of this sort and that I shall personally refer the matter so that the necessary steps can be taken.

I call Mr Lomas.

**Mr Lomas.** — With respect, Mr President, since I was one of the three Members who were assaulted by

**Lomas**

the police in a most unnecessary manner on this bridge, I would like a further assurance not just that you will see, through Madam Veil, that this does not happen again, but that in fact a very full investigation will be made not only into the manner in which the police acted and who gave them the instructions to act to prevent Members from carrying out their duties, but also into the brutal way in which they did it. It was only when Mr Tindemans also arrived on the bridge that for some reason we were then allowed through. I think it is quite deplorable and something must be done and a full investigation made.

*(Applause from certain quarters)*

**President.** — I can give an assurance that the Bureau will institute an investigation with a view to taking whatever steps are necessary.

I call Mrs Ewing on a point of order.

**Mrs Ewing.** — Was the MEP who conducted the mini-demonstration in order in this House or was he out of order? If he was in order, then this House could be reduced to chaos because we could all wave our slogans and our flags, during anybody's speech.

*(Applause)*

If, Mr President, on the other hand, he was out of order, what consequences follow now? I have only got experience of eight years in one Parliament — Westminster — and five years in this Parliament, but I have always understood that when people were out of order in a serious way, consequences followed: in Westminster the minor one was naming the Member; the other ones were suspension of the Member for varying periods of time and even, I believe, incarceration in the Tower of London was there as a possibility!

*(Applause)*

I believe my question is a serious one and must be faced up to by this forum in the interests of all the Members.

**President.** — Mrs Ewing, you have raised the question whether certain deplorable actions, such as those which took place, are contrary to the Rules of Procedure.

I would point out that, in the case of President Sadat's address, Parliament had assembled simply for a ceremony which preceded this sitting which in fact formally opened at 4.30 p.m. The case is unprecedented and therefore not covered by the Rules of Procedure.

In any event, even outside of regular sittings, the President must ensure that demonstrations which everyone deplores do not take place.

I call Mr Galland.

**Mr Galland.** — *(F)* Although we are all convinced that there is no need for a change of President, I can say one thing to Mr Pannella, and that is that we are now convinced that words should be said in the right places in certain countries to get them to change their elected representatives. I have the agenda here. It refers to a formal sitting, and that complies with the Rules of Procedure. I am sorry, but it should not say 'formal sitting' if that does not comply with the Rules of Procedure.

Rule 10(4) states that the President may move that Parliament pass a vote of censure which shall automatically involve immediate exclusion from the Chamber and suspension from two to five days. I find Mr Capanna's attitude unspeakable and degrading to this House, and I hope that the Presidency will take advantage of Rule 10(4) to exclude him for four days starting today.

*(Sustained applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Langes.

**Mr Langes.** — *(D)* I am also referring to the Rules of Procedure, Mr Capanna. Perhaps you could sit down for a moment. We all know you are so important that you may always speak to the Rules of Procedure here. I am addressing the House for the first time in my life. I should like to tell the honourable Members that I in no way feel that the security forces restrict my freedom. I would ask Members not to play up this affair and whine about it so much. As we all know, President Sadat's life is undoubtedly among the most threatened in this world, because he has enough enemies on all sides whose sole object is to murder him. We should not attach such importance to this incident.

*(Applause)*

The President can, of course, bring the incident to the attention of the Luxembourg security services, who have certainly not had an easy job to do. But, ladies and gentlemen, I really must appeal to you not to spoil this important hour here in Parliament with subsequent petty reactions. I share the view that Mr Capanna did not contribute to our honour and dignity. To Mr Galland I would say this: as you know, in the age of absolutism court jesters were kept to speak words of wisdom. We do not have any absolute rulers any more, but democracy. Perhaps we should employ a court jester to speak words of stupidity. I would therefore refrain from taking any special disciplinary action against him.

*(Applause and laughter)*

**President.** — I call Mr Kellett-Bowman.

**Mr Kellett-Bowman.** — Mr President, on a point of order: when I got here yesterday I was given a circular from the Quaestors saying that due to a visit by the President of Egypt there would be some small inconvenience to Members, so I was not unduly surprised this afternoon to find that police were blocking off the little bridge by the building. It seemed to me to be perfectly normal for the people charged with security to want to stop members of the public etc. from being on a bridge below which a distinguished person was going to pass. I did not see any Members molested — I saw Members politely refused passage, even though they showed their passes. I did hear what I think to be objectionable and challenging language from Mr Lomas; to look at men in uniform and say 'typical Fascist' to my mind is provocative.

*(Applause)*

I would not like this matter which concerns Members' dignity to go any further than the plaintive publicity-seeking complaint of Mr Lomas.

*(Applause from the European Democratic Group)*

**President.** — I call Mr Paisley on a point of order.

**Mr Paisley.** — Mr President, you said today that the sitting with President Sadat was not a plenary sitting, and therefore the rules did not apply. If any Member of this Assembly had wanted to protest verbally over his visit, would that then have been in order? I think that you need to rectify this ruling and let Members know how they can act within their rights. No Member of this Assembly, as far as I know, was consulted as to whether President Sadat should address this Assembly or not, and I certainly in the future, Sir, give you notice that when other eminent gentlemen are asked to this Assembly, I will make my protest in my own way, at my own time.

*(Mixed reactions)*

**President.** — I call Mr Tolman.

**Mr Tolman.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I realize that if someone makes a complaint, he can enforce his right to an investigation, but I also passed over the bridge today. I was not molested in any way, and the behaviour of those who are responsible for the safety of us all was correct in every respect. I felt I should say this after the remarks that have been made about this incident. The Members of Parliament must not be childish, of course, but appreciate the situation as it is. I should not like to see a slur cast unnecessarily on those

who are responsible for the safety both of the President of Egypt and of us all.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Roudy on a point of order.

**Mrs Roudy.** — *(F)* After Mr Sadat's statement, everyone felt very frustrated, because we all obviously wanted a debate. That is a normal reaction. But provision had not been made for this debate, and that is all there is to say about it. We shall therefore have to make provision for it and hold it, but we cannot allow this kind of collective outburst which we are now witnessing and which makes no sense.

I too could tell you what happened to me as I crossed the road or passed through a door, but that is not worthy of this Assembly. Arrange for a debate on the statement Mr Sadat has made here, yes, enter it in the agenda. This Assembly needs such a debate, and it is proving so at this moment, but do not sabotage our proceedings, which have been awaited by many people who have done a great deal of work for the debate on the position of women. I therefore ask you, Mr President, to give assurances to those who ask to speak on Mr Sadat's statement, tell them that a serious debate on that statement will be arranged, and let us get on with the agenda. All this is childish.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — I intend to respect the right of every Member to table procedural motions.

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* I accept Mrs Roudy's invitation and will refrain from expanding on my reference to the Rules of Procedure. I will just say I hope Mr Galland has a good time during his visit to Italy. Mr Galland, you may succeed in convincing us to vote otherwise. But for the moment we are committed to getting France to change its king and you your court.

*(Laughter)*

**President.** — I call Mr Van Minnen.

**Mr Van Minnen.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I feel that a further word of protest would not be out of place, a protest against the way in which parliamentary custom is being flouted by those opposite. It is felt disciplinary action must be taken against the right of freedom of expression which every Member has, and the right of representatives to access to this Chamber is brushed aside as petty childishness. Mr President, perhaps it

**Van Minnen**

has nothing to do with the place where we meet, perhaps we can think ourselves lucky that we are meeting here today for the last time, but there must be a thorough investigation into this incident.

**President.** — I call Ms Clwyd.

**Ms Clwyd.** — Mr President, I simply wish to confirm the version given you by other Members of the obstruction of Members of Parliament attempting to come to this building this afternoon. We were obstructed by the police. I understand that when there is an important visitor we must have regulations and security. However, I do not accept that, after we had left in plenty of time to come to this meeting, we should have been physically obstructed on the approach to this building. I personally was pushed twice by a 6ft 3in. policeman, which was quite unnecessary. I eventually retaliated, Mr President, by punching him back.

*(Loud cries)*

Mr President, I am sorry that the people who do not wish to hear the true version of events are now trying to shout me down. I am trying to keep cool; I am trying to give you an accurate impression of what happened. I was twice assaulted by that particular policeman. I eventually punched him back. Now it is not normally in my nature to assault others physically, certainly not people bigger than myself, but I believe that these security forces on this occasion exceeded their duty, and I would like you, Mr President, to assure us that a proper investigation will be carried out.

*(Mixed reactions)*

### 5. Agenda

**Mrs Pruvot.** — On behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport and as rapporteur I request that my report on youth activities (Doc. 1-826/80) be held over until the next part-session.

*(Parliament approved this request)*

### 6. Position of women in the Community (continuation)

**President.** — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the Maij-Weggen report (Doc. 1-829/80).

I call Mrs De March.

**Mrs De March.** — *(F)* Mr President, the contribution we have to make to this debate is not a gratuitous act, but a serious act and also an act of reflection, designed to bring about some progress. According to our analysis of the situation, the position of women cannot be improved if the class struggle in Europe is ignored.

The motion for a resolution tabled by the *ad hoc* committee rightly underlines how little attention is paid by the European Community to the position of women in Greece, Spain and Portugal. Furthermore, pathetically little space in this report has been devoted to this aspect of enlargement and to its implications for the lives of women, and that, we feel, is not mere coincidence.

There is in the European Assembly a broad consensus embracing all shades of political opinion except the French and Greek members of the Communist and Allies Group, who are resolutely opposed to enlargement and who publicize the implications of enlargement for the lives of the people.

It was not mere chance that our group was the only one to draw the *ad hoc* committee's attention to a study concerning the position of Greek, Spanish and Portuguese women.

We contributed statements and practical proposals to the work of the *ad hoc* committee, contrary to what has been said in this Chamber.

Commissioner Natali, for his part, has said that, by acceding to the Community, the applicant countries accepted what had previously been achieved by the Community and referred to texts and directives aimed at ensuring equal rights for women. I should like to comment on this. The pile of national and Community directives on the equality of men and women contrasts starkly with the slowness with which these directives are in fact implemented. The slowness of the process should be compared with the speed with which Community decisions are taken to sacrifice crucial sectors of the economies of the ten Community countries — examples being the iron and steel, shipbuilding and textile industries and the grubbing up of vines — and the haste with which negotiations on enlargement are conducted. When it comes to destroying a national economic base, to getting rid of human capacities, to blocking national aids, the Commission and governments are quick to implement directives. Time is then an important factor because at the end of the road there is profit for the big companies.

This debate on the rights of women in the Community is not for us or for me an academic debate. We see it in terms of our age, of life, and of the struggles in which women are engaged, above all in my own country. And very little is said about these struggles today, struggles in which we actively join in our regions, to defend the right to work and the dignity of women, to

## De March

force the withdrawal of policies of austerity and integration, which aggravate — and we have the figures to support this — all the inequalities and all the discrimination.

Yes, there is inequality in this respect. And why? Because it is in the interests of a few privileged people who see their governments, represented in this Assembly, taking action to perpetuate reactionary attitudes on unemployment among women, inequality in education and a woman's right to choose or terminate pregnancy. Training, promotion and all the rest of it are the bill to be paid in a world firmly in the hands of big money. Victor Hugo wrote in *Les Châtiments*: 'Without respite, night and day, in the world in which we live/Like grapes men are crushed/And the gold emerges from the press.'

Today's presses are also used to crush women, who account for one third of the working population in Europe but 49.8 % of the unemployed. Where is there freedom of choice? What a loss for the development of human society. What a waste of intelligence, of a source of creativity. Women's right to work comes up against the presses of modern times which are known as restructuring, austerity policies and redundancies, these choices of another age which result in hundreds of thousands of women in Europe facing poverty, humiliation and exploitation and in their remaining economically dependent. That is what really jeopardizes the human adventure, to which a speaker referred this morning. We have the figures, the hard facts on the position of Greek, Portuguese and Spanish women. But no one quotes them here. So I will quote some of them.

In Spain women account for 29 % of the working population and almost 4 % are unemployed. In Portugal, unemployment among women in industry amounts to 40 %; 38 % of adult women are illiterate, and in some cases women receive half the salaries paid to men. In Greece, what progress awaits women in agriculture, 42 % of whom work in the field, when the plan is to do away with large numbers of small and medium-sized farms in the years to come? What progress can we expect when it is the multinational companies and the banks that are rushing into these three countries, because the female workforce is open to ruthless exploitation, with differences in wage levels of particular interest for their profit levels. Enlargement, gentlemen, has nothing to do with the interests of the women in our countries or the women in the applicant countries. I would add, since this is referred to in the report by the Council, that women in the developing countries cannot expect to benefit in any way either. Furthermore, the governments of the ACP countries themselves feel that enlargement can only create new obstacles to their development.

We therefore call, in the interests of women, for an immediate stop to these negotiations on enlargement, the most advanced aspect of which just happens to

concern the movement of capital, which is an essential factor. The grubbing up of vines, fruit trees and vegetables, massive imports, that is what we are witnessing in our regions, not to speak of the closure of firms which employ women. All that is contrary to women's interests. But, of course, about all that Mrs Martin, on behalf of Giscardian women, cares little.

In a world which is changing, at a time when nations are gaining their freedom and independence, a time of revolutions, a time when mankind can prevent world wars, one of the most outstanding advances in our history is the movement of women towards liberation. They no longer accept servitude, reactionary attitudes, they choose to continue the struggle to achieve equality in every field. And we are at their side. But the motion for a resolution before us, the outcome of a compromise, contains little of this breath of life, this struggle, this irreversible change.

As the French members of the Communist and Allies Group see it, there will be no improvement in the position of women in the Community without those concepts of which little has been heard this morning: social justice, new freedom, democracy, dignity and respect for every woman and every man. There will be no improvement in the position of women without a resolute struggle for disarmament, peace, cooperation, unless a halt is called to the monstrous waste of the arms race and the plans to site neutron bombs and missiles in Europe. Now is the time for real aid to the developing peoples, to the children who die of hunger in their millions throughout the world. No, I do not think that women lack the courage to win freedom for themselves, because they have the same taste and aptitude for happiness as men. As for us, we have chosen to put on record this line by the poet Aragon: 'Woman is man's future.'

*(Applause from certain quarters on the left)*

**President.** — I call Mr Calvez.

**Mr Calvez.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this is the first time that the position of women has been debated at this length in our Parliament. Our Assembly, or at least many of its Members, is anxious to show the great interest it takes in a number of problems which women encounter every day, problems which must give rise to wider-ranging objectives, for which our Community bears responsibility, the objective of constructing a society with a human dimension as much for women as for men. The speakers who have preceded me have paid tribute to the serious work that has been done by the *ad hoc* Committee on Women's Rights, and I should like to join them in their compliments.

It is today absolutely essential for women to be more closely involved in socio-economic life, cultural life

## Calvez

and political life and for all the problems affecting the position of women to be discussed objectively. In France, Mrs De March, 200 measures have been adopted this year to reduce and eliminate all inequalities based on sex. That is a positive statement. Can that be matched anywhere else in Europe? A great effort has been made, even if the objectives set in the texts have in fact by no means been achieved. Unfortunately, we all find that adopting legislation is not enough to change attitudes: laws and even Community directives are not always properly implemented despite the evident goodwill of their authors. There are still too many restrictions and too much hesitancy. This must go, and we apply ourselves to this task every day. As we know, even though equality is stipulated in the legislation, it is far from being a fact, and it is by taking continuous action, taking action every day and using our powers of persuasion that we shall overcome the obstacles that lie in our way.

In the few minutes allotted to me, I should like to try to convince this Assembly of the need for the work of the *ad hoc* Committee on Women's Rights to be continued by a proper, standing committee on women, which we would like to see set up pursuant to the provisions of Rule 37 of the Rules of Procedure of our Assembly. The 110 or so amendments tabled to the 55 paragraphs of the motion for a resolution demonstrate the will of our Parliament to establish the wide-ranging policy giving women and men a better opportunity to combine employment and work in the home, and particularly for those women who have voluntarily decided to go out to work or to cooperate with their husbands where the latter are craftsmen, members of a liberal profession or the heads of family firms. And I should like to put various questions to this Parliament: who will ensure the actual implementation of all the measures proposed in the motion for a resolution which has been submitted to us for our approval? What point would the suggestions made in the motion for a resolution have if no action was taken on them and if no checks were possible? The Maij-Weggen report exists. It must be followed up by action that is very much to the benefit of women. But who will make up what might be called a pressure group to ensure above all that the Member States enforce the provisions contained in the directives? Which body will lend an attentive ear to the ideas expressed by European women? Who will be responsible for considering the possible implications of the proposed directives, of the recommendations and regulations on the position of women in Europe that have been put forward by Parliament? Only a standing committee can assume these responsibilities. We have a duty to seize the opportunity and again take the action that will allow solutions to be found to the many problems women face, without waiting until the next elections to our European Parliament in 1984.

And if this Parliament elected by direct universal suffrage really intends to take action to the benefit of women, it must really do something for them. Any

solution but a standing committee would only be evading the issue or an illusion which might prove dangerous when we consider the opposition of several political groups to the setting up of a committee of this kind. Do you believe it is necessary to wait two years before again considering the problems encountered by women in the Community? Would that not be a policy of burying one's head in the sand and refusing to look reality in the face for two years? Two years are both a long and a short time. Is there not a danger that the position of women will worsen in an economic crisis, which as we know only too well, is making it difficult to create jobs? The Liberal and Democratic Group cannot agree to a worsening of the present position of women in Europe.

I will conclude by saying, ladies and gentlemen, that we hope that this Maij-Weggen report will be adopted by Parliament, because it must be remembered that the problem of women's rights is a problem that affects all the Member States and those who will be joining us soon. It is not something which concerns only the regions, development and cooperation: it is a common problem, which has implications at social level. It is a problem which grows as time passes, a problem which has prompted the UN to spend ten years studying it. Parliament would look foolish if it settled for a mere working party, which would break up this very day. Have you thought, ladies and gentlemen, of the effects of Community policy on the development of the position of women? Only a standing committee can contemplate action aimed at eliminating the discriminatory measures that too many women still encounter.

At the end of this major debate we are counting on you, ladies and gentlemen, to set up this committee this week and to endow it with the material means that will allow it to work in satisfactory conditions.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Miss De Valera.

**Miss De Valera.** — Mr President, my dear colleagues, I wish to thank Mrs Maij-Weggen for her resolution on the position of women in the Community. I welcome her suggestion that the Commission must ensure a genuine Community policy in favour of women, in which national measures will be coordinated and, where necessary, supports provided for the measures envisaged by means of finance from the future Social Fund for Women. It is also of major importance that information on financing from the European Social Fund for projects designed to improve the position of women should be disseminated throughout the Community. I welcome the fact that vocational training for women is given such prominence in this resolution, for if present attitudes towards the role of women in society are to change,

**De Valera**

the first step must be through our educational system. A specific educational policy is indispensable for the creation of equal opportunities for women, and such a policy must play a vital role in the struggle against unemployment of women and young people.

I would just like to turn to some specific points, Mr President. I support the Single Women's Association in my country in its wish to see some recognition being given to those single women who willingly sacrifice their careers and pensions to look after elderly relatives and receive no remuneration for their services, although looking after their relatives at home is a considerable saving to the State. I call on the Commission to support this partly through Community funding. It would also be of great assistance to this category of women if retraining courses were improved and the present upper age limit for entering the courses lifted.

I was disappointed to note that there was no concrete proposal in Mrs Maij-Weggen's report on payment or remuneration for women who wish to work at home. This is a point which was also made by my colleague, Mr Lalor. Rather than downgrading the position of those women who have freely chosen to give up their careers to work in the home, we should acknowledge this great contribution to the community by some form of remuneration to the housewife. Very many young married women in my constituency of Dublin live in large housing estates in areas where the builders and local authorities have put little or no thought into the planning of facilities for the families who live there. I call on the Commission to promote better child-care facilities, especially in over-populated urban areas, by setting up crèches which can be used by working mothers whether they work within or outside the home.

It was with regret that I read paragraph 35 of this resolution, which encourages Member States of the Community to provide abortion facilities, while at the same time drawing up uniform legislation on the voluntary termination of pregnancy in the Community. I, on behalf of my constituents, could in no way support this proposal. It is unfortunate that this section on health care, with particular reference to paragraph 35, was included in this resolution. We, in the Group of European Progressive Democrats, feel that the Commission is not competent to deal with such matters and has no right to propose the harmonization of legislation on contraception and abortion in Member States. As these are exclusively matters of conscience, each Member State may take a different point of view on the basis of its cultural and ethical past. Decisions on such matters must be left to the national parliaments and governments. Personally, I think it a great pity that the question of abortion was raised in the resolution, for it diverts the attention from those questions regarding women's affairs over which the European Parliament has competence. Like my colleague Mr Lalor, I do not agree with this

section on health care, but with the exception of this section, the report is highly commendable and, if implemented, would greatly improve the situation of women in Europe.

**President.** — I call Mr Pesmazoglou.

**Mr Pesmazoglou.** — (*EL*) Mr President, the subject under discussion today in the European Parliament is one of those subjects where the European Parliament's opinion and initiative can have important consequences for all the peoples of Europe. The European Parliament can make a significant contribution to the question of living conditions and to the future of women in all European countries; it can mobilize public opinion, influence the traditional attitudes of our peoples and, finally, influence the decisions taken by the Community's institutions and national governments. Therefore we attach great importance to the debate which is taking place today and we hope that the results of this debate will form the basis for further investigation by one of Parliament's organs which will keep a check on the developments which are being made in all the member countries. More particularly, as regards the subject of the situation of women in Greece, I must say that while there has been progress in recent decades — and in this I refer to all that my colleague of the New Democracy Party, Mr Bournias, said a little earlier — I can categorically state that the results are unsatisfactory. The rate of progress is unacceptably slow and this is borne out by the fact that amongst us twenty-four representatives of the Greek people there are no women in the two larger groups. This is indicative of the way that women are absent from important duties and high offices in our country. But what I want to pay particular attention to is the fact which most characteristically highlights the seriousness of the problem in Greece, namely that the percentage of women who work is only 28 % of the number of women who are of working age, while the corresponding percentage in the Community is 40 %. This means that in order for us to reach a level of employment for women corresponding to the level in most countries of the Community an additional 100 000 jobs must be provided in the coming years over and above the increase in jobs called for to improve the employment situation in Greece. Consequently, we must continue our attempts to bring about progress for women and improve their living conditions. I must point out, however, that there are serious aspects to this issue which are still unsettled.

Amongst these are the reforms needed in civil law. Mr Bournias, my colleague in the New Democracy Party, said that there have been many studies, but the studies and reports, in spite of their being extremely well-founded, have still not materialized into any reforms in the field of civil law, and this delay is a great cause for concern. I also want to add that there has been a substantial delay in ensuring that women receive equal

**Pesmazoglou**

pay for equal work. Likewise, and this is something I want to stress, women's progress in professional careers has been slow and, finally, there have been delays in drawing up legislation for an integrated system of measures to protect women and their rights in the field of maternity. This latter point is a particularly serious matter.

It is essential that all Greek women, and especially Greek peasant women, should be immediately entitled to a maternity allowance and a system should be set up establishing independent rights to social security to which all Greek women are entitled regardless of whether they are peasants or live in the urban areas. I also want to refer very briefly to the comments which Mrs de March made. It is quite true that the situation of women depends to a very large extent on the rate of economic growth, and this brings me to the point where I must remind you that the fundamental aim of the European Community's policy in all spheres is to speed up the development of the less developed areas of the Community. It is quite clear that this policy is of great interest to Greece. For this reason I want to emphasize that it is essential not only that this motion should pass through all its stages in the parliamentary process, but also that there is a need for an effective and strong regional policy throughout the whole of the European Community. I also want to stress the importance of the remarks made by the Commission's representative, Mr Richards, who pointed out how important it is to strengthen and regenerate development in the whole of the Community. General economic and social progress within the European Community provide the basis for us to overcome the serious difficulties facing us in our attempt to bring about equality for women with men in basic social tasks and an improvement in the position of women in all European countries.

**President.** — I call Mr Enright.

**Mr Enright.** — First of all, Mr President, I like to join with my colleagues on the Ad Hoc Working Committee in congratulating Mrs Roudy for the very hard work she put in to chairing that committee, and Mrs Maij-Weggen for the splendid report she produced. I cannot, of course, agree with every single part of that report. In some places I would have gone further; in other places I would not have gone as far. But Mrs Maij-Weggen showed immense patience and immense ability throughout the year and I would like to congratulate her upon that.

I would also like to say that I think the way in which Mrs de March decided that she would dissent from what was being said was quite disgraceful in view of the fact the French Communists appeared very rarely indeed at those meetings. If they are going to make rhetorical statements about progress for the women of the Community, then they really must do the hard

work which is entailed, instead of just making statements. Progress requires work and it requires conscientiousness, and that simply was not present. Had the strictures not come from Mrs de March I would not have mentioned it. However it does seem to me that her position is like that of a whited sepulchre and that is something I do not accept particularly as it contrasts with the very hard work done by Mrs Squarcialupi on that committee.

However, having said that, Mr President, I would like to come to the main point of what I have to say. That is first of all that, if there is one thing that is absolutely clear in the Treaty of Rome — and this is not always realized in the United Kingdom — it is Article 119. You can have your theological arguments about other articles, but that article is unequivocal and clear. It is little noticed largely because it has a relatively small part in the budget. Yet in the provisions from the three directives which have come from the Commission there has been a tremendous advance for women within the Community. When I came to examine over this last year what the Community had done, what the Community had put into practice in terms of directives and then examined what Member State, and in particular my own Member State, had done, I came to realize for the first time that in fact the Community was well ahead of the individual Member States in this area. I think that is very important to realize this.

Indeed, my own country is currently being taken to the European Court at Luxembourg and in every case women are winning justice. Unlike Enoch Powell, I would not call going to the European Court treachery. I would call it common sense fighting for justice. I thank the Commission for the part that it has played so far.

I would like to concentrate upon one of the directives which is not due to be implemented until 1984 and which is mentioned very prominently in the resolution: equal treatment where social security is concerned. It is there above all that women are disadvantaged, especially in the United Kingdom, in a quite disgraceful way.

First of all the presumption is that wives are financially dependent upon their husbands. That is the assumption in United Kingdom law. Therefore it leaves a psychological disposition which is essentially paternalistic. It is that sort of psychological attitude which we, as men, as well as the women in the Community, must fight against.

Let us just look at a few of the results of this. I hope that the Commission will examine it very carefully and will be prepared to take the United Kingdom to the European Court once again when the directive comes into full force. First of all there is unemployment benefits. In fact even before that there is the whole question of unemployment. Female unemployment rates in my constituency in the city centre of Leeds and in

**Enright**

places like Batley, which have seen a rapid decline in the textile industry, are approaching 40 %. Yet this is totally disguised in the way in which we collect our figures. I would put to you that it is not merely morally reprehensible but is sheer moral turpitude.

Where a single mother is out of work for up to a year she can collect unemployment benefit, but once she has been out of work for over a year, she can no longer do so. And therefore many of the expressions that we have in the report that say that we want the man or the woman to be able to choose how they work and who goes out to work are, in effect, nullified by this. Single men do not have this sort of thing happening to them but married women do — there is a clear case of discrimination and injustice here.

I would also say on this particular theme, in regard to the single mother, that if I were to meet, for instance, Miss Hooper and her four children — assuming that she had four children — in the street and I said, 'come along and have a coffee' and bought her supposed children lemonade, then in fact, in the United Kingdom, she would be liable to having that deducted from her benefit. If on the other hand, she came along and saw me, a single parent, with my four children and bought me drinks, then that would not be deducted from mine. This is a clear absurdity.

Although it is only a very small example, it is indicative of a much more serious situation. If we take disablement and sickness — and I must perforce, Mr President, go through these quickly as I see my time is running out — we find exactly the same thing happening. A married man who gives up his job in order to look after his aged parents who are sick and disabled is entitled to an attendance allowance; a married woman who gives up her job for the same reason, no matter how vital that incomes is, is not allowed to have that attendance allowance. Similarly, if a man receives a disability allowance, he receives it at a 60 % rate. If a woman who is married receives it, she receives a rate dependent upon how much housework she can do. She is assessed. So they go round and they look and they see how much hoovering she can do, and how much mopping; the same does not apply to men.

If we look at retirement pensions we find exactly the same lack of equal treatment. I therefore think it crucial that when this directive comes into full force, the Commission should set about examining its own initiative — not waiting for the Council of Ministers to say we are doing it wrongly, but of its own initiative — what is really happening.

I would now like to say a few quick words about the developing countries: Dame Sheila Roberts said this morning that we should not on any account discuss this since it is outside our terms of reference. It seems to me that that is utterly and absolutely wrong. Under the provisions of the Treaty we should perhaps not have been listening to President Sadat today, and yet it

was absolutely right that we did so. Under the Lomé Convention we agreed that we would discuss this matter with our African, Caribbean and Pacific colleagues, and we also said in the debate on world hunger that this was a crucial area because women have a very important part to play in the economy of the Third World and it is very often European big business which is using and exploiting them. That is quite apart from health considerations, where we can be of substantial assistance.

In conclusion, Mr President, I would like to make a personal appeal to Mr Richard on one particular matter which affects women in the United Kingdom and ask him to use his good offices to ensure an end to this disgraceful state of affairs. I refer to the situation in working men's clubs in the United Kingdom. Where they are affiliated to the Club and Institute Union women are not allowed to be members of their committees or to vote for those committees. You may say that this is unimportant but there are a large number of people who enjoy these working men's clubs, for whom it is an essential part of their social life. It is therefore important that they should be able to exercise control over their social life. But that was one of the exemptions made from the Equality Act by, I must say, our Labour Government under Harold Wilson. It is an anomaly which needs to be removed very rapidly indeed.

*(Cries of Hear, Hear)*

So as men we must fight for justice and the only way we can fight for justice is to adopt this resolution. Once again I congratulate Mrs Maij-Weggen on the excellent work she has done.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Boot.

**Mrs Boot.** — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, for all the women in this Parliament and all the women they represent this is a special day in that the excellent report before us lays the foundations for a broader European policy on emancipation and the beginning of parliamentary control to ensure it is implemented.

We congratulate Mrs Maij-Weggen on her report. The amendments I have tabled are intended to lend legal support to this report. On the whole, the report does after all give preference to the material problems connected with the objectives to be achieved as regards the position of women over the question of the institutional set-up. It thus succeeds in convincing us of the advisability of strengthening the Community's institutional structure as we now know it. I should like to say to Commissioner Richard that the vote of confidence we hope to pass on the Commission on

**Boot**

Thursday will for us also extend to the questions put to the Commission in this report. We are addressing not only the Commission but also the Member States, since it is their duty to take all the general or special measures likely to ensure that obligations stemming from the EEC Treaty or from acts of the Community institutions are honoured.

As regards the fundamental principles of Community loyalty and cooperation among the Member States and the institutions of the Community I would refer to Articles 5, 6 and 7 of the Treaty. Article 7 in particular is of fundamental importance for the elimination of the disadvantages suffered by women, since it sets forth the general principle of non-discrimination on the grounds of nationality. One of the most significant forms of discrimination against women does after all originate from the national administrations of the Member States.

Apart from this general ban on discrimination, the Treaty contains many specific provisions prohibiting discrimination. One of these has gradually become notorious in the eyes of many men. This is Article 119, which sets out the principle of equal pay for men and women. This article prompted the Council to adopt the famous three directives that have been mentioned today. Opinions on this article have undergone a strange evolution. The original economic approach to Article 119 was not regarded by anyone as more than a basis for interpretation. It is the social considerations that have come into prominence. As a result of legislation, the Member States are required by Article 119 to ensure that the principle of equality is applied as a general principle of law. This development also cleared the way for the well-known SABENA decision of 1976, and since that time the three Community directives have been properly enforced. That is true of every Member State, but all too often a trial or Community legislation is needed if further progress is to be made. I will not conceal the fact that this has also been the case in my own country. In 1974 a young woman who had just graduated in international law took the State of the Netherlands to court. Why, Mr President? Because the Ministry of Foreign Affairs had advertised a post, inviting only men to apply. Through the institution of legal proceedings against the State the authorities were forced to change course from that moment on, since they are now required to add the epithet 'male, female' whenever they advertise vacant posts.

As regards the motion for a resolution on the position of women in the Community, I should like to comment on a number of points. First, there is the part that concerns the problem of abortion, paragraphs 34, 35 and 36. My group — and I am now speaking in particular as a Dutch member of the CD Group — feels that these paragraphs do not really belong in a resolution that concerns emancipation. We are reluctant to see the abortion problem presented as an emancipation issue. Although this is a problem which usually has to be solved by women, this is because men

often, very often shirk their responsibility. Inasmuch as the responsibility for abortion is left solely to the woman. You know the slogan: 'Women alone decide.' Men then rightly say after some time, and they do so only too willingly: 'You were so keen on deciding for yourself.' In that case there is no shared responsibility. And that means that here again it is the woman who comes off worse. For us Christian Democrats abortion is too serious a problem to be solved by women alone. We see it as the responsibility of the woman and the man, the girl and the boy, and this is certainly an aspect of emancipation. The decision on whether or not a child is to be born must be taken earlier. The man and woman must know what they want and what measures they must take. For this a great deal of information is needed. Consequently, it will not surprise you to hear that we call for the deletion of the three paragraphs I have referred to. As they now stand, these articles are too one-sided.

We continue to abide by the principle that, as the guardian of the public interest, government should bear in mind the legal protection of both the unborn child and the woman who is in need. There are two sides to be considered. We can agree only to a system of measures which takes due account of both sides, and out of respect for the individual national governments some caution over this problem would not be out of place.

Secondly, I would refer to the position of women who work in family firms in both agriculture and in small and medium-sized businesses. As incomes in these sectors are low, it is often impossible to take on paid staff. The contribution women make is never really expressed in terms of money and is therefore usually underrated. It is high time that the women who make a contribution to society in many unpaid posts derive some economic benefit from their work. I call for particular attention to be paid to this group of women. Replacement services, not only health care but also someone to look after the business, are extremely important for these women. New initiatives are needed to help them financially and with management courses.

Finally, I would recall a statement made by Evelyne Sullerot in 1975, that the future of men also depends on women. If society does not enable women to have and bring up children, they will refuse to have children. It is a hard fact that having children is always to the disadvantage of women. Society is well disposed to the idea of equality in the education of girls and boys wherever possible, but when a woman wants to train for an occupation, the answer is no.

Mr President, I am about to finish. I maintain the view that if a good emancipation policy is to succeed, and legislation will certainly be needed for this, three factors will be of decisive importance: a change of attitude, a change of attitude and a change of attitude.

*(Applause from the centre)*

## IN THE CHAIR: MRS DE MARCH

*Vice-President***President.** — I call Mr Forth.

**Mr Forth.** — Madam President, this resolution does no credit to this Parliament at all. It is a classic example of misguided idealism and irresponsibility. The mistake was made when we set up the Ad Hoc Committee on Women's Rights, because once you create an institution or body, it then has to justify its own existence. This is exactly what we have seen in this Parliament over the past year — a group of people who have been asked to justify their existence, who have sat and met many times and are therefore perforce going to come up, as such a group will always do, with a bulky document making utterly unrealistic demands. I therefore move now, amendments to the resolution in my name and in that my colleague, Mr Cottrell.

My objections to the resolution, Madam President, are as follows: first of all, it makes totally unrealistic, costly and irresponsible demands, seeking commitments of resources which either do not exist at all, or which, if we carried out what was asked for, would cause us to cut back on other programmes in the Community.

What other programmes would be cut back if we were to commit resources to what is asked for here? Would it be the disabled? Would it be the Social Fund? Would it be anti-dumping measures? It is surely incumbent on the people who are proposing these things in this resolution to specify where the additional resources would come from or what cuts would be made in other Commission programmes in order to enable these things to be done. If that is not done then it is surely irresponsible to give people the impression that such measures will be taken when we in this Chamber know full well they will not. That is the height of irresponsibility, and that is what I charge the ad hoc committee with today.

If we look, Madam President, at the list of demands made, it is of course utterly absurd. I counted at least 35 demands, starting with paragraph 2(a) 'oblige Member States to prepare statistics...'; paragraph 2(b) 'compel Member States to report every year'; paragraph 2(c) 'national committees to carry out overall assessment...'; paragraph 3 'Commission to carry out a survey...'; paragraph 6 'Commission to ensure implementation...'; down to paragraph 49, 'Commission to report...'; paragraph 50 'Commission to set up consultative committee...' and paragraph 51 'Commission to conduct systematic enquiry...'. One can go right through the entire list of demands made, and what I want to hear from the Commission,

Madam President, is how on earth we are going to find the resources to do even a fraction of these things. If they cannot do them all, then we must we must be told about the priorities within that list of things that shall and shall not be done.

My second objection to the resolution concerns paragraph 13. It typically makes a sweeping demand for a general reduction in working hours and a redistribution of employment between men and women. What in earth does that mean? What sort of redistribution? On what criteria? Between whom and whom? What effect would that have first of all on employment of men in the Community and secondly on the competitive position of industry in the Community which is already in a very difficult position? These questions have patently not been given any consideration by the committee and they should have been.

Thirdly, Madam President, the resolution demands, as so many from this House do, a plethora of committees, consultative bodies, conferences and other such things to be set up. Surely, we already have a chronic surplus of such things in the Community. We should be seeking to reduce them, not increase them, because they are not in any way going to improve the condition of any one at all.

The resolution seeks to deal with discrimination and prejudice by legislation and directives, and that is the most awful denial of the whole essence of the human condition and human nature. It is utterly absurd to defend to anyone that we are going to alter prejudice and discrimination by passing a rule against it.

The resolution displays, in my view Madam President, the most appalling arrogance, particularly in the light of the fact that it is called 'the position of women in the European Community', it then goes on to try to impose our values and our culture on women throughout the world and outside the Community. I would submit to you, Madam President, that the effect of obliging the ACP delegation to discuss it, could be utterly disastrous for our relationship with our ACP colleagues. If I were one of them I would be grossly insulted. I think it is most insulting for us to take it on ourselves to tell them how to run their society.

Finally, and for me, decisively, unless and until we are given an estimate of the costs of this and of other similar resolutions to enable us to decide on priorities to be taken within the Community, I feel it would be wrong for this Parliament to support anything that is contained in this resolution and I will find it impossible to do so. Thank you!

*(Loud cries)***President.** — I call Mr Kappos.

**Mr Kappos.** — (*EL*) Mr President, on behalf of the Communist Party of Greece I should like to make the point that it is unfortunate that the report does not deal with the problems of women in Greece as it could have presented these problems at an international level. Mr President, there is no disputing the fact that in the capitalist system, and therefore in Greece, women are used as cheap labour fodder. Consequently, the improvement of their position, as well as the improvement and equalization of their pay, is not just a problem for women but also for the whole of the working class and the labour movement. My colleague who spoke this morning painted a rosy picture of the situation of women in Greece. The truth, however, is quite different. There is just one point on which we are in agreement — that in the field of military service women have achieved equality with men, in other words they have achieved equal rights insofar as they have had new unprecedented burdens imposed upon them. However, women do not want this. They want equal rights, peace and disarmament, not military service.

Mr President, it must be clear to all of us that in Greece there is discrimination against women as regards their pay, professional advancement, and their share in the social and political life of the country. Having children is still not recognized as a social task in Greece. Pregnant women are sacked without a second thought in spite of the fact that a law against this was recently passed. Crèches are non-existent and medical care for pregnant women and young mothers leaves a lot to be desired. Family law is still behind the times and reactionary in nature. One only has to remember that there is still the institution of the dowry, and this says it all. For five years now the government has been using delaying tactics over the issue of family law in its attempt to avoid updating it and making it more democratic. Indicative of this attitude is the fact that recently Parliament failed to ensure equal representation for women and representatives of women's organizations on the committee which the new family law is to set up.

Mr President, the fact of the matter is that the situation in Greece is unacceptable. It is comforting to know that the women's movement, and the people's movement in general, is making a determined struggle for the realistic updating and democratization of family law as well as realistic safeguards for women's rights. Still, Mr President, it is clear to us in the Communist Party of Greece that the position of women will not be improved by Greece's accession to the EEC. Indeed, the report acknowledges the existence of a number of serious problems which women in the countries of the EEC are having to face. On the other hand, all the gains which have been made so far have been achieved within the context of the women's struggle and the struggle of the masses, and did not come about as a result of the EEC or its institutions. On the contrary, the struggle of women to deal with their problems will undoubtedly be made more diffi-

cult by Greece's accession to the EEC because this will create new problems for women and the people as a whole. For instance, migration of the rural populace on a large scale into the towns, the closure of small businesses, unemployment, inflation, high cost of living, the strengthening of monopolies, which effectively negate workers' rights, and the negation of democracy at all levels. It is precisely for these reasons that we take the view that Greece's accession to the EEC will make the women's struggle for equality more difficult. Consequently, we are of the opinion that the women's movement in Greece and the Greek people must work together in their struggle against the EEC for Greece's withdrawal from it and for the independent economic, political and social development of Greece.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — I call Mr Maher.

**Mr Maher.** — Madam President, I too acknowledge the work done by Mrs Maij-Weggen and her committee. It is a very difficult area and I think we should not be too critical when we discuss the very difficult questions they have had to concern themselves with over a number of months. Because my time is limited I will confine myself to a few brief remarks, and I hope I shall be constructively critical.

It surprises me that Mrs Maij-Weggen and her committee gave no indication in the report of any recognition of women's organizations that exist in all our member countries; they are not even mentioned. We have in our countries various women's institutes, organizations set up by the women themselves to provide themselves a service to help promote their interests, and it is a surprising thing that they should have been completely ignored. In my country we have the Irish Countrywomen's Association, which deals with women in the rural regions and we have urban women's organizations, I would recommend strongly that the Community, through the Commission, in any efforts it is making on a common level to improve the lot of women, should make use of these organizations and channel finance through them, if finance is being channelled into our member countries and make use of structures that are there set up by the women themselves. In that way account will be taken of the special needs of women. After all, who can know better than they what is best for them?

I hope, too, that particular recognition will be accorded to the contribution made by women in the sphere of agriculture. It is accepted, I believe, that up to one-quarter of all the food produced in the European Community today is produced by women working in the fields and in the farmyard. Have they ever received recognition for this? Is there ever any payment for it? Does the Commission, when it is

**Maher**

compiling the agricultural prices, take account of the contribution made by women? I do not think so — they are completely ignored, but still they go on. If they ever withdrew their services we could run into a serious shortage of food in the European Economic Community. I think it is totally wrong that women, not only do the domestic chores in their houses and rear a family, but also work in the fields and the farmyards as well, without any recognition, not to mention payment, for their services.

My final point, Mr President, is this, and I must make it strongly: I believe this Parliament would be making a great mistake if through this resolution it forced any member country to accept a rule or regulation which that country feels is diametrically opposed to its interests and the interests of its people. I refer to the very critical and intimate area of abortion and contraception. I think it would be extremely foolish of this Parliament to try to insist on harmonization, if harmonization means that countries have to accept certain rules and regulations because the Community says so. I can solemnly assure you that my country would leave the European Community if it were forced to accept measures which conflict with what we deeply believe in. Unless the people of Ireland decide to accept these measures, then they will not be acceptable to us and will not apply in our country. Unless there are changes, particularly in paragraphs 35 and 36, this resolution as it stands is not acceptable to me.

**Mrs Spaak.** — (*F*) Madam President, I should like to say something to Mr Forth, who spoke just now. I should like to say to Mr Forth that everything excessive is trivial, and I very much fear that he has made a trivial statement.

I should like to stress the importance and the quality of the work done by the *ad hoc* Committee on Women's Rights and pay tribute to the capacity for work and the perseverance of our rapporteur, Mrs Maij-Weggen, and also to the chairman, Mrs Roudy, who succeeded in ensuring collaboration and encouraging members of the committee to reconcile their points of view. But I am sorry about one thing: the little interest shown in our work. And I look forward, ladies and gentlemen, with impatience to the time when all Members, male and female, are convinced that it is not women who have the problems, but society. Just as we must organize relations among the various components of society, we must solve the problems between men and women, for example, legal inequalities, limited participation in political bodies, the vicious circle of jobs for unskilled women, which are poorly paid and offer uncertain promotion prospects. The progress that has been made is not irreversible. Attitudes have not really changed, and all our efforts must go into this revolution. There is a greater need than ever for vigilance in the present economic crisis, which is hitting women harder than men.

Women must seize the opportunity this economic crisis offers, not submit to it. They must seize this opportunity to reassert that they are the equals of men, that the problems inherent in their status, motherhood and the education of children, for example, must on no account be taken as an excuse for discriminating against them in favour of men.

It is at this time of crisis that we must all reassert our desire for genuine equality. The European Community must keep a particularly close watch on the measures taken by the States in any area with an economic aspect, such as social security and taxation. These measures often result in indirect discrimination against women and evasion of the implementation of the directives. I am sorry to say that the policy of my own country is far from exemplary in this respect. For example, where tax law is concerned, the combination of a married couple's incomes penalizes the wife and imposes a considerable burden on her economic independence. Lastly, under the legislation on economic recovery, again in Belgium, various measures relating to unemployment that have been taken introduce the concept of cohabitation by limiting unemployment benefits and the period of unemployment during which these benefits may be claimed. Quite clearly this is a discriminatory measure, and I even ask myself if such measures do not conflict with the directive on equal treatment.

The Community must continue and step up the campaign of information for women that began during the elections and the election campaign of June 1979 and provide appropriate financial resources. The conclusion drawn in a remarkable document by two Belgian lawyers which forms part of our committee's dossier is that, even where legislation makes provision for them, there is great difficulty in translating reforms into customary practice, particularly because of the ignorance of women. Without information there will be no change of attitude or increase in the political and social participation of women.

Within our *ad hoc* committee Mrs Dekker and I were made responsible for a report on the new technologies. We must ensure that these technologies make it possible for the labour market to be reorganized along fairer lines. They will affect sectors in which women form the majority of the labour force. Training in these occupations must be adjusted and arrangements made for retraining. In these sectors once again, women must be a driving force and accept this new challenge in their own interests.

If this development is to succeed, the employers' cooperation is essential as is that of the trade unions, which have resisted and often continue to resist the presence of women within their institutions. They will have an opportunity to show a change in their attitudes. The Community must act quickly — it has begun to do so — particularly by carrying out practical studies in the sectors which will be affected and the resulting new

**Spaak**

prospects, and it must inform women of its findings and arrange for their participation, make the social partners aware of the problems and join with them in taking action to prevent telematics from having an adverse effect on the employment of women and men. It should, for example, arrange for the promotion of adequate training schemes, in which women must be a driving force, and ensure that the growth of work at home, to which telematics threatens to lead, does not become a new source of segregation in the employment market.

Madam President, I should like to say a few words about the amendment I shall be tabling on the voluntary interruption of pregnancy. I refer to the text of the rapporteur, Mrs Maij-Weggen, where it concerns the right to contraception and adequate information. I completely agree with this paragraph. To Mr Lalor, who spoke this morning, I should like to say that no woman in the world, neither Mrs Maij-Weggen nor those who have tabled amendments, wants to encourage abortion or considers it a positive measure. It is a terrible ordeal, Mr Lalor. Women resort to abortion only in desperation. But the problem exists. Every year hundreds of thousands of women have to undergo this terrible experience in scandalous conditions, and it is hypocritical to ignore the problem. My amendment calls for the recognition of the right — and a right is not an obligation — to voluntary interruption of pregnancy for all women without any social discrimination. We are well aware that well-to-do women can get an abortion with impunity and in excellent conditions in well organized clinics either in the Netherlands or Britain.

We therefore call for all women to be placed on the same footing and for the horror of clandestine abortion to be eliminated. I am not, of course, saying that abortion should be freely available, but it should be possible where there is an urgent need. Who can deny that there is urgent need in the cases arising out of the definition of health laid down by the World Health organization. According to this definition, health is a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being and does not consist solely in the absence of disease or infirmity. It is an irresponsible attitude not to recognize the social and mental dimension of the problem of the voluntary interruption of pregnancy. The interruption must, of course, be carried out in a specially equipped hospital.

The *ad hoc* committee has completed its work. It is obvious that Parliament should not think that, this being the case and possibly after adopting the report before it, everything is settled and we can now pretend the problem is behind us.

I am convinced that our Assembly has a very important role to play in this fundamental development of our society, and we must certainly back up the decisions taken by bringing influence to bear in our national Parliaments. Each of Parliament's committees

must be aware of this dimension, and the women on those committees must be particularly vigilant.

Ladies and gentlemen, Madame President, the European Parliament in which so much hope is placed, has a duty to go beyond the aspirations for which we have served as spokesmen during these debates.

(Applause)

## IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mrs Fullet.

**Mrs Fullet.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to say at the outset how pleased I was to work on this *ad hoc* committee on women's rights and how regretful I am this evening, as I think we all are, that our task has finally been concluded, if a report on women's rights can ever be truly concluded. I hope we will have the opportunity of working together again under such good conditions.

May I be permitted to congratulate our rapporteur, Mrs Maij-Weggen, and our chairman, Mrs Roudy, on the great amount of work they have accomplished. We certainly do not claim that everything is perfect, but an effort was indeed made to tackle the problems surrounding the most important rights which women have as women.

Nevertheless, on behalf of the Socialist Group and on my own behalf, I would like to call your attention to an aspect of these rights which I feel deserves priority: I am referring to contraception and voluntary abortion in the Community countries. Those who have already spoken have expressed various opinions, some of which I share, and others which I consider very backward. I will return to this later. We can no longer ignore this basic problem of women's rights. It should be the first in a long series of choices through which women will assume personal responsibility for their private lives. This freedom of choice is of very recent date, and in some countries it still does not exist. I hope we will deal with the problem without emotion and without hypocrisy, for in reality the right to abortion has belonged only to a privileged minority able to travel to a neighbouring country, while the poorest women were and still are obliged to resort to medically doubtful methods entailing not only inescapable risks but much psychological and moral suffering as well. It is because I think it is easier to mourn babies that were never born than to provide work and a decent standard of living for those that were; because I think, as you do, that the denial of basic rights such as

**Fuillet**

contraception and abortion in some of its Member States is unacceptable in this Europe of hope and freedom, a Europe which is becoming an integrated economic zone and tending towards judicial unity as well; it is because of all this that I called for legislative harmonization in the Member States of the Community in regard to contraception and abortion. This should be done on the basis of three principles: women living in the Community make their own decisions; prosecution for abortion should cease; and the voluntary termination of pregnancy should be free. I demand this law in the name of European women, for it contributes most to the right to freedom and without it there can be no civilized society.

How can we ignore the Treaties, which say that we must defend and maintain the well being of the citizens of Europe? How can we speak of the free movement of working women when they are subject to different laws affecting their most profoundly personal decisions: whether or not to have a child and when to have one? I appeal to those of you here today who want to build a Europe where women will have a place for themselves, to those of you who do not want demographic policy to be used as a means of attaining certain economic goals, to those of you who want to grant women their rights before insisting upon their duties, to all of you: be well aware of the importance of the vote you will make tomorrow.

I tell you, but you already know, you cannot help knowing that millions of women abort in secret. The risks are great, the methods dangerous, and the suffering unavoidable. There are many of us here who consider abortion to be the last resort. We do not want it to be lumped together with other methods of contraception. We say to the women of Europe who are watching us today: this directly elected Parliament, this Parliament of hope will give proof of its greatness and its power. Free exercise of the rights of man depends also on the recognition of the rights of women. Addressing myself more particularly to Miss de Valera and Mrs Boots, I ask the following question: if contraception and voluntary termination of pregnancy do not concern women, whom do they concern? If we cannot include these topics in a report on women's rights, I wonder what sort of document would be a suitable place for them? I can see there only a hypocritical example of the way the choice of maternity has been approached for thousands of years. For my part, I know that we cannot cry for those who are not born until we can ensure happiness for those who are. That time is not yet. Thanks to your decision however, ladies and gentlemen, it is perhaps very near.

(Applause)

**Mr Lentz-Cornette.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would first like to thank Mrs Majj-Weggen, our rapporteur, who has submitted to us today a report which is complete, well-organized, and

fully representative of the work accomplished by the *ad hoc* committee on women's rights. Those who in October of 1979 doubted the need to create an *ad hoc* committee on women's rights and to hold a parliamentary debate on the position of women in the Community will yield today to the evidence that the work done by the committee was incontestably necessary. The facts and conclusions arrived at will serve as a basis for the constant improvement of the status of women in the Community, whatever Mr Forth may say. Since speakers from my group have already touched on the general problems, I will turn to a particular aspect of our work, that is, the role of women in the family. I am well aware that nowadays anyone who dares to talk about the role of women in the family lays himself open to the most violent attacks and reproaches. The so-called advocates of women's liberation for whom this liberation takes place only outside of family structures have a tendency to call backward or reactionary — as I heard from a leftist on my right — anyone who speaks up in favour of women who do not pursue any salaried professional activity. For my part, I believe that the emancipation of women does not take place only on the professional, economic, and social levels. It takes place also and especially in the family.

As long as women who work at home, educating their children, organizing family life, and managing the family budget have a lower status and fewer advantages than salaried women, emancipation will not be complete. I am not recommending that women return to the kitchen; I am appreciating at its true value the social function performed by the women who devotes herself to the family, and here I am in entire agreement with Mr Lalor. The woman who decides to stay with her children performs a social function of the first importance. The woman who accepts her natural vocation as a mother makes as valid a contribution to society as the woman who is professionally active. Psychologists are unanimous in declaring that a small child needs its mother. It needs a fixed point of reference and a stable and durable emotional tie. This function cannot be completely and perfectly fulfilled by a nursery or day-care centre. The mother, and she alone, possesses all the qualifications to fill this educational and above all emotional role. Our Assembly recently held a debate on criminality and terrorism. I firmly believe that the absence of the mother during children's early years, and the emotional vacuum in which our children very often find themselves as a result, is one of the deep-rooted causes of the increase in criminality. This, ladies, is my opinion, say what you will. It is possible to fight criminality and terrorism in parliaments, and it is also possible to fight them in the family.

I said a moment ago that I am not on the side of those who favour women's return to the kitchen; I believe that women have a right to the same professional training as men. I protest against the obstacles which masculine society, on the pretext of male intellectual

**Lentz-Cornette**

superiority, has invented to deny women access to professional life. I say that there is no conflict between women's family and professional functions. Rather, they complement one another. But I also say that I favour a well considered choice between the family and the professional function. In a woman's life, there are, roughly speaking, three distinct phases: first comes the period which precedes marriage, the time of professional training and the first professional accomplishments. Then comes the period when she bears and educates her children, the maternal phase where the interests of the child motivate her temporary retirement from professional life. Finally there is the period when the children are educated, and she can resume, if she wishes, her professional activity. I know that the laws which govern the job market do not favour women who have reached their forties and who wish to return to work. Thought must be given to the solution of this problem. It is again a question of bringing about a change in mentality, as has been mentioned here several times already.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to touch for a moment on two problems raised in Mrs Maij-Weggen's report regarding social security. Social security is one of the areas where equality between men and women has remained for the most part a dead letter. I join with the *ad hoc* committee in calling for the immediate application of this directive in all Member States of the Community. Social security does not concern only salaried women; it also concerns women at home, who are very often at the mercy of their husbands. It is necessary to provide, in the next few years, an entire legal and financial programme to ensure social security. Social discrimination between men and women must be eliminated, while avoiding the introduction of a new discrimination between salaried women and women who stay at home.

Our committee held lengthy discussions on the subject of abortion, finally retaining among its conclusions the idea that abortion can only be considered as a last resort. For my part, I believe that abortion is always a drama and a failure, and several of us here have already said the same. It is an individual and social failure. All possible measures must be taken to prevent recourse to this final and irrevocable act. Our committee had good reason to stress the need to reduce the number of abortions. I am convinced that effective measures of prevention and guidance will be able to put limits on this social tragedy. Sexual education and information are particularly important in this respect. Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the discussion we are holding today temporarily concludes the debate on the situation of women. It should not be a conclusion in itself. We have made the necessary analysis and come up with a diagnosis. We have identified the remedies. The real work has only just begun. Now it is a matter of putting our good intentions into practice. For our part, we can do this best in our respective committees, which should study the different aspects

of the question and determine the priorities. Our Assembly has shown Europe that it is determined to improve the status of women. Our permanent committees must proceed with what the Assembly has begun.

(Applause)

**President.** — I wish to draw the attention of the House to the decisions concerning Rules 30 and 31 of the Rules of Procedure on speaking adopted by the Bureau on 26 April 1967 and 22 September 1968 and communicated at the sittings of 11 May 1967 and 6 October 1969. The first part states that, with a view to ensuring a lively debate, speakers should as far as possible refrain from reading their speeches. I should like to remind the House of this. It would make both debates more lively and, in certain cases, shorter if speakers were not tied to their manuscripts.

I call Mrs Maij-Weggen on a point of order.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, I have just told Mr Lalor that a rather nasty mistake has crept into the French text, and I now understand that Mrs Lentz-Cornette has come across the same mistake, which has probably resulted in the criticism she has just voiced on a specific point. The English and French versions contain a sentence which says exactly the opposite of what is meant. The beginning of paragraph 36 should read: 'Feels, however, that abortion must be regarded as a last resort,' whereas the text in these two languages says something like 'Feels that abortion must not be regarded as a last resort'. Mr President, that is a basic political difference. Members should therefore bear in mind that the correct version is that in the five other languages and that the English and French translations are incorrect. A corrigendum will be drawn up, but I would refer all Members reading the French and English versions to the rather serious political mistake in paragraph 36.

**President.** — Thank you Mrs Maij-Weggen, it is a mistake to which I would draw Parliament's attention. Although it is scarcely possible to table an amendment now the mistake can be noted and recorded in the minutes and the final resolution.

I call Mr Seligman.

**Mr Seligman.** — Mr President, my colleague, Mr Forth, accused the Maij-Weggen report of being irresponsible and misguided. He accused it of calling for unrealistic commitments and said it would mean a cutback in other areas of the Community. I dissociate myself entirely from Mr Forth's remarks and I also dissociate Miss Roberts from these remarks. They are chauvinistic and unacceptable. I suppose that, if there was a budget deficit, Mr Forth would be against even

## Seligman

childbirth. So don't let us listen to that attitude at all! The Maij-Weggen recommendations are comprehensive and cover the whole field. I concede it may take a little longer to achieve these ends unless we get the economic recovery that will make this possible and pay for it.

Part II of the Maij-Weggen Report, the explanatory statement, is a first-class document. It is a remarkable document that should be widely read throughout the world. I only criticize Part I, the motion for a resolution, which is much too one-sided. It reflects the needs and aspirations of the career woman but pays much too little attention to the mother whose ambition is to bring up a happy family and for whom motherhood is not just an interruption in her career between the ages of 25 and 35. In fact, motherhood is a word that appears in the resolution only in connection with contraception, which is a means of avoiding motherhood, and that is really a denial of the dignity of motherhood.

The fundamental problem is that the cost of living is now so high that wives are forced to go out to work of course, this leaves the children to fend for themselves. Often they come home to an empty house, and this in turn, as speakers have said, breeds vandalism and hooliganism. So I ask the rapporteur to include in her resolution some new paragraphs stressing the importance of the *mère de famille* as opposed to the career woman. I agree with Miss De Valera and the previous speaker on this. In particular we want tax incentives to make the mother's job in the home easier and to enable her to bring up her children and husband in a good family life. Women must not suffer economically if they decide to do the job of motherhood properly. Nor should they suffer socially or culturally or intellectually for taking up this sacrifice which should be rewarded with praise and recognition. Surely a successful family life is the ultimate fulfilment of many women's lives. Despite what Mr Johnson said, this is a concept which men do not fully grasp.

The second recommendation on the resolution is that education should not be provided only for career women. We should devise some way of providing education in the home and some mental stimulation for mothers who stay at home. Finally, the resolution should make some mention of the fact that re-establishing economic growth in the Community is absolutely essential, so that the standard of living can rise and so that women are not forced by economic necessity to go out to work, against their wills. If you put these amendments in the resolution, it will restore the balance towards motherhood and against the career life for women.

**Mr Zighdis.** — (EL) Mr President, I have been following the debate with a great deal of interest as well as gloom and despondency. The interest is due to the standard of the debate, the despondency to the

subject. What in fact is the subject? It is the fact that we live in a society where half the members do not have the same opportunities as the other half to fully develop their personalities. Let us not beat about the bush. The fact of the matter is that we have condemned women in our society to have fewer possibilities to develop their personalities than men. It is perhaps the biggest failing of our society and a blot on our civilization. I wanted to speak to congratulate the Bureau and the members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, and especially the rapporteur for the excellent report she presented to us. The comments are objective and the proposals definite. It remains now for the Commission to draw up a list of priorities in order to lead up the process of converting the proposals into positive results. I also consider it my duty, even if my speech does go on too long, to express my gratitude to the *Ad Hoc* Committee, which says that the Commission has a duty to concern itself with the question of women in Greece from the very first months of our accession to the Common Market, since a problem already exists, and now is the best time for the Commission to intervene as it may get results which otherwise might take at least ten years to be achieved. The position of Greek women is not as it was presented by my colleagues in the New Democracy Party and the Communist Party. The two extremes are always prone to exaggeration. We representatives of democratic socialism, the representatives of the Union of the Democratic Centre, which I have the honour to lead, will give you a correct picture. We shall give you all the details so that today, within the family of the Ten, we can tackle together the common problem of equality between women and men.

The Greek constitution provides for equality between men and women, but so far it is a dead letter because, as we approach 1982 when the Civil Code was due to be reviewed and updated, the bill drawn up by the committee, which was set up in 1976 for this purpose, is still not on the statute book. It is still no more than a bill and it is in danger of not being adopted because the present conservative government is afraid of even the most moderate reforms recommended by Professor Gazis. The present family law places women in a subordinate role in the family. The husband has all the major responsibilities. A legal arrangement of this type is unacceptable in our society and times. There is also the institution of the dowry which is an anachronism that is resented by contemporary society. Equally, however, the laws against contraception and abortion are hopeless because they lead to crimes being committed to which we hypocritically turn a blind eye. On the other hand the institutional and legal frameworks concerned with labour, social security, education and political rights have progressed in Greece much further than in many other countries, and even further than in some countries in the EEC. Although it seems that women in Greece have made progress in these areas, the reality is quite different owing to prejudice and the absence of an infrastructure. I shall explain immediately what I mean by this term 'infra-

**Zighdis**

structure' as it is quite simple. There are no crèches, no kindergartens, nor suitable help to allow the working woman to devote herself to her work or profession in such a way that she can carry out her job without distraction. This is the first hurdle. The second is prejudice, the age-old tradition which requires that women work as housewives in their husband's home. In these circumstances employers always find it possible to give no end of excuses for paying women lower wages than men. Women do not reach the decision-making levels in organizations, whether they be in public services or private businesses. There are very few women in Greece who are managers of private businesses. Even in the civil service it is very rare to see a woman become an ambassador or director-general of a ministry, or taking on a really important department. The extent to which women are involved in political life is extremely limited. In the Chamber of Deputies we have only five or six women. We came here as a delegation of twenty-four parliamentarians and there is not one woman amongst us. This is the most outstanding example of the difference between what we say and what we actually do. Nevertheless, colleagues, we should be proud of our Greek women, and we Greek men are. In all of the national struggles, in all the struggles for democracy and in all the social struggles women have been in the front line. We Greek men admire them and turn to them in times of difficulty but, when we should be giving them equal rights with men, we say to them 'it's better if you sit there and take care of us'. The first to try and make Greek men change this attitude were women like Kalliroe Paren, who at the start of the century was one of the most outstanding feminists in the whole of Europe, and Avra Theodoropoulou, who from 1920 onwards carried the banner for women's suffrage and spent the whole of her life, until her death at an advanced age, fighting for the right of all Greek women to vote and to stand as candidates in elections.

Gentlemen, we in the party which I have the honour of leading feel that there is a need not just for fine words but for action as well. For this reason, in spite of the fact that we have given women members the same rights as men, we have set up a special women's organization whose aim is to fight for equality between men and women in Greek society.

Consequently, I am extremely satisfied and pleased to come here and witness, on my first appearance in the European Parliament, problems which concern us in Greece being discussed.

Gentlemen, we who were in favour of Greece's accession to the European Community believed that the cooperation of the Greek people with the progressive peoples of Europe would ensure a better society for everyone. I believe that as a result of this debate a rapid increase in the standard of living not only of Greek women, but also of all women in Europe, will be brought about through the cooperation of Greek women with those women who are struggling in the

other nine countries in Europe. For this reason, Mr President, I shall repeat my request for the Commission to take up the matter of Greek women as soon as possible. This is an area where the direct benefits of Greece's accession to the Common Market can be demonstrated most fruitfully. And if we have women on our side the idea of European unity will have both a logical and emotional basis, and you know that there is no power greater than this combination of logic and sentiment which is now being shown by Greek women who are fighting for equal rights.

**President.** — I call Mrs Lizin.

**Mrs Lizin.** — (*F*) Mr President, we have heard many speeches today, both good and bad. Some have asserted that the family is the ideal social order; others have mentioned poetry — fortunately, up to now we have been spared the 'feminine mystique'. Is it 'poetry' when, at 23, a woman finds herself alone with two children and, if she is lucky, a seamstress' diploma in a region where there are no more jobs? Where is the 'poetry of the family' when someone who, like me, is a magistrate in a small town, and finds herself dissolving as many marriages as she has performed over the same period? Is it 'poetry' when, at seventeen, a girl finds herself a mother without financial resources because there was no-one who dared to show her how to obtain an abortion, or when she must bear the psychological scars of an abortion performed in abominable circumstances? Is it 'poetry' when, as the widow of a small farmer, in addition to your grief you find yourself suddenly classed as a minor before the law, with no right to go on running the farm which you built up with your husband? Is it 'poetry' when both husband and wife are unemployed, obliged to live on a barely adequate income and to be sneered at by those who think of the unemployed as parasites? This is not poetry, but hypocrisy, the kind of hypocrisy which forces men to believe themselves strong and women to behave like dependent minors, the kind of hypocrisy which often speaks in public about the role of the family while trying to draw the veil over prostitution, the kind of hypocrisy which asserts that women must always accept maternity as a happy event.

The report presented to us — despite its many shortcomings — has at least the merit of not indulging in hypocrisy of this sort. It takes into account the concrete realities of the lives of women, and if some consider the list too lengthy, I can only say that the difficulties are many. What are these realities? The economic and social setbacks experienced by all workers in the present readjustment process of capitalist forces affects women very seriously. Their right to work is compromised to a greater degree than that of men by the changes now taking place. Entire factories — I will use an example in Belgium, the FN — are laying off their unqualified workers — that is, those with a seamstress' diploma — while in the same

## Lizin

factory men are being hired to work machines. Their right to unemployment compensation is being attacked in each of the European countries. Unemployed women are the victims, especially in my own country, of an attempt to strengthen the discrimination which justifies the reduction of their already small allocations on the basis of their family situation, and not on the basis of their right to work. These measures aim at considerably reducing allocations for those who are not 'heads of families,' and are contrary to the directive on social security. Delays in the application of this directive tend to render it ineffective, and our wish, which is contained in an amendment I proposed to Mrs Maij-Weggen's report, is that the Commission propose measures to expedite action on this specific point.

Time is very important today for working women. The crisis does not allow them to wait. The European authorities will demonstrate their concern for the situation of workers, and particularly women workers, by constructing a true employment policy and a sectorial industrial policy. We are engaged in building an economic community, and this is the primary factor which the Commission and the Council must take into account.

I will also speak of a particular category of working women, women in agriculture, whose labour goes unrecognized in European society. Women in agriculture are rarely in charge; they are usually assistants, who, in addition to keeping house, also do work on the farm. Their work is considered to be of negligible economic value. In reality, in each agricultural unit, there is a part — certainly at least half — of the labour which is based on the work of these women. The Socialists, therefore, have proposed measures which were incorporated into Mrs Maij-Weggen's report and which are aimed at providing access to professional training for women working in agriculture, to extend the system of social protection regarding maternity, widowhood, invalidity benefits, and the protection of professional status, by means of a directive concerning company law. In the report we have called upon the Commission to provide funding for replacement personnel so that women in agriculture can have a minimum amount of time available either to obtain training or to devote themselves to defending their rights. To achieve development in the areas we are discussing, however, there are not many choices open to us. Women must demand power; they must choose to involve themselves personally in the fight. The good will of allies must certainly not be rejected: the Commission has been such an ally in many cases and for many years. I would like to give credit here, through the Commission, to Mrs Nonon. The Council, on the other hand, has not shown the same good will.

The Commission could, I understand, continue in this direction in a very concrete way, for a vacant post might very soon permit the designation of a woman

director. I think everyone knows to whom I am referring: Miss Nielsen. Allies, however, even if they include the Commission, can never take the place of a personal will to acquire power. And when one sees the reactions set off in the minds of men, here and elsewhere, by the demand for equality, it is to be feared that one day women will estimate their strength at its true value and at last demand their right to superiority!

**President.** — I call Mr Glinne.

**Mr Glinne** — (*F*) Mr President, it is with satisfaction and a certain pride as well that I take part in this debate, which is one of the most significant held since the direct election of the European Parliament.

Satisfaction and pride because it is owing to the proposal and the insistence of the Socialist Group that the *ad hoc* committee on women's rights was created. The quality of the work accomplished by the members of this committee, the interest shown in this debate by members of Parliament and particularly by the representatives of European women's groups, the relevance of what has been said here by Socialist and other Members — all this proves that the Socialist Group and the Parliament as a whole judged rightly when they decided a year ago to create the *ad hoc* committee on women's rights, which since that time has met regularly under the chairmanship of our colleague Yvette Roudy.

The particular interest felt by our group in the problem of women's rights should not be surprising to anyone. In fact, feminism and socialism are intimately connected. I would even say, as François Mitterrand did on 5 May, the day of women and of Europe, that feminism and socialism should be inseparable. For us socialists, the battle waged by feminists and by women who are not of socialist convictions should be more than a simple demand for equality between men and women, for that would lead only to equality within a system whose very structures are being re-evaluated. It is at this point that the struggle of women becomes part of the struggle of all socialists, for, as Maria Delourdes Pintasingo very rightly said, 'In women all forms of domination are recapitulated, and for this reason the revolutionary potential of their movement is immense.' Or, again, from the same author, 'The society whose validity is in question is not that of one country or another, or one regime or another, but it is rather a society which already envelops all other societies and within which it becomes impossible for any national group to forge a new destiny for itself.'

Mr President, through its refusal of any type of domination, but also through its international dimension, the struggle of women is, must be, and must go on being the struggle of all socialists.

Ladies and gentlemen, is it necessary to underline here in this Assembly, which has many times sought to

## Glinne

defend human rights wherever they are violated, that the liberation of women carries within itself and presupposes all other forms of liberation for human beings, for workers, for those who are still colonized, for the young, etc.? In the poem, *Queen Mab*, Shelley had already written in 1813: 'Can man be free if woman is in slavery?' The liberation of women is connected with the liberation of all human beings. The degrees of freedom enjoyed by women, in every society, is thus the standard for measuring freedom in general. In order to be truly free, women must participate in all forms of social, political, cultural, and economic activity, particularly through access to all forms of training and to all professions. It is necessary to emphasize that integration into the system of production is not sufficient in itself to assure women's liberation, for, obviously, the woman who has a tiring and unsatisfying job on an assembly line is exploited to the same degree as is her male co-worker. The liberation and the struggle of women are irrevocably bound to the struggle of men for another form of work organization, based on an economy meant to serve man. This is why we socialists consider the humanization of work and the reduction of working time to be of the first importance. Such a reduction should not only permit a new distribution of available work but also it should contribute to a better development of both men and women and permit them to better fulfil their family obligations.

On this point, it would be an error to underestimate the economic importance of domestic tasks. It would also be an error not to take into account the importance for children of time spent in the family. It is another error, however, to believe that only women should perform the housekeeping tasks, should bear the responsibility of caring for and educating the children. Paternity involves the same responsibility, the same fundamental duties as does maternity. The mutual respect felt by both members of the couple living together suggests that these duties be shared.

Although we socialists are in favour of the reduction of working time for everyone, men and women alike, we are firmly opposed to the development of part-time work. Such work creates within a company two kinds of workers: full-time workers on the one hand, and on the other workers who do not participate fully in the life of the company and who often have no chance for promotion, while when lay-offs occur they are the first to fall victim to unemployment. Instead of demanding part-time work for some, we ask for the reduction of working hours for all, in order that all men and women who wish to do so can participate in economic life while retaining sufficient free time to devote to the family, to leisure, to socio-cultural activities, etc.

As François Mitterrand said with much firmness and clarity of vision: 'One of the first battles on the European level should be this one: the application in each Member State of the best social and human legislation, a legislation which most favours justice, liberty, and

the conquest of that fundamental law without which there can be no civilized society. We will fight for equal salaries, for the reduction of working hours, for employment, and for the creation of the necessary collective organizations. We wish', he concluded, 'to transform the economic structures and therefore the social structures and the relationships of production which generate slavery, alienation, and the exploitation of men by men and of women by men.' As I said at the beginning, feminism and socialism are truly inseparable.

*(Applause from the left)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Schleicher.

**Mrs Schleicher.** — *(D)* I should like to thank the President for adding another half-hour, even though he previously thought that six hours would be quite sufficient to discuss the problems. But the extensive report and also the motions for resolutions that have been tabled show in themselves that the questions that have been raised here simply cannot be discussed in a very short time and probably cannot be permanently overcome with just one report. The statement that Mr Glinne has just made shows that political opinions differ on how the objectives should be achieved and that woman's freedom of choice to decide which she prefers, work in the home or outside, raises, of course, a number of problems and the goals associated with this cannot simply be achieved by means of a given economic order.

In this context, I should like to refer to the statement by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul. She believes that the problems women face can only be solved by means of a fair distribution of working time under a planned economic policy. I must say on behalf of my group that we hold the opposite view, that a planned labour market cannot solve the problems. What we believe is that it will be easier to get to grips with the problems by increasing the range of part-time work because, if the labour market is subject to fixed rules and working hours are prescribed, it will be impossible to work more than the set hours when necessary, and in addition, those who might perhaps be interested only in short working hours would not be able to find employment. We believe in the compatibility of the employment of women and work in the home for a given period, when women are needed, and this, I believe, is possible only if there is a wider range of part-time work.

Referring to the Socialists' suggestion that the problems women face can only be solved with Socialist policy, I must say that I do not know any country in the world that has so far managed to solve all the problems, not even those which call themselves Socialist. We hope we can find joint solutions in discussions with men and women. In this respect, I am also grate-

**Schleicher**

ful to the Greek Member who pointed out that, although the 24 Greeks who have now joined our Parliament are very active, they do not include any women. But we can well imagine that after the direct elections in Greece in October we will have Greek women in Parliament, who can then join in the discussions on these problems in the committee.

*(Applause from the centre)*

I presume that this reaction was meant ironically. I am pleased to see that you too have applauded. I should like to revert to a point which I consider particularly important. We have called for the resolution and the report to be discussed thoroughly once again in our committees, because they contain a great deal of inflammatory material, and I therefore feel each committee should once again give detailed consideration to matters falling within its terms of reference, so that it is known exactly what Parliament's opinion is on the details as well.

I am happy that we have had the whole day to discuss this report. I would also like to point out that the Bundestag will probably be devoting a whole day to matters specifically concerning women in March, since we have submitted a report which the Bundestag called for and which will then be debated. I would also point out that we were particularly interested to see how full the gallery has been. Most of these visitors — the majority of them women, of course — have an immediate interest in the subject, and since the direct elections I cannot recall a debate during which a given problem has met with such interest. I thank the public for their interest, but I also hope the reports truly reflect what has been said here, because the women who have come are very interested and because those who were unable to attend because our gallery is not large enough are at least as interested. I therefore hope that our debate has not been simply a debate amongst ourselves, but that it will be carried to the outside and steps will be taken to ensure that everyone knows how we are tackling this problem and what solutions we offer that as far as possible do equal justice to both men and women.

*(Applause from the centre)*

**President.** — I call Mr Clinton.

**Mr Clinton.** — Mr President, I want first of all to pay my tribute to the rapporteur, Mrs Maij-Weggen, and to the chairman and members of the committee, who have worked so hard and put so much research over the past twelve months into the position of women in Europe. This report contains much valuable information and some recommendations which, I believe, will have wide support in this House.

That is not to say, however, that I personally can support everything said in this report, and I am refer-

ring particularly to paragraph 36, which refers to abortion. Now Mrs Maij-Weggen herself has corrected what is said here, but even with the change that she has indicated to the Parliament, it does say that abortion is permissible more or less as a last resort. I want to make my position quite clear: under no circumstances could I go along the line towards abortion, for abortion is hideous murder of the helpless innocent, and it cannot be otherwise described. In the past year-and-a-half, we have had many discussions here in which we expressed our disapproval and our aversion to violence in various parts of the world; yet here we have people who are prepared to campaign for the murder of unborn children. When I hear the casual and callous way in which some Members of this Parliament can even refer to the termination of a pregnancy, when in fact it is this hideous murder of innocent human beings, I am appalled and I cannot understand how anybody could give it any support whatsoever. This matter should not be avoided; I do not reproach the rapporteur for bringing this into her report; for it is a fact of life, and one which must be considered seriously. But it must be considered only to be condemned and condemned out of hand, because it is no solution to the undoubted anguish that people who find themselves in this position feel at such a time. What we should all be thinking of is how to overcome all thought of such a terrible way to deal with the unfortunate situation of an unwanted pregnancy. That is the only way we should look at it; and unless paragraph 36 is changed, I personally will have to vote against the report.

I have no time to deal with a report which I consider very important and extremely valuable, a report which, as I say, contains an immense amount of valuable information. Nobody can deal with it in a few minutes. I just want to say, therefore, that in my view — and I have reared a large family — there is no substitute for the care and the love and the affection provided by a mother in the home. I have every evidence of that. The first thing the children do when they come home is to open the door and shout: 'Mom, mom!'. If she answers, there is nothing in particular that they need but they want to know that she is there. That means their security; and there is no substitute for this, whatever you do to enable women to go out to work. One of the faults I find in this report is that it would make it easier and even attractive for people to go out to work. I think that is most unfortunate. What we should be doing is trying to elevate the importance of the mother in the home and by every means that we can find, to encourage people to remain at home while their families are young and rear them, because I have no doubt in my mind that when both parents have to go out to work, that is the start of delinquency; it is the start of young people going wrong, and God knows where it ends. It is very unfortunate but that is the case and of that I am absolutely convinced.

I know how inadequate my contribution has been to this debate, it was extremely important to me that I

**Clinton**

should express my view on this. I did not take part in the committee's work. I am sorry now that I was not a member of the committee. I do not think the work on this report would have gone on for fourteen months if I had been: I should have broken it up before that, because I think it is too comprehensive; it contains too much and it would have been much better to confine itself to a smaller number of points that could be pursued and achieve something. I am quite sure that the rapporteur, too, when she is concluding, will advocate priorities which really are meant to be worked on from now on.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Vayssade.

**Mrs Vayssade.** — *(F)* Mr President, we have reached the conclusion of a very important and interesting debate. Contrary to what Mr Forth was saying a moment ago, I do not believe that this report was made simply because the committee existed, but rather because in the countries of Europe there are certain problems encountered by women in their daily lives. I believe that our Parliament is now obliged to make some choices if the report is to be anything more than a Utopian document reflecting only good intentions. Mr Forth was right on this point: it is a question of choices to be made if we really want some of the proposals in this report to become the reality of the future feminine condition. In order for this to be accomplished, it is important that in this Parliament we continue to pay close attention to the problems of women, or at least be mindful of the feminine perspective regarding the general problems with which we must deal. In her report, Mrs Maij-Weggen proposed the dissolution of our committee, and that it should be re-formed after two years to evaluate, together with Parliament, the work accomplished in the intervening period. I agree with this proposal, but I think it will only be effective if, during this time, there remains a body in Parliament whose task it will be to check whether what we have put in the report has been remembered by Parliament as a whole, and for this reason we have presented an amendment. The Socialist Group proposes the creation of a supervisory committee, a lightweight structure of only 20 or 25 members, who would meet four times a year at the most — I think that would be sufficient — but who, in following the general work of the Parliament, what goes on in the committees, and the principal debates, could make sure that the problems and rights of women have really been taken into account. I will not speak longer of this, for I think that the Socialist Group has nearly used up its time, but I would like to urge Parliament to follow us in this direction, so that we may have a feminine consciousness on the alert in this Assembly for the entire length of our term.

**President.** — I call Mr Coutsecheras.

**Mr Coutsocheras.** — *(EL)* Thank you, Mr President, I shall be very brief as time is running out, and limit myself to the following facts. In 1979 the Women's Union of Greece, which has close ties with Pasok, carried out a study on women in the Common Market in an attempt to determine what effect Greece's accession to the Common Market would have. Would women receive any real benefits from Greece's accession to the Common Market? The position which the Women's Union of Greece took was that the Common Market, by its very nature, and in view of its aims and objectives, is not interested in promoting even basic rights for women. The six countries on whose initiative the Common Market was formed wanted to create a large market in which they could move freely without being hindered by national protective measures. The basic aim was clear from the start — to strengthen the capitalist structure and to develop production within a capitalist system. The Community is an exclusively materialistic brotherhood which has not been able so far to present itself in a humane light. The Europe of the large industrialists and the multinational groups is only concerned with promoting the economic interests of its member countries. Mr President and colleagues, insofar as the system is based on accumulating capital for profit, the Community is in no position to take an interest, even indirectly, in the struggle for women's liberation, because this would require a reorganization of society which would lead to an increase in production costs. Women's liberation means changing the system and changing society. It is for this very reason that we must struggle at the political level for women's liberation. As regards our strategy within the framework of the existing system our objective is to achieve whatever improvement we can in the situation of women through the cooperation of men and women. Mr President and colleagues, for this reason Pasok will support the proposal and women in Europe may be sure that the women of Pasok will fight side by side with them for reforms without forgetting their ultimate long-term goal, which is to liberate both men and women and to replace the present social system with socialism.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

**Mrs Squarcialupi.** — *(I)* Mr President, I wished to stress the active role played by Italians of the Communists and Allies Group in the work of the *ad hoc* committee on women's rights. Unfortunately we cannot say we are satisfied with this report because we think that at most it would result in a certain measure of equality without changing society itself, a society which commonly rejects those who are not healthy, strong, and productive and which today rejects even those who are: one has only to consider the nearly 8 million unemployed in the Community countries, to whom must now be added the unemployed of Greece.

**Squarcialupi**

We are now faced with a society and an organization of work which slowly alienates all citizens when the economic powers, the spontaneous and unplanned productive mechanisms, no longer have need of them.

This report shows a tendency to create a sort of trench to shelter women instead of making them active subjects in the improvement of society. It tells women to accept society as it is and it reserves a small place for them.

It is still possible, however, to improve this report by means of amendments. With our amendments we wanted to abolish all ghettos, even if some appear to be positive, like the special fund for women. Instead, we call for the integration of women's problems with all Community policies.

Concerning the family business — a frequent phenomenon in many of our countries — we ask not for a mere law, but for legislative harmonization, so that the feelings of women will no longer be exploited. We ask that businesses become productive so that they may ensure assistance in case of maternity, illness, or old age, without placing a burden on other categories of workers. We offer precise indications for agricultural undertakings concerning infrastructures, administrative structures, and the establishing of industries related to agriculture. With our amendments, we ask for clarity regarding the reduction of working time and we reject the concept of part-time work. Such positions should not be presented as a gift to women, for in reality they only represent a way of diverting their attention from unemployment and exploiting them profitably. Part-time work is just a means of keeping women in a subordinate position at home, in the family, and also on the job.

Our last amendment asks that the problem of own resources of the Community be confronted beginning with the 1982 budget. If we do not solve this problem, none of the things we have requested for women can be realized, for the meager resources at present available to the Community will go on being moved from one sector to another, displeasing large groups of citizens, especially among the weakest. This is a political amendment which we present to a committee which has sometimes shown itself to be very timid when faced with profoundly political proposals.

Mr President, I will conclude with a reference to what I have heard said here concerning the consequences of women's extra-domestic employment on terrorism. We hear that when women work, when women have an activity outside the home, terrorism and drugs are the result. As an Italian I unfortunately have a certain experience of terrorism and I can assure you that in very few cases do mothers of terrorists work outside the home. We would be obliged to conclude that, since terrorists usually have a father who works, the blame must be the father's, but this is certainly not a

thesis we support, for we consider it disgraceful to hide true problems behind false ones.

**President.** — I call the Commission.

**Mr Ivor Richard, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, with great respect, I have sat here since 9 o'clock this morning, which is ten and a half hours, listening to various Members of Parliament requesting that the Commission should take action in many different fields. It really would seem to me much more sensible if I were to answer their requests at an hour when perhaps they would find it more convenient to be present, namely tomorrow morning, rather than now!

**President.** — With the agreement of the House I propose that Mr Richard should be called to reply to the debate immediately at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

I call Mr Enright.

**Mr Enright.** — Mr President, I just wish to say that I agree absolutely with the Commissioner. It seems to me that it is quite disgraceful that people who knew the Commissioner would be speaking tonight are not here. I would suggest that, if a vote were taken of those Members who are now present, we would get an overwhelming decision that the Commissioner should be allowed to speak tomorrow morning rather than now.

**President.** — The debate is suspended.

### 7. Urgent debate

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

- by Mr Turcat, on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research, on the proposals from the Commission to the Council on financial support for projects to exploit alternative energy sources (Doc. 1-836/80);
- by Mr von Wogau, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on tax-free allowances for travellers within the Community (Doc. 1-861/80);
- by Mr Lynge and others on the relationship between Danish and Greenland catch quotas (Doc. 1-880/80);

**President**

- by Mr Israël and others on President Sadat's visit to the European Parliament and Egyptian participation in the Euro-Arab Dialogue (Doc. 1-882/80);
- by Mr Antoniozzi and others, on Community aid to Calabria for the damage caused by the recent flood (Doc. 1-883/80).

The justification for these requests for urgency are contained in the documents themselves.

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

#### 8. *Membership of political groups*

**President.** — I have been informed that Mr Erhard Jakobsen has joined the European People's Party (CD Group) with effect from today.

#### 9. *Agenda for next sitting*

The next sitting will be held tomorrow, Wednesday, 11 February 1981 with the following agenda:

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

- Vote on the motion for a resolution contained in the Maij-Weggen Report
- Vote on various requests for urgency
- Beumer report on books (continuation of debate)
- Prag report on linking work and training for young persons in the Community

*3 p.m.:*

Presentation of the Fourteenth General Report of the Commission and of its annual programme of work for 1981 (followed by a preliminary statement by the political groups).

*5.30 p.m.:*

Question Time (questions to the Foreign Ministers and the Council).

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 7.30 p.m.)*

## ANNEX

*Formal sitting on the occasion of the visit of Mr Anwar al Sadat, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt**(Prolonged applause greeted Mr Sadat as he entered the Chamber)**Speech by Mrs Veil, President of the European Parliament*

Mr President, this is an outstanding day in the history of the European Parliament and, as its President, it is an unusual privilege for me to welcome you to this chamber and to convey to you, on behalf of all the members of this Assembly, our deep gratitude for the honour which you have paid to us by coming here to address us.

*(Applause)*

Mr President, for all of us and for what we represent, your presence in this Chamber today is deeply symbolic. You preside over the destinies of a great nation whose culture, dating back for thousands of years, has nurtured our European civilization — a country which has once again found its rightful place in the concert of Mediterranean nations without which Europe cannot be Europe. You are also one of the most highly respected leaders of the Arab world with which, for a number of years now, Europe has been seeking to weave the thread of a permanent and constructive dialogue.

You, President Anwar al Sadat, have shared a Nobel Peace Prize with the Israeli Prime Minister, Mr Menachim Begin.

*(Applause)*

You are a statesman whose courage and persistence have helped to achieve, in the Middle East torn for 30 years by the fury of war, something which had seemed beyond belief, the opening of a dialogue across the battle line, leading, through a long and patient process of negotiations, to the signing of a peace treaty between the State of Israel and the Arab Republic of Egypt.

*(Applause)*

You have spared neither time, nor effort nor energy to achieve the impossible. You are a man of dialogue, a dialogue which you are unstintingly pursuing in a bid to find answers to the many outstanding problems which must be solved if a just and lasting global settlement is to be found to the Middle East conflict. You, like us, are firmly committed to peace: your people and the people of Israel today know the meaning of peace on the frontier between your two countries. At the same time, with stable institutions behind you, you are guiding your country, under difficult political and

economic circumstances, along the path of economic and social development. Against the backdrop of an assured peace, you have been able to devote renewed efforts to the well-being of all Egyptians. Europe wishes to play its part in safeguarding this peace, acquired at such cost, and in the development of Egypt's resources. The European Parliament is convinced that a strong Europe can and must throw its whole weight behind the maintenance and strengthening of stability in the world. We are deeply concerned by any focus of tension liable, by its gravity, to place world peace at risk. We are the first to be concerned by the Middle East conflict since it directly affects the security of our continent and the complex network of traditional ties and bonds created through the community of interests between your region and Europe.

In welcoming you here today, the European Parliament does not merely wish to give practical expression to that community of interests. It also wishes to give you the opportunity, as a pilgrim of peace, to take a new step forward in the search for a global solution to the Middle East problem. Need I recall that on three occasions in the past your action in the cause of peace has been supported by the European Parliament. In December 1977, our Assembly welcomed your bold initiative for a historic meeting with Mr Menachem Begin and urged the governments of the Member States to encourage, in the context of Community activities, progress towards a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. In November 1978, in a resolution adopted by a substantial majority, the European Parliament welcomed the positive outcome of the Camp David Conference and called upon the Council and Commission to rapidly implement, in cooperation with your country and the State of Israel, multilateral cooperation to foster economic and social development in the region. Finally, on 26 April 1979, this Assembly adopted by an overwhelming majority a resolution in which it warmly welcomed the signing of the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel after 30 years of hostilities, expressed once again its desire to see the European Community establish even closer links, within the framework of political cooperation, with Egypt and Israel, and advocated closer cooperation with the States of this region who wished to contribute to a global peace settlement.

Since the election by direct universal suffrage, our Assembly has not had the opportunity to express its views in a detailed debate on the Middle East ques-

tion. It is therefore all the more willing to listen to you today, Mr President, because you are the bearer of a message of peace and hope. Yours is a cause in which the European Parliament takes a passionate interest. And we are honoured that you have chosen to address today, through their democratically elected representatives, all the peoples of Europe, to convey to them your hopes and also to indicate the part which you would like to see them play in the creation of an area of peace in the Middle East.

Mr President, our views may differ on the ways and means of carrying through this great undertaking. But

when both countries and governments are inspired by an identical resolve to attain the same goal of peace, there is surely no need for us to dwell at length on differences of opinion about the methods to be followed. The dialogue in which you are today inviting us to take part will surely transcend all our differences if we have a shared resolve to attain the goal that we have set for ourselves. There is no doubt in my own mind that this will be the case and, with that deep conviction, I call upon you, Mr President, to address the European Parliament.

*(Loud applause as President Sadat walked to the rostrum)*

### *Speech by President Sadat*

Inch Allah!

Madam President, dear friends, I should like to say a few words in French and a few words in German to express my gratitude for the honour that has been bestowed upon me by giving me the opportunity to address you and address the European people. And then after that I shall be giving my speech in English.

*(F,D)* Madam President, dear friends, I wish to express how deeply I appreciate your kind invitation. I shall speak to you with absolute frankness in the hope that our meeting here today will mark the beginning of a lasting dialogue. This dialogue will enable us to lay the foundations of the new partnership which I shall propose today. I greatly welcome the contribution which each of us can make.

I would ask you to convey to the people of your countries the greetings of the Egyptian people. I wish you every success in the service of Europe and of all the countries of the world.

Madam President, dear friends, thank you and the whole people of Europe whom you represent for affording me this opportunity to meet you and share with you some thoughts on matters of common interest.

At the outset, let me convey to you a message of friendship and amity from every Egyptian. It is certainly a moment of historic significance that we are meeting together at this crossroad to ponder matters of great concern, not only for our peoples, but also for mankind. It is an historic event because we share a tremendous mission and a unique responsibility to improve the quality of life for our generation and the generation to come. This is the lesson of history and such is the dream for a better future.

For several centuries, our forefathers realized, through their vision and historical awareness, the necessity for building bridges of cooperation and interaction among nations. The school of Alexandria, with its library that

dates back to 300 years BC, saved the legacy of Athens and enriched human knowledge with the synthesis of Neo-Platonism. The treasures of the Greco-Roman culture were preserved and annotated. Such scholars as Athenasius, Origen and Clement of Alexandria added generously to our intellectual experience. A few centuries later, the light of the Christian mission spread from our part of the world to Europe, forging a solid foundation for a new set of spiritual values and a new conception of the rights of man.

The advent of Islam added a new dimension to this evergrowing interaction. Mindful of the universal brotherhood of man according to the true Islamic doctrine, Muslim scholars felt duty bound to preserve the Greek and Latin treasures, either in their original form or translated into Arabic, the language of the Koran. Hence, the works of Averroës (in Arabic, ibn-Rushd), Avicenna (in Arabic, ibn-Sina) and Avempace (in Arabic, ibn-Badjdja) became Europe's main window on Greek philosophy and mythology. When Aristotle's book *Secretum Secretorum* was first published in Europe, it was a translation from Arabic into Latin by Roger Bacon. Islamic universities in the Middle East and Europe were the greatest centres of knowledge and intellectual freedom. The contribution of Egypt, home of al-Azhar University, to this process is a fact that needs no elaboration.

The central article of faith in Islam is that mankind is one Community, a Community of believers upholding the same values and ideals.

Let us listen together to what God has told us in the Koran, speaking to our Prophet Mohammed: 'Those who believe in that which is revealed unto thee, and those who are Jews, Christians and Sabeans whoever believe in God and the Day of Judgement and does right. . . surely their reward is with their Lord and no fear shall come upon them nor shall they grieve'.

Islam should never be judged by the misguided and ill-conceived action by some who claim to adhere to this great faith. Islam is a religion of tolerance, not fanaticism,

*(Applause)*

a faith of love, not hatred, and integral system based on order, rather than chaos. An Islamic revolution is, and should be by definition, an act of mercy and justice. First and foremost it is the embodiment of human dignity and freedom.

History has taught us, dear friends, that there is no substitute for cooperation and coexistence. The bitter conflict that erupted over Jerusalem proved to us the futility of war and the fallacy of exclusive control over that city which is sacred to all believers. As such, it should remain forever the symbol of peace and harmony. The Arabs and Muslims, who were the custodians of that holy city for centuries, realized their obligation to keep it open to all the faithful regardless of creed or nationality.

*(Applause)*

We must receive this tradition and set in Jerusalem a model for human fraternity and togetherness. While the city must function as an integral unit for the benefit of all its inhabitants and visitors, the historical as well as legal and spiritual rights of all believers should be respected. I hereby urge you to join with us in a determined effort to achieve such a goal.

*(Applause)*

*(Mr Capanna held up a banner with the words 'You must recognise the PLO — no to Camp David')*

Rest assured, I have not come here to sell Camp David!

*(The House disassociated itself from the demonstration by Mr Capanna by loudly applauding President Sadat)*

Dear friends, I strongly disagree with the voices of doom and gloom which predict the collapse of Western civilization. I believe that Europe, with its resourcefulness and rich cultural heritage, is uniquely qualified to play a prominent role in the world of today. The evolution of modern democracy and the industrial revolution which led to present-day technology are great assets that should be fully utilized in order to make the world more secure and just. The degree of unity which you achieved here, in Europe after years of hard work and dedication is certain to revitalize the entire continent and instil in it a new sense of purpose. This unity, which is symbolized by this Parliament, is an inspiration to many nations in different corners of the world.

Let me propose to you, the elected representatives of Europe, the establishment of a new partnership between Europe and our part of the world. I am referring here not only to the Middle East and Africa, but to the Third World at large. Such partnership should be based on a firm belief in the oneness of our destiny and the similarity of our interests. Afro-Asian countries should not be regarded as a source of raw materials or a market for manufactured goods. A healthy partnership should be founded on a code of ethics, because interests alone cannot sustain our existence. 'You shall not live by bread alone.' We must maintain a sense of justice, equality and opportunity for all. Old practices of exploitation and domination should not be allowed to appear again, even in new forms.

We should agree together on a set of principle to guide our interaction and mutual help. Unless we establish a criterion for differentiating between right and wrong... between good and evil, we shall be unleashing the law of the jungle to destroy the very fabric of our collective existence. A narrow view of self-interest would be an invitation to global chaos at a time when we all seek a new world order based on the rule of law and morality. I cannot subscribe to the notion that morality is a concept that belongs to the past.

*(Applause)*

I was born and brought up in an Egyptian village where morality and spiritual values form the essence of life.

The relationship between the North and the South deserves further attention. The South has suffered much in the past and has legitimate concerns at present. In addition to the accumulated injustice of the past, a new pattern has been emerging of late. The South has become the theatre of devastating wars and warlike actions. This situation should be remedied without delay for our common good. The dialogue which started in Paris in December 1975 paved the way for a more equitable international structure. However, much remains to be done to redress the existing imbalance between the rich and the poor, the developed and the developing, the established and the emerging.

What is needed is not a handout or a charitable contribution. Rather, we propose a healthy partnership based on sharing together whatever we possess of resources, technology and know-how. The transfer of technology is vital for enabling us to overcome the greatest challenge of our time, namely to improve the quality of life and make everyone secure and certain of his future. We want to insure against famines, drought and insufficiency of food. We would like to protect the environment in all Afro-Asian and Latin-American countries before it is too late. We want to improve the quality of education for every child and adult in the

four corners of the world. This is a responsibility we will never neglect.

I propose to you a tripartite agreement for cooperation in this respect between Europe, Africa and the Middle East.

*(Applause)*

Madam President, if we are to create a new world order, we have to adopt a firm stand against the malaise of foreign intervention in the domestic affairs of Third World nations.

*(Applause)*

Unless this dangerous phenomenon is checked without hesitation or ambivalence, we will be imperiling all the gains we made in the twentieth century. Nations' independence will collapse and spheres of influence will replace the old colonial system. What is needed most at this point is the strengthening of the non-aligned movement. This requires a strict adherence to the principle of non-intervention. Big powers and their surrogates are undermining the entire world system as they seek to promote their own interests at the expense of nations which have been suffering for centuries.

*(Applause)*

We are determined to fight this trend to no limit. I urge you to join hands with us.

Let no nation, big or small, arrogate to itself the right to subvert other peoples' way of life. Let there be no imposition, by force or conspiracy, of any given doctrine or socio-economic system. Each and every nation must remain free to choose its own political system without duress or coercion. Let there be no foreign bases on the soil of Third World countries.

*(Applause from certain quarters)*

Let us put an end to this tampering with nations' security and stability. Let us work together to deter such reckless actions of adventurism and aggression. We should never tolerate any abuse of peoples' freedom and dignity.

*(Applause)*

Our overriding commitment is the cementing of the structure of world peace. The elimination of the causes of war is a sacred duty which is incumbent on us, individually and collectively. No people are more aware than you of the devastation and suffering that accompanies any war, be it limited or otherwise. Civilized people should settle their differences, not by killing each other, but by reasoning together in a spirit of mutual accommodation and understanding. We will not do ourselves justice or be faithful to our beliefs until we rule out war as a means for achieving national

ends. If men do not learn to live like brothers, they will die like wild beasts.

*(Applause)*

The Egyptian people, being a community of believers, have not hesitated to take the most formidable risks for the sake of peace. They did so, not out of weakness, but from a position of strength. Only those who are free of fear and who have faith in God and confidence in themselves possess the power to renounce war and make peace.

*(Applause from certain quarters)*

We are determined to pursue this noble goal regardless of any obstacles. This is our destiny and our mission.

The answer to present-day anxiety and uncertainty is not clinging to the unhappy past but paving the way to a better future. To us peace is a strategic commitment rather than a tactical manoeuvre. I visited Jerusalem in November 1977. This was a culmination of a process which began since I assumed my responsibility in 1970. Today, it belongs to all the peoples of the region and the world at large. No one has the right to detract from it or obstruct its path. We shall not allow any interference with that sacred process, for it has become an invaluable part of the heritage of mankind.

The peace we work for is a comprehensive one which benefits all nations. When Egypt took the decision of reopening the Suez Canal to international shipping in 1975, Egypt had in mind the interests of all European peoples, together with other nations.

Now that we have taken a pioneering stride on the road to peace, the people that deserve most of our attention are the Palestinian people. As Egypt did repeatedly during the past few years, Egypt urges you to support their right to self-determination and national dignity. This is their God-given right that cannot be denied under any circumstances.

*(Applause)*

A thoughtless denial of such right is an open invitation to extremism and obstructionism.

The establishment of a Palestinian entity, after a transitional period, would be a positive development to all countries in the region. It poses no threat to the security of Israel. In fact, it is the best guarantee for it. A Palestinian entity, faced with the task of reconstruction and building bridges with other nations, will certainly bear the responsibility of preventing acts of violence and hostility. We should like you to participate with us in persuading both Israelis and Palestinians to accept a formula of mutual and simultaneous recognition.

*(Applause)*

*(Mr Capanna raised a PLO flag)*

I would have preferred that you had raised this flag like we raised it in Mena House with all the parties concerned. We raised this flag in Mena House together with the Israeli flag, but no one cared.

*(Sustained applause)*

We should like you to participate with us in persuading both Israelis and Palestinians to accept a formula of mutual and simultaneous recognition. I think this should be the start of any initiative. We invite you also to take part in additional security guarantees as a European contribution to peace in the Middle East.

Let me repeat, we invite you also to take part in additional security guarantees as a European contribution to peace in the Middle East.

*(Applause from certain quarters)*

Much has been said about the Jordanian option lately. However, this must not blur the picture or confuse discerning minds. Egypt was the first to call for a Jordanian role in the final settlement. But that role, that Jordanian role, should not negate or replace the Palestinian presence. The problem we are confronting today is one involving the Palestinian people, not the Jordanians. Any attempt to solve that problem while ignoring the existence of a distinct people with a Palestinian identity is doomed to failure.

*(Applause)*

Hence, we must not evade the problem or lose sight of its nature. Jordan can participate in the negotiations at the proper stage, but not in the absence of or to the detriment of the Palestinians. A premature Jordanian role would be a complicating factor.

Let me give you a very short history of the Jordanian option and the Jordanian role. Immediately after we started the peace process — as you may remember, the October War was in 1973 and the first disengagement agreement had been reached by January 1974 — I met with King Hussein in Alexandria in the summer of 1974. We issued a joint communiqué in which we stated that a certain link should take place between Jordan and the emerging Palestinian State. Moreover, we said in this communiqué that this link should be completed and declared before we convened in

Geneva, and at that time all our efforts were directed towards convening in Geneva. The head of the PLO agreed in principle, but when he returned to Syria two days after agreeing to the principle which I declared with King Hussein, he denied that he had done so, having in the meantime had a visit from the Soviet Ambassador.

I wanted to give you this short history because I wanted you to know that, starting from the peace process in 1974 and after the first disengagement agreement had been reached, I immediately asked for a Jordanian role and I am still asking for it, but not as a prerequisite to a Palestinian role.

*(Applause)*

Madam President, dear friends, let me seize this opportunity to commend you on your statements on the essentials for peace in the Middle East beginning with the resolution of 15 December 1977. You have properly identified the complex issues and adopted unbiased solutions. On the other hand the Heads of your States have been positive and helpful. We consider the Luxembourg Declaration of December 1980 a turning point which is likely to have a constructive impact on the peace process in the near future. It was a forthcoming endorsement of the gains which have been realized so far and an appeal to all parties concerned to build upon them for the good of all nations.

There are those who get discouraged by the growing challenge of our time. However, I remain optimistic and hopeful. I do believe that it is better to light a candle than to curse the darkness. I can hear the voice of wisdom saying: 'I shall light a candle of understanding in thine heart, which shall not be put out'.

For those who aspire to a better world, I have a promise to sacrifice my life for that goal. And for those who suffer from despair and fear, I have a dream of a new dawn that would rekindle hope in every heart. I have a dream of a new world where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved. Together we shall endeavour until the day comes when they beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks.

*(Standing ovation)*

## SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 1981

## Contents

1. Approval of minutes . . . . .	97	<i>Mr Thorn (Commission)</i> . . . . .	125
2. Votes . . . . .	97	<i>Point of order: Mr Pannella</i> . . . . .	135
<i>Maij-Weggen report (Doc. 1-829/80): Position of women in the Community:</i>		<i>Mr Glinne; Mr Tindemans; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Berlinguer; Mr Bangemann; Mr de la Malène; Mr Skovmand</i> . . . . .	136
<i>Mr Richard (Commission)</i> . . . . .	97		
<i>Point of order: Mr Enright</i> . . . . .	99	4. Question Time . . . . .	145
<i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution:</i>		<i>Questions to the Foreign Ministers:</i>	
<i>Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Squarzialupi; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Squarzialupi; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Squarzialupi; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Dame Shelagh Roberts; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Macciocchi; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Dekker; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Macciocchi; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Squarzialupi; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Macciocchi; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Spinelli; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mrs Martin; Mrs Maij-Weggen</i> . . . . .	100	<i>Question No 92, by Mr Paisley: Extradition:</i>	
<i>Point of order: Mr Klepsch</i> . . . . .	113	<i>Mr Van der Klaauw (Foreign Ministers); Mr Paisley; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr J.D. Taylor; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Pannella; Mr Blaney; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr McCartin; Mr Van der Klaauw</i> . . . . .	146
<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Habsburg; Mr Ryan; Mrs Boserup; Mrs Desmond; Mr Fischbach; Mr Lalor</i> . . . . .	113	<i>Question No 93, by Mr Moreland: Release of Rudolf Hess:</i>	
<i>Mrs Maij-Weggen</i> . . . . .	115	<i>Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Moreland; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Habsburg; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Marshall; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Chambeiron; Mrs Lizin; Mr McCartin; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Schmidt; Mrs Macciocchi; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Van der Klaauw</i> . . . . .	147
<i>Explanation of vote: Mr Vié; Dame Shelagh Roberts; Mr Maher; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Estgen; Mr Del Duca; Mrs Le Roux; Mrs Gaiotti de Biase; Mrs Hoff; Mrs von Alemann; Mr Bersani; Mr Papaevstratiou</i> . . . . .	115	<i>Question No 94, by Mr Berkhower: Diplomatic relations between Greece and Israel:</i>	
<i>Mrs Maij-Weggen</i> . . . . .	120	<i>Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Berkhower; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Marshall; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Israël; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Schwencke; Mr Vlachopoulos; Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Van der Klaauw; Mr Beyer de Ryke</i> . . . . .	148
<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Seligman; Mr Blaney; Mr Romualdi; Mrs Dekker; Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Fanti; Mrs Martin; Mrs Macciocchi; Mrs Lenz</i> . . . . .	120	<i>Question No 95, by Ms Clwyd: Inadmissibility of questions for Question Time:</i>	
<i>Point of order: Mr Pannella</i> . . . . .	123	<i>Mr Van der Klaauw; Ms Clwyd; Mr Van der Klaauw</i> . . . . .	149
<i>Explanation of vote: Mrs Roudy</i> . . . . .	124	<i>Point of order: Mr Albers</i> . . . . .	150
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	124	<i>Mr Howell; Mr Rogers; Mr Hutton; Mr Paisley; Mr Van der Klaauw</i> . . . . .	150
<i>Explanation of vote: Mr Pannella</i> . . . . .	124	<i>Questions to the Council:</i>	
3. Presentation of the Fourteenth General Report of the Commission and its programme of work for 1981 (followed by a debate):		<i>Question No 59, by Mr Adam: Rural areas:</i>	
		<i>Mr Van der Mei (Council); Mr Adam; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Kellett-Bowman; Mr Van</i>	

<i>der Mei; Mr Habsburg; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Hutton; Mr Van der Mei; Mrs Ewing; Mrs Lizin; Miss Brookes; Mr Dalsass; Mr Van der Mei</i> . . . . .	151	<i>Question No 65; by Mr Bøgh: Respect for human rights in Spain:</i>	
<i>Question No 60, by Mr Pedini, Question No 61, by Mr Habsburg, and Question No 62, by Mr Berkhouwer: European passport:</i>		<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Bøgh; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Cecovini; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Balfe; Mr Van der Mei; Lord Douro; Mr Paisley; Mr Blaney; Mr Motchane; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Israël; Mr J.D. Taylor; Mr Van der Mei</i> . . .	155
<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Habsburg; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Berkhouwer; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Herman; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Christopher Jackson; Mr Hahn; Mr Fuchs; Mr Van der Mei</i> . . . . .	153	<i>Question No 66, by Mr Turcat: European industrial market:</i>	
<i>Question No 63, by Mrs Lizin: Regulation on the siting of nuclear power stations on borders:</i>		<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mr Turcat; Mr Welsh; Miss Quin; Mr Van der Mei</i> . . . . .	156
<i>Mr Van der Mei; Mrs Lizin; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Herman; Mr Van der Mei; Mr Fuchs; Mr Van der Mei</i> . . . . .	154	5. <i>Urgent procedure</i> . . . . .	158
		6. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i> . . . . .	158
		<i>Annex</i> . . . . .	159

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

*President*

*(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)*

**President.** — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of minutes*

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

Since there are no comments, the minutes of proceedings are approved.<sup>1</sup>

2. *Votes*

**President.** — The first item on the agenda is the vote on the *motion for a resolution contained in the Maij-Weggen report (Doc. 1-829/80): Position of women in the Community.*

The Commission has the floor.

**Mr Richard, Member of the Commission.** — Madam President, I am grateful to you for giving me the floor this morning. It seemed sensible at the very late hour last night that we should perhaps reserve the comments of the Commission until one or two people who had asked questions were present to hear the answers.

I am very conscious of two facts, having sat through the whole of this debate. One is that I am male, and secondly that I am a member of a wholly male Commission. I must tell the House, however, that short of resigning from the Commission, there is nothing frankly that I can do about either of those facts. In answer to Miss Hooper, the only thing I can say, in some slight mitigation, is that I was at least appointed by a woman to my present position. . .

*(Applause from the European Democratic Group)*

. . . a woman, who I am sure those who are applauding know I did not vote for!

*(Laughter)*

So that perhaps some of the blame for my presence here should be attributed to her sex as well as my own.

Madam President, we have had a long and detailed debate and obviously it is quite impossible for me to deal with the many questions of detail that were raised. I should like to make one general point at the outset and that is that I undertake to look at those points in detail with my cabinet and with the appropriate services in the Commission. I will write to the

<sup>1</sup> Documents received: see Minutes of proceedings.

## Richard

individual Members concerned where we have had an opportunity of examining the problems they raised.

This has been, as I say, a somewhat detailed debate and, I fear, a somewhat diffuse one. It has ranged wide; we have covered economic questions, we have covered the position of women in industry and in other sectors, we have covered the role of the family, abortion, contraception, social security, health, education and, indeed, whether anything at all can be done until the final demise of the capitalist system. It seems to me that the debate has lacked coherence, and it has lacked a theme. Perhaps, Madam President, this was inevitable, given the comprehensive nature of the report itself. As a document of reference the report is, I think, of great value. As a programme of action — action which indeed this House would wish the Commission to take — it is, perhaps, somewhat too wide.

I should like to examine, in what I hope is not too long or detailed a way, how with the massive experience of five weeks in my present position I feel the Commission should now approach its task. What I think we have to do is to look at what indeed we can do with the instruments that are at our disposal. There is no point, I think, at the moment in looking at different instruments or different institutions. I think I have to work, frankly, with what I have got.

We have heard many interesting declarations about the problems faced by women in the Community and indeed in the developing nations. Many who spoke stressed the need for something to be done. I rather regret, however, that the debate did not really come to grips with the problem of defining a strategy of action at Community level. The Community, as I said earlier, has certain specific instruments — legal and financial — which are complementary to those which exist at national or local level. Each time we prepare a new initiative in the Commission, we must I think analyse carefully how we can best use our resources and how we can achieve maximum impact. As we all know, the Commission cannot act alone. Not only must we have the sustained support of this Parliament, to ensure that appropriate human and financial resources are available to prepare and carry out action, we must also be realistic about the feasibility and indeed the desirability of intervention at Community level.

Madam President, I think we should prepare for our battles carefully one by one, recognizing our weaknesses and using our strengths. This means a careful selection of priorities within the context of a longer-term strategy. On many issues the Commission's most powerful tool is that of information, and I agree with those Members of Parliament who have stressed the need for information in this field — it is a point that was raised by many speakers — information to ensure that women are aware of their legal rights, information about innovatory action in order to publicize what can be done, information about the women's

movement at all levels to increase the general awareness about the pressure of changes. I am pleased so many references to the need for information activities are in the draft resolution and the Commission will certainly look closely into the best ways of reinforcing our activity in this field.

The legislative potential of the Community institutions are of course a powerful means of action. The basic foundations of a legal framework establishing the principle of equality of treatment are now in place. Much of our work must therefore now focus on exploiting those instruments to the full. And the draft resolution makes many helpful suggestions in this direction.

I should like to inform the Parliament that the report on the implementation of the second equal-treatment directive has just been approved by the Commission and is shortly to be forwarded to the Council and to Parliament.

Also, within the framework of the implementation of that directive, the Commission is carrying out a study on the situation of self-employed women — two studies are also being carried out on the laws protecting women's employment and on the desegregation of employment in banks.

Finally, and also in connection with the second directive, infringement proceedings have been instituted against several Member States for non-compliance with the directive in question, as was also the case for the directive on equal pay.

I will now examine, in the light of this debate, very carefully the possibility of formulating new initiatives with regard to equal treatment in fiscal legislation and in the field of family allowances as referred to in your draft resolution.

*(Applause)*

I was also, Madam President, particularly interested in the discussion regarding part-time work, where again a directive is suggested together with a programme of pilot projects. This is an area where there seems to be already a useful degree of consensus regarding the need for greater protection of part-time workers, whether male or female. Again, I will look at it to see what scope or necessity there may be for further initiatives and legislation in this field.

There is also revival of interest generally in different more flexible forms of work. I believe there is great scope for developing Community action in this field not merely through normative instruments but also through demonstration products at local level. Insofar as I can commit the Commission in advance, may I indicate my intention here and now to produce specific proposals in this area within the next twelve months as you request.

**Richard**

The role of the Social Fund up to now has shown its utility in the field of positive action for women. When the special section of the Fund for Women's Programmes was set up in 1978 it required a considerable promotional effort by the Commission to stimulate demand.

I wonder if I could give the House one or two figures? The total volume of aid requested for 1980, as I have said, reached 71 million units of account. This is likely to increase further to 94 million in 1981: over four times the budget. What is more important to us is the growth in the volume of programmes aimed at preparing women for employment in jobs in which they have been under-represented in the past and new jobs which we want to see kept open to men and women on an equal footing. Such programmes, classified by the Commission as first priority, amounted to about half a million units of account in 1978, 6.5 million in 1979, 14 million in 1980 and will probably exceed 20 million units of account in 1981. The Commission considers that the purpose of the special women's section must be to make a specific effort to help women overcome the obstacles they face as women in gaining equality of treatment in the labour market.

Satisfactory as the overall growth in the volume of applications in the women's section is, the Commission would prefer to see a more even distribution of applications as between Member States. Germany accounted for 78 % of all applications in 1979 and for 65.5 % of the aid that was approved. This is not, as I say, a criticism of the German effort.

They are on the contrary to be congratulated on the size of their response but it is a plea to the other Member States to do more.

Reference is made to new technologies and their impact on the employment of women is most important. There is much talk about new technologies at present and particularly about the need to take account of the implications of microelectronics at all levels of education and training. It is clear that women, particularly in secretarial work, are likely to be affected most severely in the short term. It is therefore also clear that positive action has to be taken on behalf of girls and women in the field of employment and labour-market policy, in industrial relations and at all levels of the education and training system. The Social Fund provides the right financial instrument to promote change in this direction, at least as regards vocational training provisions.

I should like to inform the House that, in drawing up the next set of guidelines for the selection of Social Fund applications, I undertake to ensure that full account is taken of this issue. While it is clear that many training courses for traditional women's occupations need to be updated to take account of the implications of new information technologies, we must take

care to ensure that the effect of new guidelines will not actually be to bring about a decrease in the number of training opportunities by the fund designed specially for women.

I am particularly concerned about the field of basic education, whereas your report emphasizes that there seems to be little progress being made to encourage girls to study mathematical, scientific and technical subjects at school and to steer them away from the traditionally feminine professions, which are themselves increasingly threatened. I entirely accept what has been emphasized in the course of this debate, namely that it is education, guidance and training that are the key areas for action to promote equality in society.

I would like to make one point, however, which has not been raised in the course of this debate. That is the question of Community competence in this field. Very often one finds that the argument is not so much about the content of Commission proposals but about the competence of the Commission to make proposals in a particular field, whether that field indeed be social services, health policy or nationality legislation.

Madam President, I am conscious of the fact that time is passing. I am also conscious of the fact that other debates are to take place. I can only say that I found yesterday's experience of listening to this debate fascinating. I have a great deal of sympathy with many of the points that have been raised. As I have been in my present position as brief a time as I have been I hope no one would expect me to come forward with revolutionary proposals at this stage for transforming the position of women in the European Community. What I can do and what I do undertake to do, however, is to look at the debate with sympathy and in detail, to see where I think and the Commission thinks that action can be taken and to try and make the maximum use of our existing instruments in order to promote what we all have at heart, namely a greater equality in treatment for women.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Enright on a point of order.

**Mr Enright.** — Madam President, the point of order is whether we should be voting now upon the Maij-Weggen resolution. When I got the amendments last night at 7 p.m. they were not all in English. I therefore had to get a combination of French and Italian texts.

The French and Italian became quite easy to understand when compared to some of the preposterous Forth amendments. However, I do not think it is reasonable to vote this morning when we did not, in fact, have the amendments at the end of the debate last night.

**President.** — Mr Enright, I think I am right in saying that all the amendments were distributed in all the languages last night.

At the request of the political groups we extended the deadline for tabling amendments. This meant that the administration did not have them until six o'clock on Monday evening. They then had to be translated and printed. You should have thought of these problems when the deadline was extended.

I call Mr Enright.

**Mr Enright.** — Madam President, I was in no way blaming the administration. What I was saying was that it was quite possible for this House to vote later when everyone has had time to fully digest the amendments. I did, in fact, read them last night until 2 a.m., but it does not seem to me fair that within two minutes of getting in here I should advise my colleagues as to the way in which they should vote without their being fully aware of the implications. It is not the administration or the staff that I am blaming, it is the Rules of Procedure if they insist that we must vote this morning. If the Rules of Procedure are so absurd, then we must alter them immediately.

**President.** — Mr Enright, the agenda was adopted with the votes scheduled immediately after the debate.

We shall move on to the voting.

*(Parliament adopted the first five indents of the preamble)*

On the sixth indent of the preamble, Mrs Boot has tabled Amendment No 101.<sup>1</sup>

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Madam President, the *ad hoc* committee rejected this amendment because Article 119 is approved by the Court of Justice. I am therefore against the amendment.

*(Parliament adopted successively Amendment No 101, the sixth indent as amended and the seventh to eleventh indents of the preamble)*

**President.** — I have three amendments on the first two recitals:

- No 90 by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti;
- No 60 by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi;

— No 15 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Madam President, I am against all three amendments, No 90, No 15 and No 60. I must say that the original texts are clearer and that these amendments have already been rejected earlier.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 90<sup>1</sup> — which meant that Amendments No 60 and No 15 fell — and then the third recital)*

**President.** — On the fourth recital, Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi have tabled Amendment No 61.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Madam President, the economic crisis affects the working woman as much as the housewife and I am therefore against this amendment.

*(Parliament adopted successively Amendment No 61, the fourth recital as amended and the fifth recital)*

**President.** — After the fifth recital, Mrs Hoffmann and others have tabled Amendment No 6.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (F) I am against, Madam President.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 6 and adopted the sixth recital)*

**President.** — On the seventh recital, Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi have tabled Amendment No 62/rev.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (F) I am against.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 62/rev.<sup>1</sup> and then the seventh recital as amended)*

**President.** — I have two amendments after the seventh recital:

<sup>1</sup> The text of the amendments will be found in the Annex.

<sup>1</sup> By electronic vote.

**President**

- No 34 by Mr Forth on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- No 81 by Mrs Lenz and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Madam President, the purpose of Amendment No 34 is to weaken the text. I am against it. As for Amendment No 81, it is in line with the motion which was introduced here in December. I am in favour of this amendment.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 34 and adopted Amendment No 81)*

**President.** — We shall now consider *Heading I — Improvement of existing Community measures.*

On paragraphs 1 to 6, Mrs Hoffmann and others have tabled Amendment No 7. The adoption of this amendment will mean that all the other amendments to these paragraphs will fall.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (F) I am against.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 7)*

**President.** — On paragraph 1, Mr Forth on behalf of the European Democratic Group has tabled Amendment No 35.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I am against this amendment, Madam President.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 35 and adopted paragraph 1 and subparagraph 2 (a), first indent)*

**President.** — I have two amendments on subparagraph 2 (a), second indent:

- No 64 by Mrs Boot;
- No 82 by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Madam President, Mrs Boot's amendment is in fact a correction of the text and we can have no quarrel with it. I am in

favour of it. Amendment No 82 was rejected in committee. I therefore have to recommend rejection, even though I am quite favourable to the amendment myself.

*(Parliament adopted successively Amendment No 64, Amendment No 82 and subparagraph 2 (a), second indent, as amended)*

**President.** — On subparagraph 2 (b), first indent, Mrs Boot has tabled Amendment No 102.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I am against this, Madam President, as it would mean that between three and five thousand professions would have to be incorporated in the directive. I think there is some error here.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 102 and adopted subparagraph 2 (b), first indent, and then subparagraph 2 (b), second indent)*

**President.** — On subparagraph 2 (b), third indent, Mrs Boot has tabled Amendment No 103.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) The third indent was approved by a large majority in committee. I must therefore recommend rejection of the amendment.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 103 and adopted subparagraph 2 (b), third indent, and then subparagraph 2 (c))*

**President.** — On subparagraph 2 (d), Mr Vié and others have tabled Amendment No 52.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) There is something I should like the author to clarify because I am not sure whether this amendment refers just to the short phrase in 2 (d). If it does, I am in favour of it because the phrase is a little bit out of place here.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 52 and adopted subparagraph 2 (d))*

**President.** — On paragraph 3, Mrs Boot has tabled Amendment No 106.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I think this is superfluous, Madam President.

I am against it.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 106 and adopted paragraph 3 and then paragraph 4)*

**President.** — After paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 1 by Mrs Lizin on behalf of the Socialist Group.<sup>1</sup>

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Well, Madam President, this is a rather complicated amendment which is unclear even in Dutch. The same alteration was rejected by the committee. I am against the amendment.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and adopted paragraph 5, first subparagraph)*

**President.** — On paragraph 5, second subparagraph, I have Amendment No 104 by Mrs Boot.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Madam President, the text proposed by Mrs Boot is legally more correct than the existing text. I am therefore in favour of it.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 104)*

**President.** — On paragraph 6, I have Amendment No 16 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Madam President, the original text was adopted by a clear majority. I am against its deletion.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 16 and adopted paragraph 6)*

**President.** — I have three amendments on paragraph 7, first indent:

- No 17 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- No 63 by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi;

— No 38 by Mr Cottrell on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Madam President, the original text is clearer than the amendments and was adopted by a clear majority in committee. I am against the amendments.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 17 — which meant that Amendments No 63 and No 38 fell — and then paragraph 7 as amended)*

**President.** — I have three amendments on paragraph 8:

- No 121 by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul on behalf of the Socialist Group;
- No 65 by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi;
- No 18 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Madam President, there was general agreement on the existing text. I should like to mention to Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul that the points she raises in her amendment are already in four other paragraphs. I am therefore against.

**President.** — What is your position on the other amendments, No 65 and No 18, Mrs Maij-Weggen?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen.** — (NL) I am against them, too, Madam President.

*(Parliament rejected Amendments No 121, No 65 and No 18 and adopted paragraph 8)*

**President.** — After paragraph 8, I have Amendment No 118 by Mrs Roudy on behalf of the Socialist Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I agree with the content here, Madam President, but I think that projects of this kind should be financed by the Member States and by regional authorities. It is nevertheless a new amendment. I cannot give any recommendation. Personally, I should vote against it.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 118<sup>1</sup> and then paragraph 9)*

<sup>1</sup> Amendment No 117 by Mrs Lizin was withdrawn

<sup>1</sup> By electronic vote

**President.** — I have two amendments on paragraph 9:

- No 36 by Mr Forth on behalf of the European Democratic Group,
- No 66 by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (F) I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 36 — which meant that Amendment No 66 fell — and adopted paragraph 10)

**President.** — In paragraph 11, I have Amendment No 19 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (F) I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 19 and adopted paragraph 11)

**President.** — I have two amendments after paragraph 11:

- No 20 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- No 92 by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Madam President, Amendment No 20 has already been tabled in committee and is resubmitted here in another form. I think it is now quite acceptable and ask for its adoption. Amendment No 92 is quite out of place here. I am very much against incorporating it here.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 20)

**President.** — I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

**Mrs Squarcialupi.** — (I) Madam President, I request a separate vote on the two parts of Amendment No 92: the first part up to the end of the penultimate indent and the second part consisting of the last indent.

(Parliament adopted the first part of Amendment No 92 — as far as the penultimate indent — and then the last indent of the amendment)

**President.** — We shall now consider *Heading II — Further action*. I have seven amendments on paragraph 12:

- No 105 by Mrs Boot;
- No 39 by Mr Cottrell on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- No 95 by Mrs Dekker;
- No 53 by Mr Vié and others;
- No 83 by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group);
- No 21 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group,
- No 67 by Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Madam President, Amendment No 105 is a legal one. I think it is superfluous and I am therefore against it. I am also against Amendment No 39. As for Amendment No 95, I think it is a good addition and I am in favour of it. The emphasis is wrong in Amendment No 53 and I am against it. Amendment No 83 is very much the same as Amendment No 53 but I am in favour of it. On the other hand, I am against Amendment No 21. The point raised by Amendment No 67 is already dealt with in paragraph 46 where it fits better. I am therefore against the amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 105<sup>1</sup> and then Amendment No 39, and adopted successively paragraph 12, first subparagraph, the first part of the second subparagraph, Amendment No 95, the first indent of the second part of the second subparagraph as amended and indents 2 to 5)

**President.** — I call Mrs Maij-Weggen.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen.** — (NL) Madam President, I also note that this principle is enshrined in the constitutions of almost all the Member States. It seems odd to me to vote against it.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 53<sup>1</sup> — which meant that Amendment No 83 fell — and then the seventh indent of paragraph 12, rejected Amendment No 21 and then Amendment No 67 and adopted the last indent of paragraph 12)

**President.** — I have three amendments after paragraph 12:

- No 119 and No 120 by Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul on behalf of the Socialist Group;

<sup>1</sup> By electronic vote.

**President**

- No 68 by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I have no objection to Amendments No 119 and No 120, Madam President. They make things perhaps a little clearer. But I am against the third amendment.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 119 and then Amendment No 120 — which meant that Amendment No 68 fell)*

**President.** — I have two amendments on paragraph 13 to 15:

- No 11 by Mrs Spaak;<sup>1</sup>
- No 8 by Mrs Hoffmann and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Madam President, I am against.

**President.** — I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

**Mrs Squarcialupi.** — (I) Madam President, I request separate votes on the two parts of Amendment No 8: the first part covering paragraphs 13 and 14 and the second part paragraph 15.

*(Parliament rejected the first and then the second part of Amendment No 8)*

**President.** — I have two amendments on paragraph 13:

- No 22 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- No 93 by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mrs Cassanagnago Cerretti.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I am against Amendment No 22, Madam President. Amendment No 93 brings a light touch to the motion. I am always ready to welcome that.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 22 and then Amendment No 93 and adopted paragraph 13)*

**President.** — On paragraph 14, I have Amendment No 96 by Mrs Dekker.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) This is a nice distinction. I am in favour.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 96 and adopted paragraph 14)*

## IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I have six amendments on paragraph 15:

- No 23 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- No 54 by Mr Vié and others;
- No 69 by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi;
- No 107 by Mrs Boot,
- No 84 by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group);
- No 89 by Mrs Schleicher.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I am happy to be able to speak Dutch, Mr President. I am against Amendment No 23 because it weakens the text. For the same reason I am against Amendment No 54. If Amendment No 69 is supposed to replace the original text, I am against it. If it is an addition, I am in favour. I should be grateful if Mrs Cinciari Rodano could clarify this point for me. I am not sure what she intends. As for Amendment No 107, it is unnecessary and I am against it. Amendment No 84 is an improvement and I am in favour of it. I am very much against Amendment No 89.

**President.** — I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

**Mrs Squarcialupi.** — (I) We accept the rapporteur's suggestion that this amendment be regarded as an addition to the text.

*(Parliament rejected successively amendment No 23, Amendment No 54, and Amendment No 107, adopted successively Amendment No 69, the first indent of para-*

<sup>1</sup> Withdrawn by the author.

**Squarcialupi**

*graph 15 as amended, Amendment No 84<sup>1</sup> and the second indent as amended, rejected Amendment No 89<sup>1</sup> and adopted the third indent)*

**President.** — On paragraph 16, I have Amendment No 9 by Mrs Hoffmann and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I am against, Mr President.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 9 and adopted paragraph 16)*

**President.** — I have two amendments on paragraph 17:

- No 94 by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mrs Cassanagnago Cerretti;
- No 24 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, the majority of the committee was in favour of this paragraph in the motion. As rapporteur, I have to reject any amendment.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 94 and then Amendment No 24 and adopted paragraph 17)*

**President.** — I have four amendments on paragraph 18:

- No 14 by Mrs Hoffmann and others;
- No 46 by Mr Forth;
- No 55 by Mr Vié and others;
- No 70 by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, the existing text was adopted by a clear majority in committee. As rapporteur, I must therefore recommend rejection of the amendments.

*(Parliament successively rejected Amendment No 14, Amendment No 55 and Amendment No 70 — which meant that Amendment No 46 fell — and adopted paragraph 18)*

**President.** — After paragraph 18, I have Amendment No 25 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I think this is a fine addition, Mr President, and I am in favour.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 25)*

**President.** — I have two amendments on paragraph 19:

- No 26 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- No 116 by Mrs Boot.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, Amendment No 26 affects only the English version. It is a stylistic change. In my view it need not be put to the vote. I am against Amendment No 116 as I prefer the original text.

**President.** — May I have the advice of either Dame Shelagh Roberts or Miss Hooper on whether it is only an English and Danish language problem? If in the other languages the problem does not arise, I think we should not vote on the amendment but leave it to a correct translation.

**Dame Shelagh Roberts.** — Mr President, it does not make sense in English, and since it relates only to English perhaps the House would agree to the amendment to the English text.

**President.** — In that case I think we should not vote on the amendment but the amendment should be seen in the light of the original language version and adapted accordingly. The text will therefore be adapted in the English and Danish versions.

*(Parliament adopted successively Amendment No 116, paragraph 19 as amended and paragraph 20)*

On paragraph 21, I have Amendment No 97 by Mrs Dekker.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I think this is a fine addition, Mr President, and I am in favour of it.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 97 and then paragraph 21 as amended)*

<sup>1</sup> By electronic vote

**President.** — On paragraph 22, I have Amendment No 56 by Mr Vié and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Against, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 56 and adopted paragraph 22)

**President.** — On paragraph 23, I have Amendment No 98 by Mrs Dekker.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, the question of preferential treatment for women is a very tricky one. We have referred to it in one or two paragraphs, but I would rather it were not dealt with in this paragraph in this way. I am therefore against the amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 98 and adopted paragraphs 23 and 24)

**President.** — After paragraph 24, I have Amendment No 72 by Mrs Macciocchi.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Well, Mr President, it is rather funny to find this paragraph under Social and Family Services. I am indeed in favour of this text but I should be happier if it came at the end of the motion under Other Recommendations and not here under Social and Family Services, where it is really out of place.

**President.** — Do you agree to this, Mrs Macciocchi?

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — (F) I agree to the suggestion that the amendment be placed in the section with the recommendations.

**President.** — To avoid getting your voting lists out of order, we could vote on the amendment now and then insert it, with the rapporteur's agreement, at the end of the motion for a resolution.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 72 which, with the rapporteur's agreement, would be inserted elsewhere in the motion)

We shall now consider *Heading III — Education and Vocational Training.*

(Parliament adopted paragraphs 25 and 26)

I have three amendments on paragraph 27:

- No 71 by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi;
- No 3 by the Liberal and Democratic Group;
- No 47 by Mr Forth.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, the committee was in general agreement on the original text. I am against Amendment No 47 as well as Amendment No 71. Amendment No 3 is a fine addition and I am in favour of it.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 71, adopted Amendment No 3, rejected Amendment No 47 and adopted paragraph 27 as amended)

**President.** — I have three amendments on paragraph 28:

- No 112 by Mrs Boot;
- No 99 by Mrs Dekker;
- No 4 by the Liberal and Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, Amendment No 4 is quite unclear because there is discrimination between women with family responsibilities and women without such responsibilities. I think we have to vote against this. It has not been drafted very well. The point raised in Amendment No 99 is in fact already covered by the motion as it stands. This amendment is therefore somewhat superfluous. I am against it. Amendment No 112 is also superfluous. It makes a slight legal change, but I am also against this amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 112, and adopted Amendment No 99<sup>1</sup> — which meant that Amendment No 4 fell — and then paragraph 28 as amended)

**President.** — I have two amendments on paragraph 29:

- No 113 by Mrs Boot;
- No 100 by Mrs Dekker.

What is the rapporteur's position?

<sup>1</sup> By electronic vote.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen rapporteur.** — (NL) Amendment No 113 is superfluous, Mr President, and I am against it. Amendment No 100, in my view, is a stylistic change which applies only to the Dutch version. As far as I am concerned, it is acceptable.

**President.** — May I suggest that we deal with Amendment No 100 in the same way as we have just dealt with an amendment on the Danish and English versions. The Dutch version can be brought into line with the other language versions. We need not vote on it therefore, and can vote simply on Amendment No 113.

I call Mrs Dekker.

**Mrs Dekker.** — (NL) I do not agree with the rapporteur's comments, and so I do not agree with your suggestion, Mr President, that Amendment No 100 is simply a stylistic correction of the text in Dutch. That is definitely not the case. The motion for a resolution has *gezinsarbeid* (domestic duties) and I want this replaced by *huishoudelijke arbeid* (domestic work). There is quite a difference. There is a fundamental difference. I should therefore like the amendment to be put to the vote.

**President.** — If the author of the amendment and the rapporteur cannot agree whether this is an alteration to the style or the content, we shall just have to put it to the vote.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 113 and adopted successively Amendment No 100, paragraph 29 as amended and paragraphs 30 and 31)

I have two amendments on paragraph 32:

- No 128 and No 127 by Mrs Macciocchi.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I am against both amendments, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 128 and adopted Amendment No 127 and then paragraph 32 as amended)

**President.** — On paragraph 33, I have Amendment No 27 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I need say only a few words about these amendments. The original text of the paragraph is based on the carefully

considered agreement of the *ad hoc* committee. Adding or taking anything away could upset this balance of agreement. I am therefore against any amendment here.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 27)

**President.** — I call Mrs Macciocchi.

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — (F) I should like the rapporteur to give her reasons each time she rejects any amendment.

**President.** — I am very sorry, Mrs Macciocchi, but the rapporteur is free to answer *yes* or *no* or to give any other reply. I am pleased that she keeps her explanations to what she feels is really necessary. *Yes* or *no* is sufficient. Anything else will make the voting three times as long in my opinion.

(Applause)

I call Mrs Maij-Weggen.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen.** — (NL) A brief point of order, Mr President. Mrs Macciocchi was seldom at meetings of the committee of which she was a member. If she had been present more often, she would know why I am for or against specific amendments, and why I give no further explanation. The members of the committee know my opinions.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 33)

**President.** — I have two amendments of paragraphs 34 to 36:

- No 85/rev. by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group);
- No 12 by Mrs Spaak.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, I have already said that I prefer to keep to the text agreed on by the committee and I am thus against any amendment.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No/85rev.<sup>1</sup> and then Amendment No 12<sup>2</sup>)

<sup>1</sup> By roll-call vote requested by Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group); see minutes of proceedings.

<sup>2</sup> By electronic vote.

**President.** — I have three amendments on paragraph 34:

- No 57 by Mr Vié and others;
- No 109 by Mrs Boot;
- No 73 by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, what I said still goes. I support the text which was agreed upon and I am therefore against these amendments.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 57<sup>1</sup> and then Amendment No 109 and adopted Amendment No 73<sup>2</sup> and then paragraph 34 as amended)*

**President.** — I have four amendments on paragraph 35:

- No 58 by Mr Vié and others;
- No 137 by Mr Pannella;
- No 88 by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti and others;
- No 110 by Mrs Boot.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, I said before that I support the agreed text-throughout this heading. I am against the amendments.

*(Parliament rejected successively Amendment No 58,<sup>2</sup> Amendment No 137, Amendment No 88<sup>1</sup> and Amendment No 110 and adopted paragraph 35<sup>1</sup>)*

**President.** — After paragraph 35, I have Amendment No 129 by Mrs Macciocchi.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 129)*

I have two amendments on paragraph 36:

- No 111 by Mrs Boot;
- No 122 by Mrs Vayssade and others on behalf of the Socialist Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, I want to draw the attention of the House to the

fact that there is a major error in the first phrase of paragraph 36 in the English version. A corrigendum should have been distributed but this did not happen. The text should read: *Considers however that abortion should be treated only as a last resort.* The English version says quite the opposite. What I read out is the correct version.

**President.** — The rapporteur has read out the correct version. The English text will be amended accordingly.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 111 and then Amendment No 122<sup>1</sup> and adopted paragraph 36<sup>1</sup>)*

I call Mrs Maij-Weggen.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, I note that the text agreed on and adopted by the committee by a clear majority has been left unchanged. I am very happy about that.

**President.** — We shall now consider *Heading V — Measures with regard to special groups and regions.*

*(Parliament adopted paragraph 37)*

I have four amendments on paragraph 38:

- No 49 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- No 74 by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi,
- No 86 by Mrs Lenz and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group);
- No 108 by Mrs Boot.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, I must say that the concept of administrative elections is unknown in a number of countries. I think this is an Italian idea, and so I am against Amendment No 74. It could lead to confusion. Amendment No 86 removes a discrepancy from the text and I am in favour of it. Amendment No 108 is superfluous and I am against it.

**President.** — I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

**Mrs Squarcialupi.** — (I) Mr President, it is clear that what is meant here is local elections and not national

<sup>1</sup> By roll-call vote requested by Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group), see Minutes of proceedings.

<sup>2</sup> By electronic vote.

<sup>1</sup> By roll-call vote requested by the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group), see Minutes of proceedings.

**Squarcialupi**

elections. This is in line with the terminology used in the Scelba report on the special rights for European citizens.

**President.** — I call Mrs Maij-Weggen.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen.** — (NL) Be that as it may, Mr President, I must point out to Mrs Squarcialupi that in the Netherlands local elections are political elections. I am still against the amendment.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 49 and then Amendment No 74, adopted Amendment No 86 — which meant that Amendment No 108 fell — and adopted paragraph 38 as amended)*

**President.** — On paragraph 39, I have Amendment No 59 by Mr Vié and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I am against, Mr President.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 59 and adopted paragraph 39)*

**President.** — I have two amendments on the introductory text of paragraph 40:

- No 28 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- No 75 by Mrs Cinciari and Mrs Squarcialupi.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I think the old text is better, Mr President, and so I am against these two amendments.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 28<sup>1</sup> and then Amendment No 75 and adopted the introductory text and then the first three indents of paragraph 40)*

**President.** — On the fourth indent of paragraph 40, I have Amendment No 76 by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I am against, Mr President.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 76 and adopted the fourth indent of paragraph 40)*

**President.** — On paragraph 41, I have Amendment No 77 by Mrs Barbarella and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, the original text was adopted by a clear majority in committee. I am against the amendment.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 77<sup>1</sup> and adopted paragraph 41)*

On paragraph 42, I have Amendment No 29 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Against, Mr President.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 29 and adopted paragraph 42)*

**President.** — On the first indent of paragraph 43, I have Amendment No 78 by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) The original text is better, Mr President.

But I have no particular objection to this amendment.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 78 and then the second and third indents of paragraph 43)*

**President.** — I have two amendments on paragraph 44:

- No 48 by Mr Forth;
- No 10 by Mrs Hoffmann and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) The original text, Mr President, was supported by a large majority in committee. I am therefore against this amendment.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 48 and then Amendment No 10 and adopted paragraph 44)*

<sup>1</sup> By electronic vote.

<sup>1</sup> By roll-call vote requested by the Communist and Allies Group; see Minutes of proceedings.

**President.** — We shall now consider *Heading VI — Developing countries*. I have three amendments on paragraph 45:

- No 40 by Mr Cottrell on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- No 79 by Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli;
- No 130 by Mrs Macciocchi.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, I am against Mr Cottrell's amendment, just as I am against the amendment by Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli. I find it odd that only housewives are mentioned. Mrs Macciocchi's amendment is really out of place here. I thought this was an amendment which could be adopted in the resolution on world hunger. It is really out of place here. Of course, I am not against what the amendment says but I am against it because it does not belong here.

**President.** — I call Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli.

**Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli.** — (I) Mr President, according to the French translation the rapporteur mentioned *housewives*. I do not see this word in the Italian version.

**President.** — Mrs Maij-Weggen, could you tell us again exactly what you have against Amendment No 79, as it does not seem to be very clear in Italian?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen.** — (NL) The amendment calls for the support of the Council and the Commission for housewives' actions in favour of peace, but I think we should support all actions for peace and not just those of housewives. That is why I find it rather an odd amendment.

**President.** — In the French text I have here, Mrs Maij-Weggen, I see just *women* although you seem to have *housewives* in your version. We can replace *housewives* by *women* in the Dutch text and then vote on it. Do you agree?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen.** — (NL) I should be happier if we could have the word *people* in its place, Mr President. I can then agree to it.

(Parliament rejected successively Amendment No 40, Amendment No 79 and Amendment No 130 and adopted paragraph 45)

**President.** — I have three amendments on paragraph 46:

- No 41 by Mr Cottrell on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- No 132 and No 131 by Mrs Macciocchi.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I am against Mr Cottrell's amendment, Mr President. I am in favour of Amendment No 132 by Mrs Macciocchi as it is an excellent addition. Her points in Amendment No 131 are already all more or less in the motion, where, they have been expressed more succinctly. I am therefore against Amendment No 131.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 41 and adopted successively the first four indents of paragraph 46, Amendment No 132, Amendment No 131, the sixth indent as amended and the seventh indent)

**President.** — On paragraph 47, I have Amendment No 44 by Mr Forth and Mr Cottrell on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Against, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 44 and adopted paragraph 47)

**President.** — On paragraph 48, I have Amendment No 45 by Mr Forth and Mr Cottrell on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 45 and adopted paragraph 48)

**President.** — We shall now consider *Heading VII — Other recommendations*. On the first indent of paragraph 49, I have Amendment No 42 by Mr Cottrell on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, I have only an English version here because I

**Maij-Weggen**

have a pile of amendments in four languages, as most people have. In my view this is simply a stylistic change in the English version. I do not think it affects the other languages.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 42 and adopted the first indent of paragraph 49)*

**President.** — I have two amendments on the second and third indents of paragraph 49:

- No 50 by Mr Cottrell;
- No 30 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — *(NL)* I think the original text is clearer, Mr President, and I am therefore against these two amendments.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 50 and adopted Amendment No 30)*

**President.** — I have two amendments on the fourth indent of paragraph 49:

- No 126 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- No 115 by Mrs Boot.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I am against Amendment No 126. I am in favour of Amendment No 115 because I think it is an excellent improvement.

*(Parliament, rejected Amendment No 126 and adopted Amendment No 115)*

**President.** — I have two amendments on the fifth indent of paragraph 49:

- No 43 by Mr Cottrell on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- No 134 by Mrs Macciocchi.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I am against both amendments.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 43 and then Amendment No 134 and adopted the fifth indent of paragraph 49)*

**President.** — After the fifth indent of paragraph 49, I have Amendment No 133 by Mrs Macciocchi.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I carefully tried to avoid giving this motion an élitist character. I have the feeling that this is being introduced with this amendment. I am therefore against it. This motion for a resolution is for all women and not just for a small élitist group.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 133)*

**President.** — On paragraph 50, I have Amendment No 51 by Mr Cottrell.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — *(NL)* Against, Mr President.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 51 and adopted paragraph 50)*

**President.** — I have two amendments after paragraph 50:

- No 135 and No 136 by Mrs Macciocchi.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — *(NL)* Let me consider Amendment No 135 first, Mr President. Since 1979 there has been a special UN Conference on Women's Rights. All our Member States have subscribed to it and I think it would be better if we kept to that instead of adding another charter. I am therefore against the amendment. As for Amendment No 136, I think it goes a bit too far. We do not want to have anything élitist in this motion. I am against this amendment as well.

**President.** — I call Mrs Macciocchi.

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — *(I)* Mr President, I should like you to call a roll-call vote on Amendment No 136 and I should like everyone to remember that élitist is something of an insult to all those women who have made tremendous sacrifices to get through university or college or to study science. I want to ask the rapporteur to stop using the term once and for all.

*(Mrs Macciocchi's request was not supported by the required number of Members Parliament rejected Amendment No 135<sup>1</sup> and adopted Amendment No 136)*

<sup>1</sup> By electronic vote.

**President.** — On paragraph 51, I have Amendment No 31 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 31 and adopted paragraph 51)*

On paragraph 52, I have Amendment No 2 by the Liberal and Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I am in favour of this amendment.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 2 and paragraph 52 as amended)*

**President.** — I have three amendments on paragraph 53:

- No 37 by Mr Forth on behalf of the European Democratic Group,
- No 32 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group;
- No 80 by Mr Spinelli and others.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I am against Amendments No 37 and No 32, Mr President. I have something of a question for Mr Spinelli. Is there anything in his report on own resources about the position of women?

*(Laughter)*

**Mr Spinelli.** — (I) We could ask for a million units of account.

*(Laughter)*

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) I know there is no mention of it, Mr President, and so there can be no mention of own resources in this motion. I am therefore against the amendment.

*(Laughter — Parliament rejected Amendment No 37, adopted the first subparagraph of paragraph 53, rejected Amendment No 92 and then Amendment No 80 and adopted the second subparagraph)*

**President.** — I have three amendments on paragraph 54:

- No 5 by the Liberal and Democratic Group;
- No 13 by Mrs Spaak;
- No 33 by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, these amendments were rejected by the committee. I cannot therefore recommend adoption.

**President.** — I call Mrs Martin.

**Mrs Martin.** — (F) Mr President, as a result of meeting some other Members this morning, there is something I should like to clarify about Amendment No 5. It might help us find a compromise solution. We think in fact that the permanent committee should have 15 or 16 members and that its chief role should be to monitor the implementation of this resolution.

**President.** — Mrs Martin, I think I am speaking for the House when I say that I cannot accept any oral amendments.

*(Parliament rejected successively Amendment No 5,<sup>1</sup> Amendment No 13 and Amendment No 33 and adopted paragraph 54<sup>2</sup>)*

I have two amendments after paragraph 54:

- No 87 by Mrs Lenz and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group);
- Amendment No 123 by Mrs Fullet and others on behalf of the Socialist Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, the ideas put forward in Amendment No 123 were rejected earlier by the committee. I am therefore against it. Amendment No 87 is in line with the resolution which was adopted in December last year. I think it accords with the committee's thinking and I am therefore in favour of it.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 87, rejected Amendment No 123 and adopted paragraph 55)*

<sup>1</sup> By roll-call vote requested by the Liberal and Democratic Group; see Minutes of proceedings

<sup>2</sup> By roll-call vote requested by the Socialist Group; see Minutes of proceedings.

**President.** — I call Mr Klepsch on a point of order.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) On behalf of my group, Mr President, I request an adjournment for 20 minutes. I think this would also suit the other groups, since we want to have the final vote in a proper manner. The 20 minutes will also serve to decide on our group's explanation of vote. I am afraid I have to ask for this adjournment because the group will not be able to give an explanation of vote until we have had the adjournment. We informed all the other groups this morning that we should be asking for this adjournment, and I trust that you will grant it.

**President.** — I propose that we close the list of those wishing to give an explanation of vote and that the sitting be suspended for 20 minutes. Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

The House will rise.

*(The sitting was suspended at 12.05 p.m. and resumed at 12.25 p.m.)*

#### IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

*President*

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

The list of those wishing to give an explanation of vote has now been closed. I request everyone to be as brief as possible.

I call Mr von Habsburg.

**Mr Habsburg.** — (D) Madam President, the fact that I shall be voting against this report does not mean that I reject women's justified demands. On the contrary, I would gladly have given them my support, but the fact is that the document presents views which are unacceptable to a European Christian and which have nothing to do with women's rights. These are fundamental matters of conscience which have nothing to do with politics. Whatever hypocritical euphemisms may be advanced in its favour, abortion is and remains murder — the violation of the right to life.

At a time when there were still genuinely social-democratic parties, Viktor Adler said that a Socialist worthy of the name would always be on the side of the weakest. And what — I ask you — could be weaker than a defenceless foetus? It is, at any rate, more

defenceless than the mother who wants to have her pregnancy aborted — it has no vote it cannot speak and it cannot demonstrate. It will be a tragic moment for this House if the party professing 'humanism' votes *en masse* for the death sentence for innocent children but at the same time cannot do enough to reduce the legitimate sentences passed on people found guilty of murder with robbery and sexual crimes.

History shows us that progress and respect for life have always gone hand in hand. In that respect, the teachings of Christ were, in worldly terms too, the greatest step forward mankind has ever taken. Against that background, the legalization of abortion in many of the countries of Europe is a relapse into barbarism. Of course, there are tragic medical cases in which the doctor is required by virtue of his Hippocratic Oath to decide on the lesser of two evils. Anything that goes beyond that, though — and that is what we are talking about today — is morally totally reprehensible. We may legitimately ask ourselves whether what we want is a Christian-humanistic or heathen-barbaric Europe, and let us not forget that the latter would mean the end of our unique civilization. I at any rate refuse to see the rights and duties of our women, to whom we owe life itself and the greatest of whom was the mother of our Saviour, in the same light as the kind of views which would encourage the murder of innocent children. In the interests of our women, I must say 'No'.

*(Applause from various quarters in the centre and on the right)*

**President.** — I call Mr Ryan.

**Mr Ryan.** — Madam President, were it not for the three most objectionable paragraphs on abortion, Nos 34, 35 and 36, my Irish Christian-Democratic colleagues and I could support this resolution. Today will be a dark and shameful day for Europe if the European Parliament disgraces itself and makes itself look ridiculous — disgraces itself by showing contempt for human life in its weakest and most defenceless form and makes itself ridiculous by purporting to give to the Commission and the Council a mandate which they cannot operate under the Treaty of Rome and also by being inconsistent. It is less than two months since this Parliament asserted the right to life by declaring that it was against the imposition of the death penalty on people convicted of killing their fellow humans. Now it would seem that the Parliament is about to adopt a resolution which in effect would say that you may not kill a convicted murderer but you may kill innocent children

*(Mixed reactions)*

as long as a human being is still in the womb of its mother. That is totally unacceptable. It is, Madam Pres-

Ryan

ident, an affront to the dignity of all individuals and to the rights and responsibilities of families, particularly having regard to the location of the resolution in a report on women's rights. It is an insult to the dignity of the womanhood of Europe. You cannot advance the rights of women by denying the right to life of the most helpless of all human beings the child in a mother's womb. The dignity of human life, the dignity of one sex cannot be advanced by an assault upon human life in its most helpless form, the unborn but nevertheless living child. This purported resolution, which pretends to show respect for the rights of some people, proposes to trample on the rights and responsibilities of others and in particular of national, local and regional communities, to ignore and to regard as not having any right of existence the laws, traditions and customs of other communities if they do not correspond with the majority view of this Parliament. I would remind this House that yesterday we heard from our distinguished guest, President Sadat of Egypt, the Muslim view that morality cannot be relegated to the past.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the right)*

We applauded that view yesterday. Let Christian Europe remember that message given to us by a great person from the Islamic world! Let us not fly in the face of God, in the face of nature; let us respect rights and moral obligations and not seek to impose the majority view of this Parliament on peoples, communities and societies that passionately reject this particular imposition!

*(Applause from the centre and from the right — Protests from the left)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Boserup.

**Mrs Boserup.** — *(DK)* Madam President, I can assure you that I shall not try to match the vehement tones of the previous speakers. I should like to say, with all due respect, that this motion for a resolution contains generalities and shaky and orthodox views which neither I nor my Group can support. My Group has identified itself with women's right to equal treatment in education, in public positions and on elected boards and councils. For that reason alone, our voters would find it difficult to understand any decision on our part to vote for what we have before us now.

We do not believe that any European fund or European action — be it for ten or twenty years — will help those women who are oppressed by virtue of the economic system we live under and the traditions of family life. Let me remind you then that, to my mind and to the mind of my voters and the people of Denmark, what we have before us here is a form of lofty words that we have tried to reach agreement on. He who sets out to be all things to all men finishes up

having nothing to say at all — I at any rate disagree with this motion for a resolution, which I feel completely ignores the aspects which have to do with the capitalist system and the oppression of weak and not very profitable workers, such as women. As far as I and my voters are concerned, women's struggle is all part of the class struggle, and that is something which has been entirely swept under the carpet. I would not deny all the accurate and good aspects of the motion for a resolution, but, in our view, it is a voice from the past and is hopelessly out of touch with what we need today. For that reason, we shall abstain when it comes to the vote.

**President.** — I call Mrs Desmond.

**Mrs Desmond.** — Madam President, on behalf of the Irish members of the Socialist Group I wish to state that we find it regrettable that in the debate this report on the position of women in the Community has been interpreted by some as dealing largely with the question of abortion. The report covers a wide range of issues and makes positive long-term proposals in the interests of women and towards the achievement of equality in our society.

However, we believe that it has gone beyond its mandate. Many of the subjects with which it deals are outside the competence of the Community and belong within the domain of the Member States. We believe it would have been more in the interest of the women of the Community to have restricted the report to those areas where there is Community legislation and Community competence, or a possibility of such developing within the terms of the Treaty. Therefore, Madam President, we supported Amendment No 57 to paragraph 34 and voted against paragraphs 35 and 36 and certain amendments thereto.

We regret that we find ourselves obliged to vote against the resolution as it now stands.

*(Applause from certain quarters in the centre and on the right)*

**President.** — I call Mr Fischbach.

**Mr Fischbach.** — *(F)* Madam President, I shall not vote for Mrs Maij-Weggen's motion for a resolution, because it could give rise to a dangerous misunderstanding on the question of motherhood by choice — i.e. that of abortion.

Of course, Paragraph 36 envisages that abortion should be regarded only as a last resort, but since the conditions for this last resort are not specified, one gains the impression that, in the present draft of the text, abortion or the possibility of abortion is presented not as a last resort but rather as an alterna-

**Fischbach**

tive to positive and preventive measures, or measures to protect unborn children.

Madam President, either one takes a stand, as I do, to protect unborn children — and in that case I do not think abortion can be regarded as a valid alternative — or one is in favour of total liberalization of abortion — and in that case I think the argument for positive and preventive measures or measures tending to dissuade women from abortion loses a great deal of its force.

That is why, in view of the final version of paragraph 36, I shall vote against Mrs Maij-Weggen's motion for a resolution, albeit reluctantly, since that resolution contains a number of suggestions and proposals which are absolutely essential for improving the position of women.

*(Applause from various quarters in the centre and on the right)*

**President.** — I call Mr Lalor.

**Mr Lalor.** — Madam President, I want to join with the other Members of other groups from Ireland who have outspokenly said that we fully subscribe to everything in this resolution under all headings with the exception of the health care heading. I find that, as I already explained in the course of the debate, my group and I have no difficulty whatsoever in going along with the improvements recommended, the requests for further action, the outlining of the provisions for improved educational and vocational training, the measures with regard to special groups and regions and the demands in favour of developing countries.

When it comes to murdering the unborn child, however, we draw the line. We certainly cannot support this resolution. Yesterday I asked the rapporteur if it would be possible for her to withdraw Chapter 4. I speak not only for the Irish Members but for all the Members in my group when I say that we unanimously oppose Chapter 4 of this report, even though we fully support everything else that is being asked of us in the report. All the European Progressive Democrats will be voting against this resolution because of the non-withdrawal of Chapter 4.

There is one other fault that I found yesterday with the report, and it is another reason why I will be voting against. No provision whatsoever, or at most a very inadequate provision, was made for doing something to assist the mother who has created a family and wants to stay at home and perform her duty of properly rearing that family.

However, from an Irishman's point of view the major fault is the failure to withdraw Chapter 4, and because

of that we cannot support the murder of the unborn child.

*(Applause from certain quarters in the centre and on the right)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Maij-Weggen.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — *(NL)* Madam President, I should like to make the point that the motion for a resolution is being misinterpreted time and time again here. The fact is that there are five or six paragraphs about the position of women in the family. There is certainly no mention of compulsory abortion. What the motion for a resolution does say is that we should take positive steps to reduce the number of abortions. In other words, we are being told lies here.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Vié.

**Mr Vié.** — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, as I said yesterday in the speech which I made in the general debate, Mrs Maij-Weggen's report contains many things with which we could have agreed entirely. But when I said that the report was a bad one — and I think my words have been interpreted in far too restrictive a sense — it was precisely because, as previous speakers have demonstrated, it contained a jumble of too many subjects and too many problems. Thus the previous speakers and myself ended up by voting against, sometimes reluctantly; for, in this jumble of subjects there are things which we regard as totally unacceptable both for ethical reasons — I shall not expand on that, since enough has been said on the matter — and for political reasons, since in our view institutional bodies are being asked to deal with matters which do not concern them.

More generally, as I said yesterday, I also regret that the overall approach of this report was, in my view inadequate to deal with one of the most important problems facing not only ourselves, but every generation and every civilization. The problem of the role of women in society is always a vital one, and am sorry that in this case the role of women in the Community has been dealt with in excessive detail rather than in a broad sweep.

I have said nothing which is anti-feminist, and I regret the construction put upon my words yesterday. On the contrary, when I say that insufficient attention has been given to the importance of the problems of women in the Community, that is certainly not an anti-feminist statement.

Vie

To sum up, I am disappointed, for there were so many interesting things which could have been said and done. This report contains some very good points on equality and practical measures, but the confusion of issues is unacceptable, as the ethical, moral and political problems raised in the section on health. We shall therefore not vote for it.

I am sorry that the amendment we tabled, which aimed to eliminate this central problem by deleting the section on health, was not adopted by Parliament. That would have avoided the present complications and perhaps allowed the passage of the greater part of the report, which now runs the risk of not being adopted because of this basic objection.

**President.** — I call Mrs Roberts.

**Miss Roberts.** — Madam President, because, as I said yesterday, I and my group subscribe to the aims, objectives and the purpose for which this committee was set up, in other words to identify areas of discrimination and to propose remedies which would achieve a greater degree of justice and fairness within the Community. I shall vote for the resolution.

There is much in the resolution, now that we have considered and voted on the amendments, with which I disagree and with which my group disagrees. There is much in the resolution which I and my group consider to be widely impracticable. If and when the proposals to achieve those measures should ever see the light of day, I and my group will resist them to the full and we shall endeavour to amend them and to turn them into something that is practical. But having said that, I subscribe to the principle underlying this motion and I shall vote for it.

Some of my colleagues may feel that there are aspects which are so impractical that they cannot share my view. I am conscious of the fact that the motion also contains issues which are a matter of conscience. I do not myself find any difficulty in supporting the paragraphs on health care which appear in this resolution, but my group was advised to allow a free vote, Members vote according to their conscience on those issues. Therefore, I must advise my group to take a free vote and to act according to their conscience on the final vote. Nevertheless, I put it this way, Madam President, to Parliament and to my group: I shall vote for the motion, and I hope that as many of them as do not have grounds of conscience for voting against it will join with me.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Maher.

**Mr Maher.** — Madam President, like so many other speakers I believe that there is a great deal of good in

this resolution, the basic aim being to improve the position of women in the Community and to remove discrimination. There has been so much discrimination in the past and a great deal of discrimination still exists. I think, however, that it is unfortunate that there is at least one area where it is quite clear, I believe, that an attempt was made to impose on the people of member countries certain systems which those people obviously could not accept unless they made a clear decision themselves to accept these systems. I refer particularly to abortion.

I do not think it is very sensible of this Parliament, or any other institution of the European Community, to create a situation where the people of a Member State would feel under pressure to accept a situation which they believe is contrary to their best interests, their culture and their religious beliefs. I do not think this is sensible, and in any event it cannot operate because there is no way the people of Ireland, for instance, are going to be bludgeoned into accepting a system so intimately related to human life that they themselves could not in conscience accept it. It could not operate. There is no way that we could be forced to do it. I think it is a great pity that the amendment to allow the people of the Member States or Member States themselves to take their own decision on this matter was not accepted. If it had been accepted I believe that the resolution as a whole would have been acceptable because it contains so much that is good.

**President.** — I call Mr Sieglerschmidt.

**Mr Sieglerschmidt.** — *(D)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I find it rather difficult to give my support to this motion for a resolution. Not — let me add — because of points 35 and 36, but because of the procedure we have adopted. This morning we were presented with a dossier of close-on 130 amendments and immediately began voting on them. I would contend that, like me, a lot of Members found themselves required to vote on what are very important points without perhaps knowing precisely what was going on.

On any future occasion, then, when we have as many amendments as this on a report as important as this one, I would ask you, Madam President, to leave us at least a few hours between the time the amendments are tabled and the time the vote is taken — I realize, of course, that there have been problems here.

Moving on to the question of abortion, which has caused me too great concern, I am not sure whether I may in fact have voted for certain amendments which I certainly did not want to support. I must reject the idea of ruling out any legal sanctions against abortion. On the other hand, I think it is utterly dishonest to pretend that no abortions take place in countries where there are severe penalties for abortion — as if

**Sieglerschmidt**

people were not aware in what medical and social conditions these abortions are carried out.

(Cry of 'Very true!')

Madam President, when it came to the vote in the German Bundestag, I was unable — in all conscience — to vote for the legislation legalizing abortion up to the twelfth week of pregnancy. I did not, however, vote against, because I thought the legislation was at least better than what had existed before.

(Applause)

I would therefore ask you all, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, to think again about whether, in these circumstances, you cannot give your support to the entire report, the other aspects of which are hardly contentious.

**President.** — I must, however, point out that at least a hundred amendments were tabled last week and debated within the political groups and the *ad hoc* Committee itself. The only lesson that can be drawn from these difficulties is that we should no longer agree to postpone the deadline for the tabling of amendments. At any rate, that is what I shall propose to the Bureau.

I call Mr Estgen.

**Mr Estgen.** — (F) Madam President, I do not intend to deliver a political sermon. I am not in that sort of mood, for the motion for a resolution has thrown me into a state of emotional conflict and a dilemma which I know many of my colleagues share. We pay tribute to the great efforts made by women, by the *ad hoc* Committee and also by the rapporteur to provide us with this report and this motion for a resolution, in a spirit of universal conciliation. And there are so many good things in this motion that I would have liked to be able to vote unreservedly in favour of it. I am not one of those who reject the whole motion because of a few points with which they do not agree. But, even so, there are in this motion for a resolution basic issues which are a matter of conscience for each of us. And it is precisely because of this question of abortion about which so much has already been said, that I find it impossible to vote for this motion, since for me and many others abortion, with all the psychological problems involved, represents a personal failure on the part of the woman and the couple, and a failure of the social and educational efforts of society. As I have just said, it is a matter of conscience. I would have to abandon my claim to be a Christian here and now if I were to accept the text in its present form. It is therefore with great regret that I am compelled to vote against the motion, for — I repeat — it contains so many good points that I would have liked to support, and indeed I have supported in the votes on the various parts; but I cannot vote for the whole.

**President.** — I call Mr Del Duca.

**Mr Del Duca.** — (I) Madam President, although I am in favour of the report's broad social guidelines, I find it impossible to vote for the motion because it contains elements which are contrary to my Catholic beliefs. In any case, I do not think the subjects dealt with in the paragraphs on the termination of pregnancy fall within the province of this Parliament. I am also a doctor, and I am therefore in daily contact with sick people expressing the desire to be healthy, the desire to live. In my view, abortion is above all a cowardly act carried out against a being who does not yet have the ability to speak and to plead for life like any other human being. I am opposed to the death penalty, in whatever way it is inflicted. It is for these reasons that I shall vote against this motion.

(Applause from the centre — Protests from the left)

**President.** — I call Mrs Le Roux:

**Mrs Le Roux.** — (F) Madam President, progress in the situation of women can only be made in a Europe of social progress, democracy and peace. We are not on the way to achieving social progress. Moreover, as a result of the plans for industrial restructuring, women are being thrown out of work *en masse*, and the situation of working women has deteriorated further. The agricultural policy followed is causing family holdings to disappear every day, while female farm workers are not entitled to the same benefits as other working women. The enlargement of the Community to include countries where women still suffer from very backward conditions will enable the multinationals to profit from this situation of inferiority. I have also noted that, while the Commissioner preferred not to mention this delicate subject, Parliament confirmed, by its votes, its consensus in favour of enlargement despite our opposition, our warnings and the opposition of the people to these plans which threaten the interests of working women.

Finally, there cannot be any social progress as long as the gap between scientific progress on the one hand and the methods available to women to control their fertility on the other, continues to widen. In a Europe of democracy, women do of course want more and more control over their own destiny. And there is still a considerable gap between a fair degree of participation — which women wish increasingly to achieve — and the reality, especially for the least favoured amongst them.

To turn to the Europe of peace, I would like to echo my friend Danièle De March in saying that there cannot be progress for women without a determined struggle for peace, disarmament and cooperation. As long as the world's wealth is used to design and

**Le Roux**

construct missiles and bombs, there will be children dying of hunger. The French Communists and Allies cannot possibly be satisfied with this debate. In spite of our proposals, the motion for a resolution does not even take into account the real situation of women in the Community and the applicant countries. The rejection of our amendments, which aimed to harmonize social legislation by bringing it all up to the highest level, and especially the rejection of the amendment on the reduction of working hours to 35 per week, is very significant. But it does not surprise us; it can be easily explained. The women in this Parliament, like their male colleagues, are governed by their political affiliation; the majority of this Parliament has never sought to implement measures to ensure equality and happiness. We observed this once more this morning, in connection with the right of women to choose whether to have children or not and the methods of making that choice possible. Therefore, we cannot associate ourselves with the hypocrisy of all these good intentions, which blur the basic causes of inequalities. We shall abstain, and, together with working women, we shall continue to fight alongside all the democrats and progressive forces in our countries to transform these good intentions into real equality, social justice, and happiness for women, men and nations.

*(Applause from the extreme left)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Gaiotti de Biase.

**Mrs Gaiotti de Biase.** — *(I)* Madam President, despite its many limitations, this report contains a number of proposals concerning the situation of women which represent a firm basis for Community policy and which I cannot but support. However, the last part of paragraph 35 and the first part of paragraph 36 are becoming the decisive points of the motion for a resolution. They are ill-drafted points, which I reject, and at the same time vague and ineffective. Yesterday the Council of Ministers clearly stated that the introduction of these points showed only that in some quarters there was a desire to carry on an ideological and superficial battle over women's rights instead of a practical political battle. It is perhaps not by chance that these points were supported by many who oppose the extension of Community powers. This debate and this series of statements are now proving how counter-productive for women's interests these ideological and abstract battles are.

I did everything I could in committee to avoid this negative result, and I did so in the interests of women. I think there is one thing we can still do, and that is to send back to committee a resolution which is now arousing only opposition from all quarters of Parliament.

For my part, if it is not referred back to committee, I shall vote in favour in spite of everything, with the

intention of helping to ensure that Paragraph 35 does not take on a political weight which, on account of its vague and superficial character, devoid of political or practical significance, it does not merit, I can do so with a clear conscience, for my views on these matters are too well-known for any misunderstandings to arise.

*(Applause from some quarters on the extreme left)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Hoff.

**Mrs Hoff.** — *(D)* Madam President, the Socialist Group will be voting for the motion for a resolution because it contains a number of very promising points, for instance, regarding unemployment among women in the European Community. I would commend this chapter to the attention of all those who seem to be concentrating on the section dealing with health care. This morning, for the first time, we had a decision regarding a general reduction in working time, and we believe that the work available must be shared around fairly, which means that the women in the European Community must get their fair share.

As regards the question of abortion, which is so much in the foreground here, I should like to point out that the motion for a resolution says that abortion must be treated only as a last resort. I believe we must bear in mind the emergency nature of this problem in our discussions. The complaint that the motion for a resolution still contains too many demands merely shows that there is still too much unfairness in the Community, and that this will have to be got rid of.

*(Applause)*

We Socialists are surprised at the attitude of the Group of the European People's Party, because it was precisely that Group which tabled an amendment in the committee as a proposed compromise solution. Do not forget what we decided this morning. Our amendments went much further, and if you insist on falling back behind your rapporteur's compromise proposal, you should not be surprised if doubt is cast on the credibility of your Group as a whole.

*(Applause from various quarters on the left)*

Your sanctimonious attitude in this debate is a slap in the face for every European woman's right to self-realization and equal treatment.

*(Applause)*

What we have witnessed here is an attempt to establish a pregnancy psychosis whereby abortion is deemed to be murder and all the good and promising things in this motion for a resolution are simply swept under the carpet. That is no way of discharging our duty to the

**Hoff**

people of Europe. Parliament has a duty to retain its credibility, and I would ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to read through paragraphs 35 and 36 once again with great care. I believe that what we have heard today on the subject of abortion simply misses the point these paragraphs are making.

*(Applause from the left)*

I would ask you to vote for the motion for a resolution for the special reason that this subject has now for the first time taken on a European aspect, and we have a duty to take action in this field.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — I call Mrs von Alemann.

**Mrs von Alemann.** — *(D)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, it is with a sense of intense bitterness that I have asked for the floor once more to say how depressing I find it that 14 months' work on the part of a group of men and women who genuinely wanted to improve social conditions in the European Community should now suddenly be dragged into a discussion which is unfair and in which, above all, the facts are being twisted.

*(Applause)*

I should like to ask those gentlemen who have spoken in this debate to tell us precisely where we are supposed to have given our approval to abortion. What we are saying is that imprisonment is not a suitable means of stamping out abortion once and for all. There have always been abortions. Where precisely are we supposed to be passing what amounts to a death sentence on unborn children? How can you possibly make such incredible claims? Women Members of this House have tried hard to reach a consensus. In the committee we voted by 14 to 1 for the motion for a resolution, with 6 abstentions. How can you accuse us of something that no woman should be accused of?

*(Applause)*

We want to see this motion for a resolution adopted. We have been prepared to make compromises wherever it was at all possible. I would appeal once again most fervently to this House to adopt this motion for a resolution. It is not true that we are in favour of abortion. Just take another look at the final section of paragraph 35. Women in distress are still having to seek help in other countries. Where do you think German women went for their abortions before § 218 of the German legislation was amended? To the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of course! Where do you think French women went for their abortions? Again, they were forced to go abroad. Are you just not prepared to recognize the facts? Do you not

realize what a problem this is and what it means to women?

*(Applause)*

Do you think it is easy for women to have an abortion? Do you really think that such a thing is easy for a woman with a sense of responsibility — and women do have a sense of responsibility. Just try to imagine

another country to seek help. Which of those men who spoke earlier referred to women at all? They were concerned only with the murder of unborn children. But what about the risks run by women who have to resort to back-street abortions and lose their lives as a result?

*(Applause from the left)*

On behalf of my Group, I would urge you to vote for this motion for a resolution because we have taken so much trouble to meet you half-way.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Bersani.

**Mr Bersani.** — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to explain why I shall be voting against this motion. My objection is a general one. It is always a mistake to try to include delicate and complex moral questions in such broad economic and social topics.

It is not possible to strike a compromise over questions of principle — neither now nor in the future. We feel that it was a mistake to include the issues outlined in paragraphs 34, 35 and 36 in a document which, on the whole, is laudable; as can be seen from the voting, I too have consistently voted in favour of its individual sections.

In this specific case, the motive behind these paragraphs is to affirm — in a vague and superficial fashion, as Mrs Gaiotti De Biase said — the principle of binding statutory provisions. But these would have the effect of undermining another principle, and one which constitutes a supreme law for the whole of mankind: the safeguarding of life from its very beginnings.

Although we do not lack sympathy and understanding, we can only — or, I should say, I can only — repeat what I said to my colleagues of the time in our national parliament: we cannot possibly agree with this, *non possumus!* Let us not have any misunderstandings here; we must of course obey the law and conform with its provisions, but no, we cannot support the demands contained in this section of the motion. You cannot blame our Group, but this has ended up

**Bersani**

by dominating a document which, as I said before, we all consider to be generally laudable. Nevertheless, it contains these statements which, whether you like it or not, cast a menacing shadow over mankind's aspirations for freedom and triumph . . .

*(Protests from the left)*

We shall probably be in the minority, ladies and gentlemen, but that does not matter. Our role here is not just to bear witness; it is my opinion that we are here to make a statement of principle. Sooner or later this principle will win through, and it is only on this basis that I believe we will one day emerge from our present slough of despond. But we will not help the human race to find the right path by compromising moral values.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

**President.** — I call Mr Papaevstratiou.

**Mr Papaevstratiou.** — *(EL)* Unfortunately we note that this most serious and important motion is in danger of not being adopted on account of the subject which has cropped up and to which so many Members have referred at length. I shall therefore be very brief. I would appeal to the *ad hoc* Committee on Women's Rights and to the rapporteur to make it clear that the termination of pregnancy will only be allowed in cases where the woman's life is in danger and with the authorization of the doctor in charge. If this is done, there is no doubt that this important motion for a resolution will receive the votes of a large majority in this House.

**President.** — I call Mrs Maij-Weggen because I do not believe that paragraphs 35 and 36 say what you think they say.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen, rapporteur.** — *(NL)* Madam President, I shall be very brief. Please forgive me for being somewhat emotional, but at least I have not indulged in hysterics like some of the Members. The motion for a resolution states quite clearly that abortion should be treated only as a last resort. I am sure all of us know what last resorts tend to be like. If a woman's physical or mental well-being is at stake, abortion must be permissible. This may be tantamount to choosing the lesser of two evils, but that is what life is sometimes like, and that is precisely what this motion for a resolution is aiming at.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — I call Mr Seligman

**Mr Seligman.** — Madam President, I shall be very brief. I have listened to a lot of men saying they cannot accept the Maij-Weggen Report because of their conscience. What right have we men got to dictate to women in this matter?

*(Applause from various quarters)*

What right have we men got to deprive women of the choice to decide for themselves whether they want to bring unwanted children into the world? We have not got that right, so I am going to vote for the whole report and I ask people who are troubled by their conscience to abstain.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — I call Mr Blaney.

**Mr Blaney.** — I, like many others, find a great deal in this report with which I agree and have agreed during the voting. I wish to join with my colleague, Mr Sieglerschmidt, in deploring the manner in which so much of such importance is thrown at the Members of this House in a voting procedure that in fact is confusing, to say the least of it. However, my firm belief and conviction is that women have been, are being and may continue to be exploited in various ways. While the content of this report does in many respects go quite a long way in showing how exploitation and discrimination could and should be ended, nevertheless I would feel that, in many respects, it has not gone far enough.

I agree with those speakers who decry the fact that little, if any, recognition has been given to the role of the woman in the home, that she is neglected, continues in this particular document to be forgotten, that women, as some other speaker has said, working on farms, particularly in the disadvantaged and remoter areas, are being exploited and discriminated against and that there is little in this report to change that situation in any way.

But despite that and despite those omissions, I find myself in general agreement with the excellence of the report and its recommendations except in regard to Chapter 4, paragraphs 34, 35 and 36. While this is a matter that can and has been dealt with by many speakers, in some cases in rather emotional terms, I would merely suggest that, in dealing with the rights of women, we should first of all have regard to the fact that in the matter of abortion we are ignoring the rights of the child. It is a mistake that this matter should have been brought into a report which in many other respects is desirable, necessary and, if anything, does not go far enough in trying to rectify the situation of exploitation and discrimination against women over the generations.

**Blaney**

I find myself, like many others, in the regrettable position of agreeing with the report generally but having, unfortunately, to vote against it.

**President.** — I call Mr Romualdi.

**Mr Romualdi.** — (*I*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, following the advice of the 'Adelaide Ristori', an association which has been campaigning for women's rights in Italy for years, my colleagues and I had agreed to vote for this resolution. But now that we have voted on the amendments, we feel we must refute the statements on abortion, which is such a tremendous human and social problem. We intend to show our opposition to it during the forthcoming referendum campaign in Italy.

For this reason we are not able to vote for the resolution, even though we had in fact intended to support it — with some reservations because it does aim at improving the position of women, above all at work and also where their social welfare and all their civil and political rights are concerned. We must aim for equality, but we cannot believe that such equality should worsen the position of women by obliging them to go beyond the limits of their duties and natural functions. For when we consider the human condition of both sexes, we recognize that it is those very aspects of women which are the highest expression of our civilization, and its safeguard for the future. That is why women are our partners and the true heroines of this glorious adventure which we call life, despite its all too frequent trials and tribulations. But abortion on demand, granted indiscriminately to all and sundry, is a brutal condemnation and denial of life.

**President.** — I call Mrs Dekker.

**Mrs Dekker.** — (*NL*) Madam President, to save time, I had originally intended not to make a declaration of vote. However, in view of certain things that have been said, I have now decided to do so after all, and I am now speaking on behalf of Mrs Spaak too. Certain speakers have accused those Members who are in favour of legalizing abortion — not in favour of abortion, you will note, but of legalizing abortion — of being murderers. But what about some concern from Mr Habsburg and his colleagues for those women who, as a result of illegal abortions, are either killed or so badly mutilated that they can never again bear children? Mrs Von Alemann was quite right to raise this point in her contribution just now.

Nor do I recall hearing any of those speakers refer to the question of paternity and men's responsibilities in this respect. It is a striking fact that those shooting their mouths off here are in the main men whom I have never seen in the *ad hoc* committee, who made

no contribution to the discussion on what should go into this report and who have taken no interest in our work.

(*Applause from the left*)

They belong mainly to an age group who, normally speaking, cannot expect to have any more children, and the same goes for those politicians . . .

(*Applause and laughter*)

. . . Madam President, I said 'normally speaking'. The same goes for those politicians who are concerned with this subject at national political level, in various Member States in which the legalization of abortion has become, politically speaking, a hot potato.

Women of the potential child-bearing age group — and that can be narrowed down more precisely — are rather thin on the ground in politics. The political aim I am advocating — and here I am not speaking on behalf of Mrs Spaak — is that abortion must be left purely and simply up to the woman concerned. That is my very firmly-held conviction. The reason why we believe this to be such a fundamental point is that any restriction placed on this principle will jeopardize the woman's own responsibility and dignity.

I am not making the case for abortion. No right-thinking person could be in favour of such a thing, but what I am advocating is the right of women to make their own decisions.

Madam President, although I am not wholeheartedly in favour of the passages in the motion for a resolution which deal with this point, this will not prevent me from voting for the resolution as a whole: firstly, because the passages in question are not unacceptable either and secondly, because there is no chance, for the time being, of finding acceptance for a more radical standpoint in either direction.

(*Applause from various quarters*)

**President.** — I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman.

**Mrs Kellett-Bowman.** — Madam President, there is a very great deal in this report of which I strongly approve; but, as many speakers have said, it has gone well beyond its terms of reference, which were to enquire into discrimination against women and seek to achieve a greater degree of fairness towards them. Alas, it went far beyond its mandate into the domain of Member States, in particular in paragraphs 34, 35 and 36 on abortion, against which I voted but which unfortunately were passed. A colleague of mine referred to the women's right to choose if she wants to bring unwanted children into the world. She chooses, Madam President, at the time of conception, and I

**Kellett-Bowman**

might point out to him that unwanted pregnancies are not the same as unwanted children: I myself had a very much unwanted pregnancy just before standing for Parliament, but she is a very much loved child today.

*(Applause from the centre and from the right)*

It is with the greatest regret, therefore, that although the motion contains a very great deal of value which I hope will come forward in another report, because of my belief in the sanctity of innocent human life I cannot support this report.

*(Applause from the centre and from the right)*

**President.** — I call Mr Fantì.

**Mr Fantì.** — *(I)* Madam President, I should like to give an explanation of vote on behalf of the Italian Communists and Allies.

We set great store by the setting up of this *ad hoc* committee and, as the months have gone by, members of my Group have tried to make a sustained and, I believe, valid contribution to its work so that a broadly uniform conclusion could be reached. Now that all the work has been completed, however, I regret to have to say that yet another opportunity has been wasted by the European Parliament.

We should like to make one general criticism: The motion for a resolution tries to cover too much and runs the risk of skimming over all the problems as a result. It seems to me that the position of women is not yet included as a natural and integral part of all Community policies.

Among the problems which have been tackled here, we agree with some points in the section on social welfare, while there are others to which we are opposed, as we pointed out during the voting on the amendments. On the other hand, we approve of the controversial chapter on health care, including the paragraphs which refer to the voluntary termination of pregnancy.

We have listened with due respect to the problems of conscience evoked by several members of the EPP Group with regard to this question. But personally I have no qualms about saying that I am sorry the position argued by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase could not be adopted by the EPP Group as a whole. It is a pity that the Group did not manage to avoid a split in its ranks on this occasion, as some members were unable to resist introducing principles of dogma into a political debate.

To conclude, we regard this work — both the discussion and the finished resolution — as the beginning of

a new role for the European Parliament, because it represents a reference point for all the women's movements which have been campaigning in Europe for so many years. That they feel this to be true, moreover, is confirmed by the presence of so many of their representatives here today and their participation in this debate.

For these reasons, and with these reservations, therefore, we are in favour of the motion for a resolution.

*(Applause from the left)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Martin.

**Mrs Martin.** — *(F)* Madam President, we were most disappointed by the rejection of our amendment together with any other which provided for the committee's work to be continued, and we still think that our work will not be understood by all the men and women who have followed its progress. Be that as it may, we will vote for this resolution which, although it is a compromise, contains so much that is positive in our eyes that it should be adopted by an overwhelming vote on the part of this Assembly.

I should just like to say, both as a woman and as a European, how deeply sorry I shall be if the outcome of this debate is as I anticipate, and all the more so for this reason: if you read carefully the points concerning the termination of pregnancy — which seems to be the main stumbling block here — it should be quite clear to you that the report is only in fact trying to take account of a situation which already exist and is trying to find a solution to desperate situations. Of course, nobody is in favour of abortion. In conclusion, I appeal to all those who want to reject this resolution to think very carefully about the consequences and what our image will be in the eyes of the many European women who have come here, if, having raised so many hopes, we disappoint them now.

**President.** — I call Mrs Macchiocchi.

**Mrs Macchiocchi.** — *(I)* Madam President, both I and the majority of my Group shall be voting in favour of this motion for a resolution. We have listened carefully to the discussion over paragraph 35 and the attitude of some members reminds us of that painting by Rembrandt in which several doctors are seen bending over the body of a man. In our case, the body is that of a woman; here we have a whole army of highly intelligent and capable men trying to make up their minds as to whether a woman's pregnancy should continue or not. Rembrandt's painting displays a keen sense of irony in showing the absolute power of the doctors leaning over the body stretched out on the operating table. Well, I have been struck by a similar irony here

**Macchiocchi**

today on hearing all these gentlemen holding forth about women's bodies — even if they are guided by a sense of moral purpose — as if these bodies belonged to them.

We, on the other hand, intend to reaffirm what we have said before: we support a woman's right to choose. It is therefore up to each woman to make this very basic choice, and I say so as a mother myself. Each woman must decide whether to bring one or more children into a society whose limitations she knows and in full consciousness of the struggles she will have to endure to guarantee that her children have a future safeguarded by society as a whole. Paragraph 35 reveals a sense of balance in this matter and I think it was quite out of place of certain members to raise their voices on the grounds of their religious beliefs against those who are willing to tackle what is a basic problem of contemporary European society and a central concern to all those women who have been invoked here today. We claimed that we wanted to draw up a resolution in the interests of European women, which is why, for the first time ever, we have seen the public gallery crowded with women today. Let us not disappoint them, ladies and gentlemen; the European Community is already so unpopular among women! They have appealed to us for help and we should not respond by frustrating and trampling on their hopes. For these reasons, I — and I believe, other members of my Group — shall be voting in favour of the motion for a resolution.

**President.** — I call Mrs Lenz.

**Mrs Lenz.** — (*D*) I should like to say on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party that I deplore the fact that we have had a debate of this kind here today.

From the very beginning, we have issued warnings in the *ad hoc* committee not to pursue this subject in this direction. In our proposed amendments, we have tried to water down points 35 and 36 dealing with abortion under certain conditions, because we realize that these matters have created profound ethical and religious problems in our countries. The legislation on this subject differs from country to country, and we have always advised against seeking to harmonize this legislation. These are points we have made loud and clear, and the only personal reply I have to make to one of the previous speakers is that we have always made it clear that we have gone as far as we possibly could in view of what we personally thought we could support.

The various explanations of vote made by members of our Group show clearly that these questions of conscience go particularly deeply in our Group, and we cannot do justice to the range of opinions by engineering a bloc vote. I would ask you to remember that the declarations of vote given here are personal

statements which we must respect. Everyone in our group is free to vote as his or her conscience dictates. In our view, the importance of the sanctity of life cannot possibly be stressed too much, and we cannot debate the rights and wrongs of it in this form. We regret that doubt has been cast on the report and the months of very hard — and, in many respects, excellent — work put in by our rapporteur by these points and also that a good example of what can be done by all the women Members of this House pooling their efforts to formulate a comprehensive policy on the position of women in the European Community has now been jeopardized. In view of the unemployment problem, the educational and training problems and the threats to the status of the family, we had expected some important pointers from this motion for a resolution.

I should like to make it clear on behalf of my Group that we are for freedom of decision and for the free development of the human personality, but we are also for the joint responsibility of men and women for human life, which is so often mentioned in our debates on human rights. Like all the other Groups in this House, we want to see an end to discrimination against all women in the family and in employment. We want to find solutions to these problems; after all, many of our voters are women, and we are aware of their problems and are just as keen as anyone else to give them social security and equal opportunities. I am sorry to have to say that, in view of the distortions brought about by the points I have just mentioned, a lot of the members of my Group feel bound to vote against the motion for a resolution. A minority will be voting for the motion, and some will be abstaining.

(*Applause from the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group)*)

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

**Mr Pannella.** — (*F*) I am sure that you are well aware and that your conscience could tell you that you have deliberately allowed other people to speak before me, even though they asked for the floor after I did. I do not think that you can take away someone's rights in this House just because you don't like the look of him, Madam President. I therefore wish to give an explanation of vote, just like everybody else!

**President.** — Mr Pannella, you will be allowed — along with others — to speak later. I gave the floor to Mrs Macchiocchi, even though she wasn't on the list of speakers, because she told me that this omission was due to a secretary's mistake . . .

**Mr Pannella.** — (*F*) I could quite well give the same excuse. It only goes to show that getting permission to speak depends on whether you like the look of

**Pannella**

someone. It's worse than trying to get a drink in a crowded bar!

**President.** — I call Mrs Roudy.

**Mrs Roudy.** — (*F*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I will keep my comments short as all the points have already been made and noted by those present. I should just like to say that there was a time when I dreamed of a great resolution, brimming over with enthusiasm, boldness, purpose and courage, in favour of women's rights. Well, it would appear that I'll have to wait for another opportunity because dreams are one thing and reality is another. What is the reality? The fact is that we can hardly call ourselves progressive in this Parliament. So, we have done what we could and the resolution closely reflects the character of this Parliament, which is capable of taking little steps forward from time to time, but never great strides.

Confronted by this tentative image of a Parliament which does admittedly take liberties with the Treaties from time to time, one may well hesitate to judge, and some people are indeed hesitating now. Even I hummed and hawed for a while, but after hearing speeches which must be without parallel for their vehemence, dishonesty and hypocrisy, I must say that my mind is now made up.

I want to congratulate Mrs Maij-Weggen for having the forbearance to sit through all these speeches (*Applause*) and to impress on her that she must not allow herself to be discouraged by the facile and somewhat cowardly arguments voiced by the defenders of a moral order which I, for one, regard as inhumane and outmoded. Whatever you do, don't give them the satisfaction of wounding you with their remarks, for they do them no credit! I shall therefore be voting for this resolution and I think that we should all do so for a very simple reason, namely, that it will benefit many women.

I should just like to remind Members that, although many voices have been raised against the motion, there have also been many for it. I am thinking of the messages from Ireland and the thousands of petitions received recently by our colleague and friend Mrs Yvette Füllet; she has been bombarded with petitions from women begging her to do her utmost to obtain approximation of the laws relating to the voluntary termination of pregnancy. By acting in this way we knew that we were making a positive response to appeals from women whose voices would otherwise never have been heard, and who are unable to be here today for obvious reasons. The proposals contained in the resolution are in fact very modest, so no one need fear that they are going to spark off a revolution!

As far as the voluntary termination of pregnancy is concerned, which has become an obsession with some

people, and used by them to create panic among others, I suggest that you take another look at the text; all it says is that steps should be taken so that women are no longer obliged to resort to this expedient, and calls for

decisions at national level such as to obviate the need for journeys of this type which make any form of social aid impossible and lead to unacceptable commercialization . . .

It may be assumed that such commercialization is not regarded as a bad thing by some countries. Nevertheless, is it really revolutionary to request that any woman who finds herself in difficulty can obtain the necessary assistance in her own country?

To sum up — and these are my last words on the subject — let us vote in favour of this motion for a resolution in the knowledge that it is a small step forward. We shall have opportunities at some other time to discuss the protection of life and we shall see what our positions are then. But for the moment, I ask you to vote for this resolution; it is far from revolutionary, but it is helpful. We will try to do better the next time . . .

(*Applause from various quarters*)

(*Parliament adopted the resolution*)\*

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella for an explanation of vote.

**Mr Pannella.** — (*F*) Madam President, I voted in favour of this resolution not merely because of its overall worth but because it has once again brought us face to face with views which I personally would label inhuman.

It is quite monstrous, Madam President, that anyone should put forward religious arguments, even Catholic ones, in support of certain attitudes when for nineteen hundred years it was forbidden to baptize anything which was not manifestly human in appearance.

For 1 900 years the Church withheld baptism from any being which was not patently identified as human. For this reason, Madam President, I feel that the repeated attempts to place the life of the fertilized ovum or the embryo on the same plane as that of the human being are blasphemous. I am very sorry for Mr Bersani, who feels that on behalf of foetuses everywhere he cannot vote in favour of this resolution on women when, in my opinion monstrously, he and his party each year approve military spending which means that 20 million people who are, or could be, baptized are condemned to death. This is a truly monstrous way of looking at

\* By roll-call vote requested by the Socialist Group; see minutes of proceedings

**Pannella**

life, not just in its social aspects but from a moral point of view as well. These are the reasons, Madam President, which led me to vote in favour of this resolution.

**President.** — The sitting will now be suspended until 3 p.m.

The House will rise.

*(The sitting was suspended at 1.55 p.m. and resumed at 3.05 p.m.)*

## IN THE CHAIR: MR DE FERRANTI

*Vice-President*

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

3. *Presentation of the Fourteenth General Report of the Commission and its programme of work for 1981 (followed by a debate)*

**President.** — The next item is the presentation by Mr Thorn, President of the Commission, of the Commission's Fourteenth General Report on the activities of the Communities in 1980 and the presentation of the Commission's annual programme of work for 1981.

The Commission has the floor.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Thorn, President of the Commission.** — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, a month ago I stood here to introduce the new Commission and in accordance with your wishes we agreed to meet again today for a more thorough discussion of policy and programmes.

Who could have imagined that scarcely a few hours later one of the pillars of the Commission, Finn Olav Gundelach, was to leave us for ever? Thus the Commission found itself faced with new and difficult problems. Tribute was paid to our colleague in this House, so I will not re-open the wound but simply remind you that within barely five years he is the second Commissioner who has been unable to finish his term, both being struck down in Strasbourg after a last appearance here.

I must also say that the Danish Government acted swiftly on our request and very quickly appointed

Poul Dalsager, its Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, to complete the term of our late friend, Finn Gundelach. The choice was promptly ratified by the Member States and the Commission, after considering all the possible solutions and weighing the pros and cons of each, decided to give Mr Dalsager the agriculture portfolio and let Mr Kontogeorgis take over full responsibility for fisheries, as had been planned in any case.

That is all I shall say in presenting our new colleague. Firstly because you already know him well enough as a former Vice-President of this House and because, like Mr Kontogeorgis, who was the first to appear in the front line of the very heated discussions at a Council meeting on fisheries, Mr Dalsager will soon be appearing before you to defend, at what is a particularly critical juncture, the agricultural prices for the coming year.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, you have before you the Commission's Work Programme for 1981. This paper is to some extent the first of its kind. Given your future role, the new Commission felt that it was preferable to let you have a few pages of our priorities which would give you food for thought, rather than the customary memorandum annexed to the no less customary programme-address, which was simply a list of all the activities to be undertaken by the Commission.

So as not to take up too much of your time by embarking on a lengthy and pointless survey of a four-year programme and of priorities for the next twelve months and also to avoid any charges of neglecting political nuances or comment, my colleagues and I decided that we would simply lay our programme before you. Of course we are here to sustain the debate on all the points covered in this paper and those which you choose to raise. I shall now briefly, I hope, present the programme and make some comment upon it.

As we step into 1981 my task, I know, is a daunting though enthralling one, and for two reasons: one being European and general and the other particular, Community and institutional. Let me take the institutional one first.

My Commission is the first to appear before a directly-elected Parliament. Believe me when I say that this new situation is crucial. His Excellency President Sadat came here to address you yesterday, and that says more than any lengthy speech of mine about the importance of this House and the eminent role, indeed the eminently political role, it will have to play. With a political and democratic base deriving from your support and powers of control, the Commission owes it to itself to be more responsible and watchful in its relations with Parliament. These new, unaccustomed working conditions, to which I will return later, will have an enormous influence on the institutional

### Thorn

future, not only yours and ours but also that of the whole Community. They will compel the Commission to give a more detailed account of its stewardship, past and future, and force it to pay particular attention — you have my word on this — to your criticisms and suggestions. When I spoke to you last month I told you that I felt our collaboration to be of paramount importance: I have since made a point of confirming my views in writing to your President.

The second daunting aspect of our task is, alas, that never before have we had to set out priorities against a background that was so gloomy in the short term and so uncertain thereafter. The Community — indeed the world — has never, you will agree, been in such a parlous state. It is ailing. Not just economically, or socially. It is ailing, period, as you have frequently pointed out.

And the people of Europe, disturbed by the increasingly frequent reports of our society's ills, are frightened and are no longer giving the Community the trust it deserves and desperately needs. But I will return to this later.

My particular concern today is to sketch the outline and highlight the particularly significant points of the new Commission's plan of action for steering Europe through the hard times ahead. You are better placed than anyone to realize that our success depends heavily on the political support we get. Every day in our work we shall be asking for that political support from the governments of the Member States; today we are here to ask it of you on this particularly special occasion, but it is above all through you and beyond you that we are seeking it and indeed we must obtain it from the peoples of the Community, the men and women who elected you.

As to the background, we must recognize that the development of the world situation holds little comfort of Europe. It is best described as the aftermath of a series of conflicts, the most glaring of which have been building up for the last few years.

On the political scene it is clear that *détente* has taken such a beating in recent months that the term itself seems obsolete and a replacement is being sought. The world situation now is more worrying than at any time since the Cold War. The invasion of Afghanistan was a further turn of the screw. A war between Iraq and Iran coming on top of a revolutionary change of régime in Iran and compounding the Israeli-Arab problem with the Palestinian dilemma and its Lebanese repercussions, all this is making the Middle East more dangerous than ever, despite all the hopes raised by the courageous missions President Sadat undertook so recently. Africa is the prey of covetous eyes and widespread unrest. Latin America is in the grip of new and murderous internal conflicts, and in Asia, apart from the invasion of Afghanistan, daily happenings are a cruel reminder of the tragedy of our times.

In addition to the events which by their harsh brutality make the headlines, there are a number of question marks over the international situation. The fate of Europe, and in particular its influence, will depend, whether we like it or not, on how the new American administration views the future of East-West relations. The serious threats to world peace directly involve Europe. Their repercussions, and it is in terms of repercussions that they most trouble us today, may make nonsense of our efforts for integration. Indeed, the bouts of fever raging on the fringes of Western Europe make us constantly aware that Europe is still in the middle of the hotbed of tension between East and West. So we, the people of Europe, have a role to play as custodians of world peace, not only for ourselves but also in terms of the alliances some of us have contracted and various commitments we have entered into all over the world.

On the economic front there is no point in mincing words: the prospects are particularly bleak. We are in the trough of a protracted crisis, a structural crisis; we are trying hard to live with it; but have yet to learn to overcome it and control what some people, including myself, have no hesitation in describing as a change of civilization. The cards are being dealt at world level. The development, meaning the expansion and operating conditions, of world trade is at risk. There are clear signs of a widespread return to protectionism. This is particularly disquieting for the Community, which, as the world's leading trading power, needs free and expanding trade for its very existence. The collapse of international trade, meaning its fragmentation, its restructuring, would be a body blow to the Community. It is all too clear that the impacts would not stop at the Community's outer borders but might well threaten to jeopardize the very existence of the Common Market, the name by which so many know our Community. With these dark clouds looming over us, may I simply remind you by way of example and as a call for solidarity to the Member States that the unbalanced development of the Community's trade with a major partner like Japan is a source of serious concern.

We must not forget that apart from the general slow-down in economic growth the Community has another weak spot in that, more than any other big economic group, it has to import the bulk of its energy and raw materials. In 1980 the Community countries ran up an oil bill of over a hundred thousand million dollars. With the exception of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, Community countries, with Japan, are the most heavily dependent on external supplies. This has far wider consequences than are usually imagined. We must remember that even Europe's agriculture — which keeps the Community self-sufficient, or in surplus as some critics would have it — is heavily dependent on imported oil and raw materials. Twenty years ago, when I was sitting on your benches, Parliament was worried about our energy future, notwithstanding the initial enthusiasm generated by Euratom.

## Thorn

The 1973 crisis has sadly not taught the signatories of the Euratom Treaty the need for increased solidarity. Let us hope that our energy bills, which will keep going up and up, and our meagre rates of economic growth will prompt us in time to change our ways.

Because of its dependence the Community could actually see its share of world trade shrink from 20 % to 15 % over the next decade. The main beneficiaries would be Japan and certain 'go-ahead' developing countries.

The worsening economic climate holds a further peril in that it could undermine the efforts that the Third World countries are making to develop, thus harming the interests of our potential customers, widening the gulf between nations, heightening tension and reducing some countries to famine and despair with all that can mean in political terms. The urgency of these problems and the growing realization that the northern and southern hemispheres are economically interdependent highlight Europe's special responsibilities here. To speak of this problem is to define our responsibilities, what we can do, the role we must play.

To take a different, but related, line of thought, anything which disrupts our monetary system can make our forecasts and forward calculations obsolete. Here, as elsewhere, the dangers inherent in any fresh upsurge in prices are so great that we must persevere in our efforts to re-establish stable and universally recognized monetary relations. No one can doubt that Europe has played, and will continue to play, a crucial part here. While I realize there is nothing to be gained by rushing our fences, I cannot accept that we should shy away from them either. My feeling is that in the face of our present difficulties we must advance, all ten together, lest we see our economies continue to move further apart and thereby jeopardize what the Community has achieved.

Is there any need to mention the consequences for the Community of a declining population and of the effects — of which so many Europeans feign ignorance — on the labour market, economic activity, social innovation, political life and Europe's place in the world? If the present trend were to continue, the population of Germany, now some sixty-one million, would fall to a mere forty million or so by the year 2050. If Europe's present birth rate continues beyond 1990 Europe will be on the brink of extinction in demographic terms. Europe would be the only region of the world with a stagnant, declining or at least ageing population. History has shown us that economic and demographic change frequently go hand in hand. I am afraid that a declining, ageing population may reduce our capacity to adapt and innovate, reinforce the Malthusian pattern and make the dialogue with young, prolific nations even more difficult. The main concern of some nations will be their children, while others may have to devote themselves to the care of the elderly; some will be

concerned with maternity homes and nurseries while others, meaning us, will be running intensive-care homes for an older and older population. The pattern of research and the economy and the choice between investing in new industries and propping ageing ones may well depend on the outcome.

Turning now to the Community, we can clearly see that all is not well. Let us reflect a moment, as serious and informed politicians, and consider what the position of our countries would be without the Community.

There were those, not so very long ago, who claimed that Europe was the last of the great myths. No one of my generation or the generation before who witnessed the butchery of the First World War, the Great Depression and the rise of Fascism in the thirties, the slaughter and atrocities of the Second World War and the myriad sufferings it generated, would dream of doubting the intelligence, generosity and courage of those who have worked so tirelessly since then for European unity.

Can anyone deny the cardinal role played by the European idea in bringing about Franco-German reconciliation, the reconstruction of our continent, the removal of internal European frontiers and the opening up of Europe to the world, the unprecedented economic and social recovery of the late fifties and sixties? Not only is it the first time that 35 years have passed without the countries represented here today clashing in armed conflict but also — let me say it loud and clear — the first time that not one of our 250 million people contemplates even the possibility of such conflict. Surely that alone makes it worthwhile going all out to consolidate our achievements rather than thoughtlessly running them down?

*(Applause)*

Today our Community appears as a haven of peace and order in a world where, as events in Iran have made abundantly clear, lawlessness may take over from the rule of law. Despite its imperfections, our Community can still serve as an example of democracy to others. In this respect its image abroad, I regret to say, is more attractive than its image at home.

The Community today is still a busy trade centre, accounting for 33 % of world exports overall and 40 % of all manufactured goods exported. It is the main trading partner of the rest of Europe, the Middle East, Africa, Australia, New Zealand and Eastern Europe. Naturally the objectives of Community commercial policy are shaped by this situation and our Commission will make a point of setting up, in agreement with the governments, a truly common policy which will serve their best interests. Together we are a force to be reckoned with; alone even the strongest among us is vulnerable — enslavement and destruction would be ultimately inevitable.

### Thorn

With the international monetary system in disarray, the advent of the European monetary system in 1979 gave Europe a measure of monetary stability which has helped to reduce tensions between the economies of Europe. But the significance of this lies, above all, in the future; what was true yesterday is true today and will still be true tomorrow. Today the big blocs fix the odds and only they can afford to play for the highest stakes. We tend to forget, when speaking of the United States and the Soviet Union, that it is the 'United' in United States and the 'Union' in Soviet Union that give these countries their formidable political and economic might, not to mention the Arab League, the Islamic Conference, the OAU and so many other organizations.

Perhaps we should question the motives of those who are swimming against the tide of history today, opposing those who are anxious to quicken the pace and enlarge and strengthen our Community.

I fail to understand how — at a time when a Latin-American Common Market has just come into being, when certain black African and Maghreb countries are toying with the idea of economic and political union, when ASEAN is beginning to emerge as an economic and political force to be reckoned with — some members of the Community — and not the least among them — can question its value and argue in favour of a more 'flexible' or rather looser, association.

If you have followed my arguments so far — and surely no one can deny the truth of the picture I have painted — then why is it that Europe has such a poor image within the Community almost thirty years after the ECSC Treaty was signed? Where, for example, would the steel industry be without the Community? No doubt we would be squabbling among ourselves, and where would that leave us? Would we have made any more progress on energy policy? Would there be a wider regional policy? Would agriculture cost any less? I am sure it would cost more. Would we, individually, be able to play a major role in the Middle East, Asia and Africa? Would any single Member State have achieved a Yaoundé or a Lomé Convention? Would any of our members have been able to wrest balanced agreements from the United States and Japan single-handed? Or to take a final example, could any one of us play a decisive role in the North-South Dialogue? The answer is implicit in the questions themselves. Why, then, does Europe have such a poor image within the Community? We are all to blame: our governments, the man-in-the-street, the Commission as the Community's executive, and you as the elected representative of the people of Europe.

The initial confusion arose from identifying European integration with the golden age of prosperity and opportunity which marked its first fifteen years. Everyone welcomes this Europe of plenty, with annual growth rates in double figures — which today we

would enviously term Japanese proportions. Then came the hostility of many politicians, who were only too happy to attribute all their ills to the Community but were quick to claim the credit for any benefits.

*(Applause)*

The fact that the Community is rarely, if ever, so much as mentioned by our political leaders in their public speeches says a lot about the mentalities they created before becoming their captives and then their victims in their own turn. Inevitably the man-in-the-street feels that the Community is remote from him, and we must all work together to do something about this. But then the man-in-the-street can hardly be expected to feel involved when his immediate problems are overlooked. By failing to mount a campaign to explain Community action and promote understanding between Community citizens, we have knowingly created the climate of indifference, if not hostility, discernible among a sizeable proportion of Europeans.

What this Commission wants to do — with your assistance — is to make every citizen of our Community realize that we are sensitive to his problems, whether they concern employment, social policy, old and new industries, agriculture, fisheries or the professions. Every citizen of Europe can criticize us tomorrow as he did yesterday, but never again can he be allowed to claim he doesn't know who we are or understand what we are doing.

*(Applause)*

Of course this is not a Defence Community — and we know why that is — nor is it a Political Community; our Community is essentially economic, and yet who can claim in today's world that these elements can be separated from each other? After thirty years of interaction who can say that the economy is not a thoroughly political phenomenon? And so, while we will comply fully with the Treaties — the Commission is their guardian — the fact remains that if we want our Community to be a success and if we genuinely want to achieve European Union, we must not disperse our efforts. We must stand united against those who would divide us and work for European Union based on the existing Community institutions which have shown their mettle.

While we are on the point, I would venture to suggest that the procedural arguments which are claiming your attention at the moment are of little interest to your constituents. For one thing they have become far too subtle and consequently lost their mass appeal; for another, the citizens of Europe have far too much common sense to accept that our so-called European institutions should be fighting each other instead of pooling their efforts to build Europe.

*(Applause)*

## Thorn

This infighting makes the Commission's hair stand on end, and we will do everything we can to get the institutions working together properly. To put it bluntly, familiarity breeds contempt. People have grown accustomed to the Community but have failed to understand, or have frankly forgotten, its political aims. We tend to imagine that the Community can come through every crisis unscathed and overlook the fact that its essence is being steadily eroded!

Today Europe, if you will forgive the metaphor, is a rather ramshackle house. Its roof has been blown away by disunity. There is no heating, since energy is in short supply. There is no architect, since the generation of founding fathers who supervised the building has passed away. The builder is on the verge of bankruptcy, his resources virtually exhausted. The garden is still reasonably presentable, but is costing more and more to maintain. The tenants are at their wits' end — so many of them are out of work while other potential tenants are knocking at the door.

We are aware of the problems facing the people of Europe, especially young people, women, and the unfortunate victims of unemployment, insecurity and the aggression of modern life.

As far as the young — that fortunate generation that has never experienced war — are concerned, the new Commission intends to anticipate their demands, get to know their problems, and, above all, speak their language so as to give them new hope.

As far as women are concerned, Community legislation and Court rulings have of course blazed a trail towards equal treatment. I admit that much still remains to be done. Personally I and all the other members of my Commission regret that our institution consists entirely of men, though the fault is not ours. The Commission is after all a feminine noun in most European languages. The blame for this lies not with the Commission but with the ten Member States.

Ladies and gentlemen, I can see no alternative. We have no choice. There is no point in trying to create Europe from nothing, for we have been working on it for thirty years already. As for the challenges before us, you may well ask where we are to start. Well, frankly, we must take up all the challenges before us simultaneously. The priorities before us flow inevitably from challenges from outside and from the commitments entered into by the European Council and previous Commissions. The task facing the new Commission is to revitalize Europe — a Community of Ten today, a Community of Twelve tomorrow. And so, what we want to do today is to give you some idea of the approach and principles that the new Commission will follow during its term of office.

Our most pressing task, then, is to find new ways of meeting the challenge of the eighties without departing from the objectives set out in the Preamble

to the Treaty, which I took the liberty of running through with you less than a month ago. There are four preconditions for this:

Firstly, current policies must be adapted to new demands; safeguarding what we have achieved, though essential, must not be allowed to lead to rigidity. Secondly, the respective competences of the Community and the Member States must be clearly defined. Harmonization for its own sake and the pooling of resources at any price can be counterproductive. Thirdly, priorities must be reviewed regularly in the light of what can be done and what needs to be done. A Community that does not live in the present will end up by losing all credibility. Fourthly, the policy-makers must adopt a new approach of treating co-existent problems as a unit. But, let me repeat, the main aim of the new Commission, guided by the principles I have just set out, is to restore confidence in the Community by getting closer to grips with the real problems, by which I mean the problems which are uppermost in the minds of our citizens.

To respond to their justified anxieties the Commission will make every effort to obey three fundamental, closely-linked imperatives. The first is to make more effective use of available resources; the second is solidarity; and the third is to offer the people of Europe greater security.

Making more effective use of resources means that we must first re-examine current Community policies. As you know, the Commission gave an undertaking last year to set about solving the budgetary problems which are a serious threat to Community cohesion. This was to be achieved through structural adjustments and would follow the guidelines laid down by the Council on 30 May 1980. It has been argued that these guidelines are virtually irreconcilable and that this makes things rather difficult for the Commission. Be that as it may, the Commission has been reviewing a number of Community policies and it will present its findings to the Council and this House before July.

Before I come to the great problems of the day, or at any rate a few examples, I should like to make one point. I cannot accept it as an article of faith that the current ceiling on budgetary resources is sacrosanct.

*(Applause)*

The argument is a theological one, based on a narrow, mistaken philosophy. If it becomes more deeply rooted still in Community soil it is going to create enormous difficulties, especially for those who originally devised it. Our citizens have often paid dearly for the progress, stability and freedom of our Member States and for the unity of Europe. Indeed they have frequently paid with their lives, so let us be realistic enough to recognize that we cannot build Europe from the comfort of our armchairs.

### Thorn

There can be no question of trying to make a 1 % Europe, nor even a ½ % Europe.

*(Applause)*

Be that as it may, if we accept that we must pay the proper price for Europe, I am quite willing to agree that the Commission should concentrate first and foremost on clearly-defined priorities, that it should cut back activities in certain areas to release energies and funds for tackling what I have called the real problems. My temperament and my convictions tell me that what is needed now is a concentrated burst of fire rather than random sniping. And let me say very bluntly that if you and I wish to set ourselves up as responsible politicians we must understand that in today's circumstances any new financial effort inevitably entails a sacrifice and more than ever we must deserve it, we must be able to justify it and if necessary we must begin by making savings where we can.

Obviously the common agricultural policy, by far the largest budget item, will be at the heart of our review. The gap between agricultural spending and spending in other areas — I won't say 'policies' — is far too wide and must be adjusted. I specifically say adjusted, because there can be no question of abandoning the only real common policy we have. Europe needs a strong agricultural industry, and the mandate given to us last year states explicitly enough that the fundamental principles of the CAP are not to be touched. No. What the new Commission intends to do is to rein in the runaway growth of farm expenditure, in line with the reflections sent to you at the end of last year and the basic principles governing the common agricultural policy. It is unfortunate that the absence of any effective mechanism for keeping agricultural spending within bounds has cast doubts on the soundness of the policy itself and brought those who gain most from it into disrepute. Starting this year the new Commission hopes to be able to inject new life into the policy by involving farmers in its management through a co-responsibility mechanism but continuing to offer guaranteed incomes to the eight million people who work in this vital sector of the Community economy. The price proposals for the 1981-82 marketing year are ready and Mr Dalsager will be giving you further details next week. I do not propose to give figures now, but I will say that our proposals do not anticipate our response to the mandate given us on 30 May 1980.

The second area in which increased effectiveness is an imperative that I submit to your vigilance is the adaptation of our industrial apparatus to the demands of today's world. Non-intervention by Europe here could have appalling consequences, particularly in the political and economic context I have been talking about. As you know, increased industrial competitiveness is a precondition for a return to full employment in Europe. We need only think of the steel crisis to realize how disastrous failure to act at Community level would have been. The Commission is often very

unfairly criticized. We, like our predecessors, will resolutely promote the adaptation of production structures to relative energy and labour costs and to changing patterns of international demand. This is the price of success. It must be realized, however, that the back-up policies the Commission will adopt to support national restructuring efforts, public and private, must necessarily be compatible with the vision of a genuine common market. In no circumstances can they lead to a consolidation of the national patterns of production or the re-establishment of preferential markets. The Community is not just for lame ducks. It can and must face the challenges of the future. One of the new Commission's priorities here must be to promote new technologies. Our aim is to work out a strategy that will meet every aspect of the challenge that advanced technology offers our society and our industry. The Community is lagging behind, and it is time it caught up. A strategy based on this or that individual industry just will not do. The new Commission will seek to create conditions that will be conducive to industrial development, better training and coordinated scientific research. It will stake its claim in the area of innovation and research since this is the only way to ensure that the Community will come through the present wave of structural upheaval.

You know that this vast process of adaptation depends on the willingness of companies to take some risks and the willingness of workers to accept greater mobility. This implies that all must be prepared to shoulder a share of the inevitable burdens and sacrifices.

The Commission's second imperative will therefore be to develop policies inspired by the spirit of solidarity which underlies our whole endeavour, a spirit which must reign both inside and outside the Community.

The need for greater solidarity within the Community is becoming more and more urgent as the employment situation worsens. It can no longer be left to so-called back-up policies. To my mind solidarity cannot be described in terms of mere figures.

Today, more than twenty years after the Treaties of Rome were signed, we are forced to admit that the Community has failed to reduce regional disparities. There is an undeniable gap between the Community countries, but then similar gaps can be found within the borders of most of our countries, which is why it seems wiser to talk about disparities between the Community's regions rather than its Member States.

I need hardly stress here that if the Community fails to bridge this gap it will be faced not only with the problems arising from the malfunctioning of the internal market but also with the growing frustration that is widely felt in our society. This could do untold harm to its image.

For this reason the new Commission must convert its concern for greater convergence into immediate action

## Thorn

by adding to the Regional Development Fund's financial weaponry and fixing its sights on new targets. It will seek genuine cohesion in the various Community policies.

Social and employment policy too must be reappraised in the same spirit of solidarity.

The new Commission shares your deep concern at the relentless growth of unemployment, which has now soared beyond the eight-million mark leaving the equivalent of Europe's entire agricultural workforce out of a job.

We all realize that a situation in which young people account for 42 % of the unemployed is bound to exert intense pressure on the fabric of our society. Let me say clearly, in this House, that we cannot afford to sacrifice this potential which is, make no mistake about it, Europe's future. For these are the very people who, tomorrow, will have one of two options: to make or break Europe.

*(Applause)*

Faced with this intolerable situation we must make more selective and telling use of the powers at our disposal and, what is more important, do it quickly. I won't go into any detailed explanations at this point. Suffice it to say that the time is now past when the only concern of each of the Member States was to get the Social Fund to provide 50 % of its expenditure on programmes — admittedly often very necessary — of national interest.

The task has assumed such enormous proportions that the Commission will have to find a way of persuading all concerned to get round the table and hammer out a new social and employment strategy acceptable not only to those called upon to implement it but also to those who will bear the consequences. In my view developments affecting the quality of life, working hours and industrial relations are all suitable topics for joint discussion. Social policy cannot be limited to the fight against unemployment.

A final thought in this connection: the new Commission is fully aware of the need to involve both sides of industry not only in its social policy options but in other areas too.

But, as you all know, the authors of the Treaties did not want policy of development and progress in a spirit of solidarity to be confined to the Community. If our development policy is to remain a success and fulfil the original role defined in the Preamble to the Treaty, it must be more closely integrated with other Community policies. Only in this way can we reap the greatest benefit and get a clearer picture of the implications of our action. This new approach will have to be devised and subsequently applied with the active cooperation of all concerned in our countries and,

more importantly, the direct involvement of the developing countries themselves. I agree that the Lomé II Convention is our proudest achievement in this field but matters do not end there: you all realize how important it is for us to remain open to the whole Third World.

Clearly, if the Community wishes to inject a political element into this dialogue with the less-favoured nations of the world, it must take part in all in-depth discussions of the North-South problem. Its record on this front has always been, and must continue to be, exemplary. World economic recovery is at stake; the Community cannot opt out — it has a duty to itself and to the world as a whole. This is the spirit in which we are already making our preparations for the Ottawa Summit.

Our current dialogue and cooperation with the developing world is not inspired by charity. Given the increasing interdependence of our economies the security of all is at stake.

This brings me to our third imperative, no less important than the first two, namely the quest for security.

The disquiet shared by many of you revolves around three basic problems: firstly, the security of our energy supplies, secondly, the threat to our position as the world's leading exporter and, thirdly, the strategic importance of strengthening our ties with the Mediterranean countries.

Let us look at energy supplies first. The Community can hardly be said to have progressed far enough in the right direction. I know that a number of specific measures were taken to ease the uncertain supply situation created by political developments and military clashes in the Gulf region. But the worsening economic crisis must spur us on to further action.

This comprehensive approach will be one of the priorities of the new Commission. We cannot expect to get very far with structural adjustment without a coherent energy policy. We will make a special effort in the field of energy saving, nuclear safety and the development of new technologies. We will do more in the area of prices and stocks. Outside forces at play here mean that the dialogue with oil-producing countries must be stepped up and joint action taken to help the developing countries. For the dialogue is doomed to failure unless the problems of both parties are considered.

Another source of disquiet is that the Community, as the world's leading exporter, sees a threat to the free-trade system, built on rules and procedures approved by GATT, and vital to its existence. Our trading position should enable us to require more consideration and respect from our major trading partners than we have in the past. We should ask them to avoid a return to protectionism in exchange for our commitment to free trade. It is because we are aware of the vital

### Thorn

importance of our trading links with other industrialized countries that we have decided to use forthcoming international meetings to convince President Reagan and our Japanese partners of the seriousness of the situation. I would add that the opening of our frontiers must not be allowed to lead to any imbalance in our trade or to any disturbance of our economic and social equilibrium. Something will have to be done fairly soon about our lop-sided trade balance with Japan.

There is a further point I would like to make. A European monetary order is vital if the Community is to maintain its leading position in world trade. There is no need for me to go into the relationship between trade and monetary decisions here. Suffice it to say that an instable international monetary situation can severely handicap the development of world trade.

A number of questions have been raised over the last few years in connection with the third problem area — our relationship with the Mediterranean countries, which are of prime strategic importance to Europe. The main concern is enlargement, the acid test of the Community's ability to evolve and expand and ultimately enter the big league. All the Member States have declared their readiness to accept this challenge. We must on no account disappoint those who — both within the Community and outside it — are counting on our Institutions.

Naturally, the effects of enlargement will reverberate not only throughout the Member States but also throughout the various Mediterranean countries which have enjoyed preferential trade arrangements with us for so long. The inevitable conclusion is that the Community must define a coherent and comprehensive policy towards these countries. The fact that one member of my team of my team has taken over special responsibility for this policy speaks for itself.

Although enlargement is eminently desirable from the political point of view it is nevertheless understandable that, in this period of crisis, we should ask what problems expansion is likely to bring for the various Community policies and to what extent there is a danger of enlargement weakening rather than strengthening the union. The new Commission will act to foil those who view the third enlargement as a chance to demolish the patient building of the past.

However, I am sure that no one will contradict me when I say that the deep-rooted unease which is haunting our peoples, and which I see reflected in this House, goes far beyond these three imperatives.

Let us not mince words. We cannot hope to give any genuine reassurance to the people of Europe unless we are prepared to grasp the nettle and tackle the problem of security. The security of oil supplies, for instance, is as much a political issue as an economic or technolog-

ical one. The Euro-Arab dialogue — which we owe it to ourselves to revive — is one proof of this.

Indeed who would attempt to draw a line between the political and the economic these days?

I need hardly say that the revamping exercise I have just outlined will be doomed to failure unless it is backed by what my friend Emilio Colombo has termed a politico-institutional design. And this politico-institutional design will remain an illusion until the institutions stop bickering and start talking to each other at last.

You know better than anyone else that the Community cannot afford an institutional crisis.

The rot set in 1975. Since then we have witnessed a steady erosion of the European idea that inspired the authors of the Treaties, its covert watering-down into intergovernmental cooperation. Above all we have witnessed the re-emergence of nationalist reflexes. By now every issue that comes up is used as a pretext for picking an inter-institutional quarrel, for sparking off a crisis of confidence between the Member States. Perhaps this is our way of avoiding the real issues and ducking the real problems. We are being treated to the sad spectacle of Europe indulging in bitter infighting with national vanities being given full rein. Instead of anticipating or taking up the challenges of our decade, Europe is content to react, usually when it is too late. It is hardly surprising that our generation's idea of Europe as a grand design is losing ground.

During the Hallstein years no one had any doubts about the Commission being an independent policy powerhouse. In those days the Council had no option but to act on the Commission's initiatives as it translated commitments spelled out in the Treaties and duly ratified by the Member States into regulations and directives. But as soon as it became necessary to go further and break new ground, the Council's influence in the formulation of decisions became more and more dominant. It must be said that today, in practice, the Council operates more like an intergovernmental conference than the institution described in the Treaties and given a specific mission which is well known to you all.

It is true that the well-meaning have tried to right the balance. The Commission and the 'non-elected' Parliament have pointed repeatedly to the need for institutional reform. On each occasion — in 1962, in 1973 and again in 1975 — the ingredients of the proposed reform included wider powers for the Commission as the Community's executive, stronger legislative powers for Parliament and a greatly reduced role for the Council and its committees. There is no need to tell you that no Council ever examined these problems in depth. The only significant institutional reform over the years has been your

## Thorn

election by direct universal suffrage. And the Treaties made provision for that. In the present crisis our reflex should be to close ranks, to defend the Community's cohesion and international identity. Instead, let's face it, there is a crisis of confidence between the institutions. Why can't we all be courageous enough to take our share of the blame? The Council, for instance, is jeopardizing the effectiveness and development of our mission by trying to freeze budgetary funds, by refusing to apply its own rules and finally by failing to agree on new rules even where these are proposed at its request. On this point I feel that even a partial return to the qualified-majority vote written into the Treaties would be desirable, or even necessary . . .

*(Applause)*

. . . particularly in the enlargement context. Indeed the European Council itself advocated this.

By wanting to make the Commission more independent of the Council, some Members of this House are in danger of going too far in the opposite direction. The Community is, after all, based on three institutions — the Council, the Commission and Parliament. The new Commission will defend its independence against all comers in the interests of the entire Community — in yours too — and in line with the Treaties. It will strive to be ever more vigilant and vigorous in discharging its responsibilities. It is determined to be the real motive force of the Community, jealously guarding its right of initiative.

*(Applause)*

It will keep in close touch with Parliament briefing it and consulting it scrupulously. The new Commission will endeavour to provide the information which is necessary and essential in a democratic Europe so that everyone can see and judge the whys and wherefores of the Commission's proposals, Parliament's views, and the Council's decisions. It was no idle promise I made to this House last month when I said that the new Commission intends to work to restore the institutional peace which we all want so badly.

We should weigh up the consequences of the chronic ineffectiveness of the Community Institutions in the decision-making process. Taking the political view there is a danger that our penchant for referring our inter-institutional disputes to the Court will in time diminish the Community and its institutions — the Court included. In passing may I pay sincere tribute to this eminent institution which has always managed to stay on course despite the storms. The Community needs it now more than ever to tell us what is right.

*(Applause)*

However, we need to have done with squabbles about interpretation, with legal wrangling. We need to identify our goal, to decide what form of European inte-

gration we want, and ask ourselves whether we are prepared to make the sacrifices that a political commitment of this kind entails

Ladies and Gentlemen, you know what Europe's problems are, just as the Commission knows what Europe's problems are. You, like us, must feel that the time has come to pull ourselves together. Without the support of Parliament, without the support of the Council, the two institutions participating with it in the decision-making process, the new Commission cannot succeed.

For the reason the institutions can and must join in a genuine three-way conversation. Firstly, through the restoration of peace in our institutions and candour in their relations with one another. Secondly, by giving the Commission a pivotal and catalytic role in defining the Community's response to the major issues of the day. And thirdly, by evolving an entirely new formula for integration, putting Europe in a stronger position to meet the many challenges confronting it. It seems to me that the restoration of peace in our institutions and candour in their relations with one another is absolutely vital if we are to succeed.

Let me explain. The Commission has no ambition to take over the functions of the Council or Parliament. What we want is to see the Council act — and I mean act — using the legislative powers conferred on it by the Treaties. We want it to act promptly, responsibly and above all consistently. But we also want it to act on the basis of Commission proposals drafted by officials who — and this is absolutely essential in my view — must remain independent in the performance of their duties. And I may say here and now that my Commission will abandon the practice, all too frequent in the past, of sending the Council compromise proposals which have been watered down to satisfy the demands of national experts to the point where there is nothing left of the Commission's initial ideas.

*(Applause)*

The new Commission's aim — and I give you my word on this — will be to produce proposals which reflect the interests of the Community, the whole Community, and nothing but the Community, and which we will be happy to put our name to. I must make the point again that the new Commission will not sit and wait for the Member States to authorize or request it to prepare a proposal on this, that, or the other.

*(Applause)*

As far as this House is concerned, may I say that I and my colleagues — and eleven of us have served as MPs and Government Ministers, remember — are expecting a great deal of you.

### Thorn

Firstly, we expect Parliament to muster a majority which is prepared to support the Commission — at least on the key issues — in the exercise of its role as initiator of proposals in the Community interest. Secondly, we expect Parliament to fulfil its consultative role by supplying us with high-quality reports which will unquestionably increase our knowledge and which will always be given due consideration. For our part, we promise to assist you in these tasks by briefing you as fully as possible. Mr Andriessen will have a crucial part to play here, and his reputation and past record are a sufficient earnest of our future intentions.

The new Commission is determined to live up to its obligations and make every endeavour to fulfil its mission. This goal is attainable now that its machinery has a direct line to the wishes of the people of Europe as expressed through this House. Not that this will change the face of Europe. The Commission cannot move mountains or transform the harsh realities of the recession. Our function and our duty is rather to incite others to action, exercising our right of initiative courageously and not hesitating to break new ground where necessary. This means that my colleagues and myself, and this is something to which I am personally committed, must form a truly united and collectively responsible body of men which, need I repeat, cannot be equated to a coalition government. Our position in this three-way conversation between the institutions must be determined by the twin principles of effectiveness and democracy. And equally by a duty to defend the application of Community law. It was this last consideration that decided us, in the current budget dispute, to initiate the infringement procedure provided for in the Treaty. But we are by no means intransigent in this matter. In fact, we are endeavouring to negotiate new rules with the Member States.

It must not be forgotten that these institutional questions are much more important to us than to any national government. As an institution which has barely come of age, we have a clear need to defend the few powers which the Treaties have given us so that we may be in a position to fulfil our function properly.

But — I repeat — the Commission must also play or resume a pivotal and catalytic role in defining the Community's response to the major issues of the day.

We have seen that the challenges facing the Community are constantly increasing both in number and scale and that the policies which must be devised to tackle them will go far beyond those provided for in the Paris and Rome Treaties in the years ahead. Granted, the Treaties were written in a very different economic climate, and would, no doubt, benefit from being touched up here and there. But where would we be without them?

While we do not wish to press the point, I can tell you frankly that the Commission is keen to speak for Europe in the great international debates of our time

on issues which may not be explicitly mentioned in the Treaties, but nevertheless have a direct bearing on their application or inapplicability.

It is important — of this I am convinced — that the Community as such and not simply individual European States, should participate in major international debates.

*(Applause)*

What institution other than the Commission which the Treaty has placed under your control would be better able to express a truly Community viewpoint on any issue you care to name? It is time we realized that Europe's credibility suffers each time its partners perceive that its united front is a sham, that national policies and Community policies are, even on fundamental matters deriving from the Treaties, not only divergent but at times diametrically opposed. The danger is that by acting in this way we will lose on the swings as well as the roundabouts. Typical cases have proliferated alarmingly in recent years. The cumulative effect, in today's climate, could be a quick recipe for disaster.

What Europe really needs is an entirely new formula for integration. The future of Europe is patently not just a question of economics.

The world's cards are being redealt and Europe must see to it that it gets the hand it deserves. To do this it must first master, and if possible anticipate, the forces of political, technological and economic change. A political Community which would incorporate and transcend the three existing Communities is no longer an impossible dream. But this political Community will never see the light of day unless there is a common political will, and you, Ladies and Gentlemen, are in a good position to — shall I say — spread the good word, or at any rate the missionaries among you. For I have no illusions: unless the Member States act, unless the people of Europe are won over to the cause, unless there is a campaign to educate and inform our citizens, this initiative could die an early death. Instead of relying on a set of external mechanisms, such as common policies and institutions, to change people's attitudes, we should start from the attitudes themselves, from the inside, if we want to arrive some day at outward expressions of solidity. Instead of making our ultimate goal the creation of Europe, it is time we thought about creating Europeans.

Ladies and gentlemen, in conclusion, your election by direct universal suffrage gave democracy a foothold in the European venture. But this does not mean that your constituents are convinced of the relevance of our work to them. Let us therefore remain alert and attentive to the wishes of the people of Europe, notably by devising a new framework for dialogue between our two institutions.

### Thorn

It is not for me to go into details at this stage. All I would say is that, in the Commission's view, no aspect should be overlooked. With Europe — and indeed the world — at the crossroads of history, in the process of exchanging one civilization for another, our task, here and now, is to plan a second-generation Europe.

Anyone reading the programme and priorities which we have put before you with a practised eye will realize that through all these discussions on the common agricultural policy, on the need for a new balance between it and other policies, old and new, on monetary policy, energy policy, social and regional policy, it will be our privilege, over the months to come, to re-model the Community, to give European Union its definitive shape, in short to create Europe. And this mission we must fulfil — and I include this House in this — in the greatest possible clarity, without the slightest trace of ambiguity, and in a concern to avoid any misunderstanding.

We will also have to be crystal-clear in emphasizing our commitment to enlarge the Community and at the same time to strengthen and complete it. This triptych of The Hague, recorded in history in 1969, remains fully valid and now, twelve years on, we must be quick to put it into practice.

If we are to attain this goal, we must at the same time — that is to say right away — put a searchlight on the role of the institutions and their relations with one another, otherwise with ambiguity escalating into misunderstanding, and crisis into lawsuit, we will quickly run out of steam as the months wear on and lose what little confidence we still have in ourselves.

This need to put our house in order has often been neglected and discovered anew. At such times people have turned to a great European like Leo Tindemans, or to the Wise Men, or to more and more experts and their reports, which sad to say have served only to fill the library shelves.

Which is why my question today is this: surely you, the elected representatives of the people of Europe, and we, the Commission, selected by our Governments to be the guardians of the Treaties, the Community's executive, its powerhouse, surely we — together — are capable of producing all the proposals we need on what can and must be done to plan European Union. And are we not equally capable of deciding on, and then submitting, whatever proposals are necessary on what might or ought to be done?

*(Applause)*

The European Council, and the Council of Ministers with its various hats, are, I believe, regular visitors in this House; they too are invited to take part in the great mission which awaits us. But even if it is quite understandable that our Governments might at this stage prefer to stand on their dignity, in the know-

ledge of their power, and insist on acting only on proposals, Commission and Parliament should not delay in declaring themselves ready to commence the task with the intention of completing it before this Parliament comes up for re-election?

Ladies and gentlemen, we must constantly bear in mind that by 1985 we must have consolidated the Community, and this we can only do by adapting it, by underpinning what already exists and by developing our institutions. By 1985 either our Community will have progressed as I have indicated, it will have gone further and gained strength, or it will not even be what it is today, it will be falling apart at the seams.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, my appeal to you on behalf of the new Commission is that we should work together to breathe new life and vigour into our Community. I would ask you therefore to continue to keep watch over the affairs of Europe, bearing two things in mind. Firstly, it is far from certain that time is on Europe's side. Thanks to the headlong advances of technology, our planet is constantly shrinking. The major problems of our time are gradually becoming universal in nature, and everything points to the fact that our geographical situation and historical heritage will in future be a less powerful impetus to solidarity and cooperation than they have been in the past. Secondly, in the tasks which lie before us we will need as much courage as imagination. Alfred, Grosser recently dubbed me 'the man who wouldn't give up'. I hope, ladies and gentlemen, that where Europe is concerned, I may prove him right.

*(Sustained applause)*

**President.** — We only have just one hour before we reach Question Time so I think that we should proceed as decided to hear the spokesmen of the political groups for a maximum of ten minutes each and the three non-attached Members who are entered on the speakers' list for a total of 15 minutes. This means that we will have to interrupt the speakers' list for Question Time and it certainly means that the votes on urgency will have to be postponed until tomorrow morning.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* Mr President, it is a pity that we are increasingly forced to speak on points of order which we are all, I feel sure, tired of, while we deal less and less with the basic issues . . .

Mr President, I know that you are extremely vigilant where this part of Parliament's existence is concerned. The Bureau felt that Rule 28 of the Rules of Procedure, which applies to a debate, ought to apply to whole days. We do not agree with this, but this is no

**Pannella**

longer of importance. A very dangerous precedent is being set today. Up to now the various Groups at least had the right to allocate their speaking time as they saw fit. Today, Mr President, we are being told for the first time that the Technical Coordination Group has ten minutes and that those ten minutes must be used by a single speaker if we wish to take the floor today.

This is a dangerous precedent. I see from the minutes that the President of Parliament made this suggestion at the request of the chairmen of the various political groups. However, neither the chairman of my Group nor its Secretary-General remembers having made any such suggestion . . .

But this is still not the real issue, Mr President. We request that we be allowed to allocate our ten minutes today, as we have always done previously, to three speakers representing each of the three streams of political thought in our Group. We have been doing this for one and a half years. This decision is in some ways an assault on my group. I do not know if the Communist Group is satisfied at having Mr Berlinguer speak today and the representative of the other part of their Group speak tomorrow. As far as we are concerned, we protest vigorously against the precedent which is now being set. This may appear to be of minor importance, but it is important nonetheless.

**President.** — I think I was stretching the rules, I am afraid, in allowing you to continue to speak at all, as it quite clearly was not a point of order. We have taken note of what you said, but let me make it quite clear on behalf of the House that under Rule 28 the decision has been made — it was made on Monday, it was agreed by the House and it was in the minutes. We will now proceed with the debate.

The Socialist Group has the floor.

**Mr Glinne.** — (*F*) Mr President, Mr President of the Commission, ladies and gentlemen, I would like my contribution to this debate to be a useful one and for this reason I will spend a large proportion of my speaking time criticizing Mr Thorn's speech. Please do not interpret this criticism as hostile prejudice on my part. If we want to save time I do not think that it is necessary to repeat all the details of the consensus reached between Parliament and the Commission on a substantial number of points.

However, let me underline very briefly two elements of the existing consensus: first of all we are very favourably impressed by the importance which the President of the Commission has once again said he attaches to the correct functioning, in conformity with the letter and the spirit of the Treaty, of the rule of the qualified-majority vote in the Council.

Secondly I do not wish to repeat the views expressed by the various political groups at the last Parliamentary

session. We appreciate the spirit in which the Commission has taken the initiative to institute proceedings against three Member States in the famous question of the 1980 supplementary budget and the 1981 budget. On this point we hope that the mistake made will be rectified in good faith, in the positive spirit which has inspired the Community's leaders both in the Member States and in the Community institutions. Again, I repeat, I am not going to devote any more time to the points on which we agree.

I should now like to make some criticisms. First of all, as regards the famous mandate of 30 May and the possibility of restructuring the budget, I noted that the terminology used by Mr Thorn on this subject is very cautious, that he avoids mentioning that the budget reform must be a radical operation when the time comes for a full-scale reform. Now this is a question of capital importance, faced as we are with the depletion of our own resources. When the President, Mr Thorn, tells us that the current ceiling on budgetary resources is not an article of faith, he is either showing the political will which we would like to see, or he is indulging in a particularly refined form of 'understatement'.

Moreover, in the memorandum which was circulated at the same time as the President's speech, no specific reference was made to the preparatory work leading up to an increase in own resources. Let me conclude this first point by saying that on the question of the budget, the speech which we have just heard does not in our view represent a sufficient commitment, but yet again unfortunately demonstrates a superficial evaluation of problems which are of quite fundamental political importance.

I come now to my second and last series of remarks, which concern economic and social policy. President Thorn quite rightly considers inflation, low growth and unemployment as being amongst the main problems of the eighties, and he stresses the need for greater coordination of national policies to deal with these problems. For our part we attach great importance to the 'Jumbo Council', as this is already being called in journalese at which the Ministers of Economic Affairs, Finance, Social Affairs, Employment and Labour, etc. will meet around the middle of this year. We regard this as being of primary importance, not only in its timing, but also as regards the policies to be developed. Moreover, in Mr Thorn's speech there was one sentence in particular which pleased me, in which the Commission affirmed its determination to 'persuade all concerned to get round the table and hammer out a new social and employment policy'.

While we welcome this we also regret certain points, and particularly the fact that the employment policy, like the whole of the social policy, is treated as a appendage, an accessory to the economic policy, whilst the latter's main goal is profitability. This is not the first time we have regretted this situation: you

**Thorn**

know that if, since 1974, we have attached importance to developing a Community social programme this is because, along with Chancellor Brandt at the time, we wished to redefine our priorities, so that policy would no longer be an appendage of economic policy, but would be placed at least on an equal footing. In the chapter on the social policy, you recognize the need for a coherent economic and social strategy to combat unemployment — I have already mentioned this — but the only details given of such a strategy refer to assistance in the transition towards new structures, and continued dialogue with both sides of industry with a view to improving the divisions of labour and of working hours; these are your own words and they cannot help leaving the impression in our ranks that this is — excuse my turn phrase — an emergency policy designed to repair the damage caused by the economic policy rather than to restore true equilibrium.

In the chapter on economic policy and restructuring aimed at industrial innovation, you advocate an active liberalization of the existing liberalism, even if this means a slight alteration and shift in emphasis. The aim is to increase productivity, improve trade, strengthen the monetary system and, in planning all that, you say that it is important to seek and try to obtain the approval of workers and their representatives, in particular the trade union organizations. Here I would criticise the fact that you appear to want to perpetuate existing policies, simply improving them here and there, albeit with excellent intentions. But all this has to do with the functioning and not the content of the policies. In passing I should also like to put a question to the Commission as a whole and to Commissioner Davignon in particular, concerning the chapter on industrial policy, where it is proposed that measures should be aimed at advanced technology undertakings: how is this passage in the speech compatible with the argument, which we find convincing, that increased aid to small and medium-sized firms is a particularly appropriate way of furthering job creation?

*(The President urged the speaker to conclude)*

I am concluding for today by saying that we do in those circumstances attach very great importance to the paper that was given to the Council in September of last year, where six points were put forward by the Confederation of European Trade Unions, aiming at another kind of economic policy with other social results. I shall turn to that tomorrow.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) has the floor.

**Mr Tindemans.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I should like to congratulate Mr Thorn on the speech he gave here

today. On the day when the new Commission appears before the directly-elected European Parliament for the first time, he was quite right not to confine himself to a mere catalogue of problems. He was at pains to give a political speech in the best sense of the word, the striking feature of which was the fact that — notwithstanding the gravity of the present situation — he stressed the possibility of adopting a determined European policy so as to divert our gaze from the current fear of disasters to come to a new, positive future goal. He made it quite clear that, so long as we have the political will needed to carry out a policy capable of meeting current and future challenges, prospects are not entirely bad, although we are facing fundamental changes. I too believe that we have entered into a new economic era, and I have said in my own country that we can channel the present concern about the future into fresh hope so long as we are prepared to mobilize our full know-how and determination.

A second positive characteristic of Mr Thorn's speech was the emphasis he placed on the need for the Commission — and hence the Community — to develop a strategy. This is something we are extremely pleased about, because there is a danger that the Commission may adopt the pragmatic attitude of certain governments in merely trying to plug existing gaps or react to immediate requirements without any regard to whatever basic options exist without knowing what direction we want to proceed in or without creating any possible future options.

I shall confine myself in my speech to certain aspects of external and economic policy. Other Members of my Group will be commenting on other points from Mr Thorn's speech, and Mr Jonker will be devoting particular attention to the institutional aspects.

Mr Thorn was courageous enough to refer in his speech to European Union. Am I not right in thinking that a summit conference in 1972 proclaimed that European Union would be ushered in before the end of the decade? We are now in 1981, and there is still no sign of any such thing happening. It seems to me, though, that increasing importance is being attached to political cooperation, however odd this may appear in view of the fact that no Treaty covers this point. We have had proposals aimed at strengthening political cooperation, and we shall be looking forward to having a good debate on this matter. I have always believed that European Union is impossible without a common European foreign policy.

A primary area in which we must formulate a common European position is our relations with the United States of America. Someone once said that the Europeans get the Americans they deserve. Together with the United States, Europe will be in a position to play an important role and the Atlantic Alliance will grow in importance in direct proportion to the degree of cohesiveness, courage, determination and wisdom

## Tindemans

Europe is prepared to show. The first step, though, must be to overcome the quarrels and rivalries between us so that Europe can take its place on the world stage as a unified force. This will be all the more necessary in view of the fact that developments in the United States could result in the Americans taking the view that there is no longer such a pressing need to show solidarity with Europe. The time when we used to refer to a spirit of equal partnership as an ideal now belongs very much to the past. Europe and the United States should do more together to go into the problems and matters of mutual interest and, wherever necessary, distribute the work so that both sides are clear as to their respective roles in trans-atlantic cooperation. Unfortunately, Europe cannot bring much political weight to bear. And even if we were to strive to bring into being a common European foreign policy — which I myself have advocated — the fact is that we do not possess the means to carry out any such policy purposefully and with credibility. We must not stumble into the trap of casting Europe loose from the United States altogether. Now that the Reagan Administration is in office, there seems to be an urgent need to clear up the misunderstandings which arose under the Carter Administration, to define what scope for agreement we have and to set in motion consultations between the European Community and the United States. We must also define our attitude to the Soviet Union. As you said in your speech, Mr Thorn, we need to find a word to replace *détente*. At this confused and dangerous point in time, the main thing is that we should reach agreement with the Soviet Union — however naive this may sound — on a code of behaviour, deliberately avoiding any trace of ambiguity and denouncing existing ambiguities.

Another area in which we must formulate a common policy is the Middle East. Here too, though, I would say that the best policy would be based on the relationship with the United States which I have just discussed. Europe itself must be prepared to formulate its own views on what is known as the North-South Dialogue. We deplore the fact that the Community split into different factions at the special session of the United Nations at which North-South relations were discussed. Even the West's economic problems are no longer capable of solution without a new relationship with the developing countries. We are aware of this fact, and yet we are incapable of formulating a joint policy.

As regards economic affairs, Mr Thorn rightly emphasized Europe's dependence on foreign supplies of oil and other primary materials. The failure of Euratom is a particularly gloomy episode in Europe's recent history. Here too, we have seen that Europe must take every chance going of adopting a joint approach to the major problems of our time. Mr Thorn rightly drew attention to this danger in his speech. Euratom is an example of how things should *not* be done. Let us never forget that it was only after the failure of the World Economic Conference in

London in 1932 that Europe sought refuge in national solutions and economic and political nationalism. The more we now revert to government-to-government relations, the greater the danger of a return to this kind of nationalism.

We are now once again faced with this danger. The only thing which is different from the situation in 1932 is that we now have a framework — the European Economic Community — within which we can formulate a common policy. And that is precisely what we must do. You referred, Mr Thorn, to the need for all concerned to 'get round the table and hammer out a new social and employment strategy'. So far, so good — but what Europe needs is not just for all concerned to get round the table, but first and foremost a clear policy. Thinking about and discussing what to do is no longer enough. If Europe is incapable of formulating a comprehensive, convincing anti-crisis policy, what hope is there for us? What will our young people think of Europe if we prove incapable of specifying our aims and formulating a policy on this point? Was it not the great hope of the 50s and 60s never again to make the economic mistakes and errors of the pre-war years but to pool our resources in pursuing a determined policy which would bring us prosperity? As I said in my own country, we must channel fear into hope. In a European context, I would say that we must channel pessimism and despair into a constructive and positive policy which may bear fruit in a changed world. With eight million people on the dole, we cannot afford to simply sit back and wait. You said in your speech that we must strive for practical aims, security and solidarity. Let this be the basis of an economic policy in Europe which is more than just a nine days' wonder and which — rather than being a mere stop-gap policy — is one which will really point the way to the future.

We need solidarity first and foremost in Europe, but wherever necessary, we should seek solidarity in a wider context. You referred, Mr Thorn, to growing disorder on the international monetary scene. Should we not seek agreement as soon as possible between the European Monetary System, the dollar zone and the yen zone? Should we strive not only for a European energy policy, but also for international agreements? Mr President, I have never forgotten what someone — I think it was Walter Rathenau — said in summing up the whole tragedy of pre-Hitler Germany: 'Our fate lies in the economy'. In other words, if we fail to find a solution to our economic problems, our fate will be to watch social and political opportunists destroy our democracy.

(Applause)

We are the prisoners of economic events, in which case let us Europeans formulate a grand economic policy of the kind we need if our young people are not to lapse into defeatism and if we are not to become the victims of political opportunists. It is up to Europe to show us the way and to help us break out of our

**Tindemans**

old-established structures and ways of thinking. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development said in its report entitled 'Interfuturs' that it was precisely the old-established and obsolete structures in Europe which were holding back any new development. The final paragraph of this report says that the conclusion to be drawn from the analysis is that the approaches adopted have to be tailor-made to the countries concerned. Developed societies have acquired a degree of structural rigidity which could adversely affect their ability to adapt to changing situations. This is where Europe should be taking the lead, and where necessary, forcing the Member States to discard their straitjackets and approach the future with a greater degree of flexibility. The European Community must avoid repeating these national mistakes. It must help us to establish new structures and to face the future in a new spirit. We must renovate and innovate, otherwise — sooner or later — we shall all be relegated to the second or third divisions.

That is the kind of policy the Commission must formulate. Parliament will support you in getting the Council to give its approval. And, incidentally, I must make the point that — as has been said about the budget — we must get the resources that Europe will need to carry out any such policy.

*(Applause)*

The Community is, after all, a limited liability company; in other words, it is up to the Member States to cough up the money needed to implement whatever policy we espouse. Let us never forget that. The money must be forthcoming, Mr Thorn, if we are ever to have a practical and cohesive policy which will give us security. You can be assured of our support in your Commission's endeavours to breathe new life and dynamism into the Community: in this, you can rely on the Group of the European Peoples' Party.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The European Democratic Group has the floor.

**Sir James Scott-Hopkins.** — Mr President, I think your exhortations merely show that ten minutes to reply or to set the scene for a debate after a speech of one hour and twenty-five minutes are not sufficient.

This is nobody's fault, but I regret that it has happened the way it has, because I would congratulate the President on his speech — long, detailed and full of things which are of importance. But I really would suggest to him that in future, if he is going to make a marathon speech like that, the House should be given a white paper, or a green paper, or whatever you like to call it, at least five or six days beforehand, so that they can study it! Then he can speak to that paper when he

comes here. That might be a better way of going about things than the way we have done it now.

His speech, as I said, was a very interesting one, large on ideals, but lacking, if I may say so with the greatest respect, the kind of details of what he wants to do over the next four years that I would have expected from him. In that respect it was empty, apart from one or two important issues which, of course, we must not forget, such as his wish to take the initiative and not always to ask the Council before the Commission does anything, and the wish for a partial return to majority voting in the Council — although he cannot do much about that. Apart from that, however, we did not hear very much about what Mr Thorn and his colleagues are actually going to do about agriculture, energy and other vitally important matters. I hope they will tell us over the next few weeks or months, for we do not really know from Mr Thorn's speech.

As Mr Glinne said, it was not a speech full of optimism; it contrasted extraordinarily with President Reagan's inaugural speech made only recently in the United States, which was brimming over with optimism for the future. I am sorry that Mr Thorn sees such a gloomy outlook. Of course things are difficult; they always are, and this is a moment when they are particularly so; but surely if he with his colleagues can chart a road ahead and we have the courage and the guts to follow it, then there is hope for the future of this Community. As Mr Tindemans has just been saying, we can move forward together, and if we do move forward together then indeed we can come through these crises.

Let me briefly turn in the short time at my disposal to the issue of agriculture. This is the absolutely crucial part of what the Commission has got to do. It was agreed that they should bring forward issues by the end of July, and I sincerely hope that this can be done by the end of July — preferably earlier than that.

We shall never have a truly European agricultural policy until production conditions apply. It is all very well for the new Commissioner for Agriculture — who unfortunately is not here, though I welcome him to us — to announce common prices every year, but common prices do not constitute a common policy. Each country has a different rate of inflation, different interest charges, different taxation; and until the Community has a unified economic structure, a common agricultural policy will not be truly possible. I hope that is one of the objectives towards which the Commission is going to work.

The discharge of the Commission for the 1979 budget is due very soon. This operation, which is part of our powers here in the Parliament, is a formidable one; and I must say to the President that I hope his directors-general are not going to be sensitive when they meet criticism, as indeed they may when Parliament is

**Scott-Hopkins**

probing into what has happened in their particular sphere of responsibility.

When the Commission comes forward with new proposals, as it will do in the near future, these proposals should be properly costed — they have not always been in the past — not only in terms of expenditure, but also in terms of the manpower required and their overall effects on the Community, including both the cost and the benefits.

Far too many of these proposals, unhappily, are unjustified and place unnecessary burdens on industry and the consumer. Indeed, that also applies to this House too when it initiates policy, such as that set out in the resolution on women. It was completely uncostered, and I suspect that if anybody really got down to it they would find that the cost of that particular document was enormous.

But, moving on from that to another issue, I sincerely hope that the Commission will put forward in the coming months a new policy on energy. It seems to me that, as he said himself, and it has also been echoed in some of the speeches already, that we have almost come to a halt in the energy field. It is absolutely crucial if we are going to move at all to have a common pricing policy for energy. What is the Commission going to do about encouraging nuclear research and development, and about environmental problems in the Community? There was not a word about these matters.

I am sure they are going to do something, at least I hope they are. This sort of issue really must be considered and I hope that it will be understood.

Then again, if I may turn to the budgetary side, President Thorn will know that in the last few days and probably the last few hours the EMS has been going through enormous stress. Indeed the Deutschmark had to be supported by the Federal Bank of America. I think that the EMS is one of the foundation stones of the Community, one of the very good things that President Jenkins brought in, and I sincerely hope that it will survive this particular crisis. There will be, I fear, crises in the future. But what I have not heard from anybody in the Commission or from President Thorn is whether there are any contingency plans to deal with this, because I think that it is absolutely crucial that the EMS should be consolidated and made much firmer than it is. I am sure there are plans, but I should like to hear about them because I believe this is crucial. I sincerely hope that my country will find it possible in the near future to become a full member.

Again this is only symptomatic, I think, of the difficulties and the problems that we face. If I go on much longer I know that my colleague, Mr Berlinguer, who is speaking after me is going to miss his plane to Rome and I would not like to deprive the House on one of his very brief visits to this House of the pleasure of

hearing him speak. All I would like to say, therefore — and I will not go on with many of the things that I wanted to say — is that I believe that what the Parliament must concentrate on is the future.

In his inaugural address President Reagan referred to the United States as the last and the greatest bastion of freedom. I do not believe this is true. It may be one of the greatest by a narrow margin, but it certainly is not the last. I want this Community to address itself not just this year, but over the next decade, to consolidating the ideas and the ideals of freedom which we have fought so hard for, and I want this to be one of the grand themes and one of the purposes of an occasion such as this. The Commission must seize the opportunity to make these ideals a reality.

President Thorn in his speech showed he had the ideals, what he did not show us was how he is going to turn them into reality. I am convinced that we must take this opportunity. European integration, as the preamble of the Treaty makes clear, is not an end in itself and I would ask President Thorn never to forget it. Freedom is threatened today, Mr President, we all know it, but if we stand together and if we can have a coherent and a positive policy for the future. I believe that the ten countries of Europe — and, hopefully, the two more who will join later on in this decade — can go forward in freedom to greater prosperity for all our people.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The Communist and Allies Group has the floor.

**Mr Berlinguer.** — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the new Commission has taken up office at a time when the present world economic and political crisis is coming to a head.

And this European Community of ours — as Mr Thorn stated in his speech — has never been in a situation as difficult as the one it is in today.

When we view the state of affairs in our various countries, we are bound to note that the average rate of inflation has risen to 13·8 %, that production is tending to stagnate or slump, that the number of unemployed has already gone over the 8-million mark, that the regional imbalances in the Community are continually increasing. In the last few weeks, further fluctuations in the monetary field have been added to these difficulties, fluctuations produced by the rise of the dollar which amongst other things increases the tendency, which has been prevalent for some time, to take refuge in protectionist measures. Therefore, the economic outlook — and once again Mr Thorn made this clear — has never been so gloomy.

## Berlinguer

The political outlook is gloomy too. The constantly worsening crisis in international *détente* lies heavy on the world in general and on Europe in particular. This crisis stems mainly from the constant heightening of the bitter conflict between the two superpowers. If this trend is not halted — and it is our view that Europe could play a fundamental role in halting it — the outcome might well be a war which would spell disaster for us all. Another outcome might be a worsening of relations followed by a bipartite agreement, reached behind the backs of other countries which would be such as to deprive Europe of any means of playing an effective role on the international scene. And in the meantime the arms race is threatening to go beyond the point at which, because of the characteristics of the arms now being manufactured (new types of missile and the neutron bomb), the means of control would be reduced and arms limitation talks robbed of all real meaning.

In the immediate future, the situation in Poland is a serious cause for concern. It is our wish that the various forces which participate in the social and political life of Poland should find ways to act in a responsible and cohesive manner so that the reforms which are needed may be furthered without anarchy being the result. Above all, however, I should like to repeat our hope that the terrible risk of repression or outside intervention of any sort should be avoided.

The main feature of the whole present world situation is the problem which arises from the growing imbalance between the economically advanced countries and the huge areas which are underdeveloped, where hardship, poverty and hunger reign. This is an unsolved problem which is getting more and more serious and which is the most disturbing and explosive problem of our time.

But, ladies and gentlemen, the fact is that it is just at this time marked by the worsening of all international relations on the economic and political planes, a time which is also marked by expectations and hopes and a wish to see action taken, and just when peoples from all regions of the world (one only needs to think of the Middle East) are looking to Europe for help, that the EEC has reached its lowest point.

Why is this? I am forced to admit that I was unable to find in Mr Thorn's speech, even though this was cryptic in its description of the present situation of the Community, any convincing analysis of the causes of this crisis or a viable explanation of how we can escape from it.

We cannot in fact make do with what was in any case a superficial denunciation of the factors which influenced and are influencing the Community towards an increasing abandonment of its commitments. And however moving they may be, appeals for greater unity are not enough.

It is quite obvious that given such a parlous state of affairs in the Community we must, if we wish to overcome it, carry out a profound transformation both of our political attitudes in and outside Europe and of the working of the institutions and their relations with each other.

I shall now proceed to examine this viewpoint in what must be a summary fashion. In the fifties and sixties the economies of European countries made striking advances. One of the major factors in this was the liberalization of trade. But we should not forget that this boom in production was mainly caused by a leap in private consumption, even if this was uneven and unfair to some social groups. But if development on capitalistic lines is allowed to follow its own course, this leads to an increase in production in areas where capital investment is already centred and where the largest and quickest possible profits can be made. This is in our opinion the main cause of the heightening of imbalances within the Community itself and even between the various regions within individual countries, with development spiralling upwards in some areas and other areas being allowed to falter and go to ruin.

The fact is that today we are reaching a point at which the worsening of the economic situation in the least favoured areas is hampering development in the more prosperous ones.

This then is one of the trends we must reverse. The only real stimulus for a revival in production which would serve the interests of all our countries is the rebuilding and creation of a stable economic fabric in the depressed countries and areas of Europe, which means especially in the southern and Mediterranean regions.

But this means amongst other things that 'regional' policy can no longer be simply one item amongst many others in the life of the EEC and in the Community budget. It cannot be left to a Fund which is anyway quite insufficient, but it must become one of the fundamental guidelines of economic policy in all sectors with all this implies in terms of own resources and the budget, beginning with the agricultural policy for which there is no doubt that the mere readjustments referred to by Mr Thorn will not suffice.

If we take this reasoning further and apply it to the Community's external relations it is obvious that the problem is similar even if on a far larger scale. Europe, and the assertion of its new role in the world, can only have a future if the idea of raising living standards and boosting production in the economically underdeveloped areas of the southern hemisphere, in particular in the Mediterranean basin and in Africa, becomes one of the main guidelines of economic activity in the Community.

But, in order to establish a new-style relationship with developing countries — a new relationship which is

**Berlinguer**

absolutely essential on economic grounds as well as for reasons of justice — we must have the courage to take suitable steps not just where industrial policy is concerned but also in the political sphere.

Naturally, the first step towards achieving this is to further *détente*, to reduce and control arms, thereby producing a stable balance of power, and rejecting any temptation on the part of one country or one bloc to obtain military supremacy over another, since any such attempt would erode the very foundations of world security. The second decision, which is linked to the first, is that of recognizing at last the new factor inherent in the desire of developing countries to shake off once and for all any form of political or economic dependence and of recognizing that they too wish to act and play their part in world affairs both as individual countries and through the organization of non-aligned countries.

What is therefore needed is a bold initiative by an independent Europe on the world stage both as regards East-West and North-South relations.

In our opinion, this should not make us any less cooperative with the United States of America nor, for the countries which are part of it, should it jeopardize the relationship with NATO with regard to the geographical area and the scope of the defence tasks laid down in the NATO Treaty. But it is clear that if the American Government wants to blame the international terrorist movement — and recommend political and military intervention — for any national or popular movement which is aimed at gaining complete independence (as is the case of Namibia) or which rejects hateful dictatorships (as is the case for all the countries of South and Central America), then Europe, if it truly wishes to take on its true role in the world, cannot follow the United States along this path and should dissociate itself from such a policy and discourage the American Government from pursuing it. What is more, even on a crucial matter such as the Middle East, are not all the signs from all sides that what people want is for Europe actively to pursue a line which, since it would be aimed at giving full recognition to the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and to the establishing of their own stable geographical unit, would not be the same line as that presently pursued by the United States? On this question, even a conservative such as Lord Carrington recently stated that Europe has its own role to play by influencing the United States.

On the subject of the institutions I should merely like to point out for the moment that we cannot agree with Mr Thorn who, after referring in a somewhat strongly-worded phrase to the 'chronic ineffectiveness' of the decision-making process, then appeared to restrict his suggestions to a desire that 'peace reign between the institutions' or that a better dialogue be instituted between the Council, the Commission and Parliament. We are more than ever convinced of the

need for a reform which would include the reworking of some articles of the Treaties. But at the same time we feel that what is really needed is for pressure to be exerted so that the axis of political power may be oriented towards organizations in which, so to speak, the percentage of pro-European feeling is highest, or the least low, thereby giving ever greater leverage to the Commission in dealings with the Council and to Parliament in dealings with both the other institutions.

Please allow me, ladies and gentlemen, to make one final general remark which impinges on the admittedly very important problem of the institutions. Why is it that, in spite of the fact that so many motives and opposing interests urge us to develop the process of European union, this process is not advancing and is in fact in the doldrums or regressing to such an extent that it is threatening, as Mr Thorn pointed out, the very survival of the Community?

In our opinion, the basic reason for this is that the economic and political groups which have been dominant up to now, and which gave birth, as we are willing to admit, to the EEC, are with few exceptions now exhausted and disillusioned and unable to take a long-term view of the interests and role of Europe in a world which is so full of new factors, and they are therefore robbed of their determination. On the other hand, too many of those on the Left and in the worker's and people's movements have not yet grasped that meeting the challenge of European unity is in line with their deepest and most long-lasting interests.

It is our desire, and our intention, to do all we can to achieve this aim as quickly as possible, since we are certain that here lies the best guarantee for a Europe which can be more united only if it manages to replenish itself by accepting the indispensable contribution of its workers and its people.

We shall in particular make every effort both inside this House and outside it to arrive at every possible convergence of views with the whole range of worker and democratic movements in Western Europe.

(Applause)

**President.** — The Liberal and Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mr Bangemann.** — (D) Mr President, Mr Thorn's speech was an encouraging one, which I think we can only interpret as an invitation to cooperate with him and his Commission over the next four years so that the Community's present and future will not turn out quite as gloomy as some people may think. We have been called upon to cooperate with the Commission. In my opinion, it is not a bad thing that this programme will still have to be fleshed out on this or that point. That is something we shall do together, and

**Bangemann**

in a first response, I should like to set out the Liberal and Democratic Group's position under four headings.

Let me deal first of all with the role of the Community in international relations. After we had listened to President Sadat's speech yesterday, I was asked by a number of journalists what was the point of a speech of that kind to the European Parliament. After the accession of Greece, and with the forthcoming accession of Spain and Portugal, there can be no doubt that the Community will have to extend and intensify its political interest at least to the Mediterranean region and thus to the Middle East. There are new tasks waiting for us in that region, as President Sadat's speech showed. But we cannot do what has to be done by purely diplomatic or economic means. If we really want to make a contribution to the peace process, the Community as such must formulate a security policy which will require fresh efforts from us. So far, we have always used misleading formulations for such efforts, but now we must really make a serious effort if we are to realize the hopes held by people in that region.

My second point concerns the economic problems which we can only solve if three conditions are met. Firstly, we must really get down to formulating a common energy policy covering not only energy savings and the development of new sources, but also entailing a clear and unambiguous affirmation of nuclear energy under safety conditions which can be guaranteed by the European Community. The main thing, though, is that nuclear energy should be given a vote of support. Secondly, we must join battle with the forces advocating protectionism. At times of economic difficulty, there are always situations in which people tend to look no further than the ends of their noses, but the fact is that a protectionist attitude to world trade would damage the prospects of the Community and the countries of the Third and Fourth World more seriously than any other factor. Thirdly, we must give serious attention to the development of new technologies, because the argument advanced today by a Member of the Socialist Group that there must be a fairer share-out of the available work is, to my mind, a basically conservative attitude. It would mean that all the people of the Community would have less work and would earn less. On the contrary, we must create new work and make it possible for people to do that work. That will require a progressive attitude to this problem, the development of the necessary technology and a European policy on education and training. At present, there is no such European policy, and that is a shortcoming which must be remedied. We shall then be in a position to get to grips with the economic problems.

Fourthly, regarding the reform of the agricultural sector, I believe that Mr Thorn's approach is the only realistic one. We must involve the producers in the process of cutting down surplus production by the principle of coresponsibility. There is no other alterna-

tive, and that is a point we must emphasize again and again. At the same time, however, we must make sure that farmers are not discouraged — although we have unfortunately almost reached that stage now. I almost get the impression that farmers have become the whipping boys of the European Community. That is neither right nor fair, and we should be careful what we say on this point, otherwise we shall forfeit the cooperation of the agricultural sector.

Fifthly, I should like to discuss institutional developments. This is the only point on which I should have liked to see the President of the Commission adopt as clear a position as he did regarding own resources. Let me quote from the part of his speech dealing with relations between the Commission and Parliament. He said:

... we expect Parliament to fulfil its consultative role by supplying us with high-quality reports which will unquestionably increase our knowledge and which will always be given due consideration.

Pardon me for saying so, Mr Thorn, but that, as far as my group is concerned, will not do. We realize that we can try to use our experience to support the Commission. However, we have submitted two precise proposals to which we expect a reply. What does the Commission feel about a political agreement between us, whereby our legislative proposals must, under certain conditions, be taken into account? What is the Commission's view regarding the budgetary powers conferred on it by the Treaty; in other words, what is the position regarding the implementation of the provisions of the budget? You said, Mr Thorn, that what the Commission wanted was to see the Council act. Unfortunately, such hopes have a tendency to remain mere hopes. The only way we can really get things done is by the Commission and Parliament working together to implement the budget — even if the Council remains incapable of acting.

The sombre tones in the picture you painted of the Community are not the work of this House. Nor — let me add, because I am after all addressing an institution and not specific persons — are they the work of the Commission. The Council's ineptitude — as typified by their failure to reach a decision on the fisheries policy by 1 January of this year — has given the Community a worse image in the eyes of the people of Europe than would have been the case if, for instance, a decision had been taken, but had placed certain elements at a disadvantage. A German fisherman may perhaps have had some sympathy with you if you had come up with convincing arguments on this problem which must be solved sooner or later. But they certainly have no sympathy for a Council which is incapable of reaching a decision and which has condemned them to give up fishing, to give up their livelihood — and to pay no taxes — just so that the Community can move forward. Those are the problems we are now facing.

**Bangemann**

Mr President, we are not prepared to put up with general declarations. That is not intended as a criticism of the Commission so much as a challenge to the Commission to work out the details together with us. Mr President, I have used up all but four minutes of my speaking time. I would ask you to divide my four remaining minutes up and to credit Mr Thorn and Mr Tindemans with two minutes each, because they are two men on whose cooperation the Liberal and Democratic Group is counting.

*(Applause and laughter)*

**President.** — The Group of European Progressive Democrats has the floor.

**Mr de la Malène.** — *(F)* President Thorn, ladies and gentlemen, my remarks will not of course deal with the report on the Commission's activities which, Mr President, cannot be attributed to you. Nor will I speak on the report on the Council's activities, which could perhaps be attributed to you: I have noted with pleasure the salutary attempt at self-criticism which marked your statement on this report on the Council's activities.

I will therefore speak about your programme. It could be summed up by saying that Europe is in danger. Europe is indeed in danger, but we know that if this is so, Europe itself is not so much to blame as the situation in our European nations, the world economy, social crisis, demographic problems — let me thank you for emphasizing these — and the challenges of all kinds which face our societies whether they be industrial or not. Faced with the crisis, Europe must not — though perhaps there is a risk that it will do so — appear to be a luxury left over from easier times but rather a vital necessity to help us through difficult times. Oh, I have no illusions. Nobody believes that our Europe will disappear. International institutions never disappear, they are immortal, but they become devoid of any meaning and that is the true danger threatening us. A shell will remain, a large, empty, dried-up shell with no influence on everyday life or ascendancy over men's hearts. You were right in saying that Europe must henceforth appear as a vital necessity in difficult times. You intend to prove it, indeed you have to prove it, but you have to prove it not only in speeches — that is our task — or with arguments. This vital necessity must be evident in the facts of daily life and I wish in my brief remarks to focus on three subjects, just three.

First of all, the great problem facing you is the mandate given on 30 June last which expires in less than four months, on 30 June next. You must reorganize the common agricultural policy while scrupulously observing its principles, but you must correct its financial excesses and remain within a given financial framework. This, you may say or think, is a contradic-

tion in itself and the problem is how to resolve it within this mandate? There are three problems: first, to reform the common agricultural policy without infringing its principles. There will undoubtedly be numerous debates on this subject in our Parliament. I will not labour the point but let me point out in passing that the first step is to safeguard Community preference which would in itself be an achievement. As regards the remainder, as regards the necessary improvement, there are many proposals before us and we will have an opportunity to discuss them and chose amongst them.

The second major problem, and a much more difficult one, is to correct the financial consequences, or to distribute the burden, whichever way you prefer to put it. There are two ways of doing this, the right way and the wrong way. The wrong way is the way it was done on 30 May last. On the understanding that it was a temporary solution perhaps it was the only one possible. But two unwelcome aspects have already emerged as a result: the concept of fair returns which is fatal to the European ideal, and what has been called convergence.

I am referring, Mr President, to the deplorable system of more or less direct financial transfers. Europe must not become a welfare office for nations. In no event, unless perhaps in the short term in the monetary sphere, must Europe become a welfare office for nations. Europe must be the reflection of a common will to act together, which is a completely different matter. We have started, and are again being urged to continue on course. The right course, on the other hand, is that which will emerge from common measures and policies in new sectors. This is the only passport to progress, and can only be saved by progress. Mr Thorn, the convergence about which so much has been and is still being said, has no future.

You face a third problem in this mandate: that of funds. You will receive them, Mr President, you will have our support in receiving them if you select the right course. Otherwise you will receive nothing. I shall continue to maintain that it is a Community-held misconception of the budget — although contrary to historic truth, contrary to the spirit of the Treaties, and above all unworkable — that a budget must precede policy. No budget precedes policies, a budget exists to finance the policies which have been jointly agreed in advance. First agree on policies, and you will get the resources afterwards. But remember, Mr President, that no strong-arm tactics, no institutional manoeuvre will accord you the funds before agreement has been reached on the policies.

The second big issue, and I will be more brief although I ought to speak at greater length, is trade policy. We have become a trade giant. You said that and you were right. But we are a trade giant which is unarmed, defenceless against the aggression which is on the increase in today's world of economic warfare.

## de la Malène

That cannot continue, Mr President. What is at stake here is the unity of markets, the credibility of Europe, faced as it is with an inordinate increase in unemployment. We can no longer continue the trade policy we pursued in the iron and steel and textile sectors and which we are pursuing today in the motor industry. There again, Mr President, you will have to shoulder your responsibilities.

The third point on which I wanted to say a few words, even more briefly in view of the pressure of time, is the institutional problem. You appealed for prudence. I hope your appeal is heard. Neither the institutions, nor tactical manoeuvres, nor violent outbursts will ever replace political agreement. On the contrary, as you said. We know it, but this view must be translated into action otherwise political agreement will be supplanted to the detriment of Europe. I could say more on this subject. I see that there is a resolution circulating which aims to transform the role of our Parliament in relation to your Commission, to try to introduce profound institutional change. This is not the right course. It is a clumsy approach and nobody is doing you any service, Mr President, by trying to transform the present institutional structures. We can probably approve your programme — but to try to nominate you, to oblige you to endow us with legislative powers, Mr President, what is the point of that, where will that lead? It would be doing you a disservice and of course we will have nothing to do with it. What we will support, Mr President, is your effort to try to make Europe into that vital necessity to help us through difficult times, to allow Europe to advance on the road towards progress.

*(Applause)*

## IN THE CHAIR: MR KATZER

*Vice-President*

**President.** — There are still three Members down to speak after Mr Skovmand. Since we have to start Question Time now, I propose that we hear these three speakers tomorrow immediately after the votes on urgency.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

*(Loud protests from Mr Pannella who asked without success to speak on a point of order)*

I call Mr Skovmand.

**Mr Skovmand.** — *(DK)* Mr President, I should like to point out that I am speaking not as a member of the

Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members, but as a representative of one of the three parties in that group, the People's Movement against Danish Membership of the European Community. I shall therefore speak for the proportion of the allotted speaking time my group is entitled to, and leave the rest of the time to other Members of the group.

I should like to address a word of thanks to the President of the Commission, Mr Thorn, because what he had to say was so clear, because he said he intended to work for the Community and against national interests, because he wanted to restrict the right of veto in the Council of Ministers and, generally speaking, restrict the role of the Council — an institution which, despite all its faults, is made up of the democratically elected representatives of the Member States, and which is therefore, when all is said and done, the only safeguard the small countries have in the Community. That is the kind of language which will be understood in Denmark, and which will make it easier for those of us who want to get Denmark out of the Community.

Mr Thorn expressed surprise at the fact that so many people were dissatisfied with the Community. Perhaps he was thinking about the recent opinion poll in Denmark which showed that 48 % of Danish voters wanted to pull out of the Community, as against only 33 % who wanted to stay in.

I shall try to explain to Mr Thorn why it is that there is so much dissatisfaction in Denmark. Ever since Denmark joined the European Community, there has been a constant decline in conditions in our country. The main effect has been a large rise in the number of people unemployed. I shall not go into detail as to how things came to this pretty pass — that would take too long — but I can say that there is a strong feeling that the other Nordic countries — Sweden, Norway and Finland — have fared much better, and they, you will remember, decided against joining the Community. In a number of fields, the European Community has been poking its nose into Danish affairs and preventing the government from doing something about the high level of unemployment. Let me just give you one example of what I mean. Only a month ago, the Community ordered the discontinuation of regional aid to a high-unemployment area. That, Mr Thorn, is the kind of thing that makes the Danes opponents of the European Community.

## 4. Question Time

**President.** — The next item is the second part of Question Time (Doc. 1-842/80). We start with questions to the Foreign Ministers. I call Question No 92, by Mr Paisley:

**President**

What progress has been made in securing a common system of extradition throughout the Community?

**Mr Van der Klaauw, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.** — (NL) In replies to questions previously put down by Members of the European Parliament — particularly the written question by Mrs Macciocchi, the oral question by Mrs Lizin and the written question by Mr Van Miert — the House was informed about progress towards a draft convention between Member States on criminal procedure, with particular reference to extradition.

**Mr Paisley.** — Is the Council aware that since this Parliament met last in plenary session Her Majesty's Lieutenant for the County of Armagh, a former Speaker of the Northern Ireland House of Commons, Sir Norman Stronge, and his son James Stronge, who was also a Member of the Northern Ireland House of Commons, were brutally murdered in Tynan on the border between Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic and that those who did this dastardly deed are now safe in sanctuary in the Irish Republic?

Is he also aware of the fact that sixty murders have taken place in County Fermanagh and that all the murderers but one are safe in the Irish Republic? And would he inform the House when the United Kingdom Foreign Affairs Minister last raised this matter of extradition in the Council of Ministers?

**Mr Van der Klaauw.** — (NL) I naturally abhor the murders to which the Honourable Member has referred, but the Council has no further developments to report since its replies to the questions I mentioned.

**Mr J. D. Taylor.** — I am very disappointed at the replies from the Council so far. In view of the fact that the greatest source of terrorism in the Community is along the border between the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland, both nations being members of this Community, does the Council not think that it would be wise to discuss the subject of extradition rather than blandly to say that nothing more is going to be done? Does the Council not recognize that almost 2 000 people have now lost their lives in Northern Ireland; that many of the murderers are hiding in the Republic of Ireland; that even the murderers of Sir Norman Stronge are known to be in the Republic of Ireland; that the Republic of Ireland is the only member of the Community which has failed to sign the Council of Europe's Convention for the Suppression of Terrorism and would the Council now consider the problem of extradition throughout the ten members of our Community?

**Mr Van der Klaauw.** — (NL) I am sorry, but I can add nothing at this stage to what I have already said.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Instead of putting a supplementary, Mr President, I should like to say that your conduct of this sitting has been arrogant and, as far as I am concerned, totally unacceptable. I asked to speak on a point of order, but you refused my request. You have no right to do that! We would say in Italian 'Che cosa Katzer sta facendo?'

**President.** — Mr Pannella, you no longer have the floor. I have been applying the Rules of Procedure accurately and impartially. It says here 'To be called during Question Time', and you yourself agreed to this.

**Mr Blaney.** — Might I ask whether it is a fact that special legislation is on the statute book in Ireland to deal with the alleged situation which has been presented today? If there has indeed been a failure the failure rests not with the government in the south of Ireland, but rather with the authorities in the North. Furthermore, might I ask whether there is anything this Assembly, the Commission and the Council could do or will do to bring about the extradition of the 500 men that were paraded by Mr Paisley in the Antrim Mountains a few short days ago with great publicity? Maybe he might give an answer to that himself.

(Laughter)

**Mr Van der Klaauw.** — (NL) I do not think this is a matter for the Council, Mr President.

**Mr McCartin.** — Is the Council aware that the British Government is on record as saying that less than 2 % of the violence in Northern Ireland has its origins in the Republic of Ireland and is it aware that the British Government has publicly stated on a number of occasions that they are completely satisfied with the level of security cooperation that they are getting from the Republic of Ireland? I would point out that my friend from Northern Ireland, Mr Paisley, avails himself of the opportunity to raise questions in this Parliament, and makes lengthy speeches, but as the only cleric in this Parliament he was very, very quiet this morning when moral issues were raised in this House.

**Mr Van der Klaauw.** — (NL) I think it should be made clear that we are talking here about European political cooperation rather than the Council of the European Communities. No stances of individual governments have been discussed in European political cooperation.

**President.** — I call Question No 93, by Mr Moreland (H-641/80):

**President**

Do the Foreign Ministers support the release from Spandau jail of Rudolf Hess and place pressure on the government of the USSR to obtain his release?

**Mr Van der Klaauw, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.** — (NL) The imprisonment of Rudolf Hess is a matter exclusively for the four powers responsible not only for Berlin but also for the entire German question. It is thus not discussed in the framework of European political cooperation.

**Mr Moreland.** — I trust that the Foreign Minister realizes that Berlin is part of the Community — it is, indeed, very much part of the Community and therefore of interest to us. Does he not agree in that context that the aim behind the Russians' insistence in holding Rudolph Hess at Spandau Prison for 40 years is in fact to maintain a presence in Berlin and, I emphasize, in the Community? Therefore it should be of interest to him, and his foreign ministers should give full support to the governments of France and the United Kingdom.

**Mr Van der Klaauw.** — (NL) In principle, of course, it is always important to give support to any Member State, and we shall always do so, but in this case there is nothing for which European political cooperation is responsible, as I have already said. Regardless of what the views of the individual ministers may be, existing agreements lay down that this is a matter for the four powers primarily responsible for Berlin.

**Mr Habsburg.** — (D) Now that the Community has discussed a wide range of questions concerning human rights, and since the case of Rudolf Hess is undoubtedly no longer a matter of politics but rather one of humanity and mercy, is it not time for the Community to say something about this case of human rights as well, as it is something which is of direct concern to us?

*(Applause from various quarters in the centre and on the right)*

**Mr Van der Klaauw.** — (NL) I repeat that this is not a matter for the Community, but one for European political cooperation, and that it has not been discussed in that framework. I still maintain that this is a matter for the four powers, who are primarily responsible for it on the basis of existing agreements.

**Mr Marshall.** — Mr President, would the President-in-Office of the Council not agree that the continued incarceration of this poor old man is little short of an international scandal? And would he not agree that this Community, which expresses its views on human rights is East Germany and other Eastern bloc coun-

tries, should also express a view on civil rights and political rights in West Germany and other countries within the Community? And finally when will he learn that the quality of mercy is not strained?

**Mr Van der Klaauw.** — (NL) I repeat, it is not a question of the views of individual ministers on this matter. As a Dutch minister I naturally also have my views on the subject, but that is not the point. This is not a matter which can fruitfully be discussed in the framework of European political cooperation, in view of existing agreements.

**Mr Chambeiron.** — (F) Mr President, may I say that many people of my generation have seen and heard lots of things, but I never thought I would hear Members of this House defending — with an obstinacy bordering on provocation, or even madness — a war criminal, a monster who was responsible for atrocious crimes against humanity. I welcome the reply given by the President-in-Office, which is exactly in line with his reply to my question on the situation of Berlin, and I am glad he has made the situation with regard to Rudolf Hess clear. Shame upon those who, in this House, dare to talk about human rights, when the person involved is a criminal. That is a matter for their own consciences, but I should like to thank the President-in-Office for telling us that this was not a matter for the European Community.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the left)*

**Mrs Lizin.** — (F) Will the President of this House ensure that, for each victim of Rudolf Hess, as much time is devoted to considering any emotional problems they may have?

**Mr McCartin.** — Does the Foreign Minister not agree with me that a conflict such as the last World War throws up a lot of criminals and that the only difference between Mr Hess and some of the many other criminals in that war is that his side lost and the other side did not?

*(Mixed reactions)*

Would the Foreign Minister not agree with me that since this Community has busied itself making comments on various situations throughout the world the European Economic Community should stand together in this one matter of mercy to one individual and see that mercy is shown to him at this stage?

*(Interruption by Mr Paisley: 'Your country helped Hitler in the last war?')*

**Mr Van der Klaauw.** — (NL) I totally disagree with the Honourable Member! The reason for what

**Van der Klaauw**

happened in the Second World War is not to be found in the conflict itself, but in the system then obtaining in Germany — a country which has fortunately now changed completely and is a valuable partner. However, it was the system which caused all these problems.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**Mr Schmidt.** — *(D)* It has just been said on the other side of the House that Berlin belongs to the European Community. Could you please confirm that the legal position is that, while Community legislation applies to Berlin, Berlin is not a Member State of the Community since it does not form part of the Federal Republic of Germany?

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — *(F)* In the January part-session we debated the situation in Uruguay. Can the President-in-Office tell us whether it is true that Dr Mengele is a technical adviser in the Libertad prison in Uruguay, where he is known by the name of Willy Larr? I have received this information from reliable sources . . .

**President.** — I must interrupt you. I cannot allow this supplementary, since it has nothing to do with the question.

**Mr Van Minnen.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I am very glad the President-in-Office stressed that the case of Rudolf Hess was of particular symbolic importance. May I also ask him whether he does not feel that the release of Rudolf Hess would provoke such enormous reactions among the victims of the Third Reich that it would take a new toll of people whose mental health could not cope with this move. Does the President-in-Office therefore not feel that, quite apart from legal or political considerations, his release should be refused on moral grounds?

**Mr Van der Klaauw.** — *(NL)* Mr President, in view of what I have already said, and since this matter has not been discussed under European political cooperation, I do not feel that this is an appropriate place to express an opinion on this very delicate question.

**President.** — I call Question No 94, by Mr Berkhouwer (H-659/80):

Do not the Foreign Ministers agree that it is incumbent upon the Greek Government, now that Greece — since 1 January 1981 — is a full member of the Community, to normalize its diplomatic relations with Israel so that all Member States of the Community maintain identical diplomatic relations with Israel, a country which is linked with the Community through a cooperation agreement? If so, are they prepared to take initiatives to bring about this normalization?

**Mr Van der Klaauw, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.** — *(NL)* The Presidency would remind you of the contents of the letter sent on 10 May 1976 by the then Luxembourg Foreign Minister, Mr Gaston Thorn, to the then President of the European Parliament, Mr Spénale, concerning parliamentary questions. In particular, I would draw your attention to that part of the letter which lays down that, in general, the rules governing political cooperation do not allow for an answer to be given to questions involving the individual policy of one or more Member States. Mr President, I therefore regret that I am unable to answer this question.

**Mr Berkhouwer.** — *(NL)* That makes my supplementary very easy, since I can then ask: Is there no opinion on this subject within the Council as such or within the European Council of the — now — Ten? What is the view of the Ten? If the President-in-Office cannot speak on behalf of one of the Ten — and I appreciate that he cannot speak on behalf of Greece — he can nevertheless somehow perhaps manage to speak on behalf of the Ten. What is the view of the Ten? I hope the President-in-Office will say something this time instead of just fobbing me off again.

**Mr Van der Klaauw.** — *(NL)* This matter has not been discussed within the framework of European political cooperation. There have, however, been individual contacts.

**Mr Marshall.** — Can the President-in-Office of the Council tell us how, if it is not going to be able to persuade Greece, a Member State of this Community, to normalize relations with Israel, it expects to be able to persuade the PLO to recognize Israel, as was hinted at and suggested in the ill-fated Venice Declaration?

**Mr Van der Klaauw.** — *(NL)* It is naturally generally desirable for the Member States to maintain diplomatic relations with those countries with which the Community and the foreign ministers meeting in political cooperation are frequently concerned. However, as far as this political cooperation is concerned, I cannot see how a positive reply can be given to the question as formulated by Mr Berkhouwer.

**Mr Israël.** — *(F)* Mr President-in-Office, do you not think that, to prevent any blackmail, our Greek colleagues — and particularly the Greek Government — should recognize the State of Israel as soon as possible? Every day that passes shows that Greece has been able to join us without harmonizing what I might call its diplomatic ethics with those of the Community.

**Mr Van der Klaauw.** — *(NL)* I think that my previous reply answers this question.

**Mr Schwenke.** — (D) Mr President-in-Office, would you agree with me that European political cooperation is only indulged in when it involves our Member States, and that you reply is thus unsatisfactory? Do you not also think that, after this Question Time and in view of Parliament's interest in the matter, you should next time discuss the matter with your Greek colleague in your capacity as spokesman for the foreign ministers, so that this question can finally be settled?

**Mr Vlachopoulos.** — (EL) Mr President, I should like to answer the question put by the Honourable Member and inform the House that Greece enjoys good relations with Israel, as it does with all countries in the Middle East. There is naturally the question of the level of diplomatic cooperation. At the moment we have relations at *chargé d'affaires* level — in other words we have *de facto* but not *de jure* relations — and our relations are making continual progress. Our cooperation is improving greatly, and as you know, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, relations in the Middle East are a delicate matter. Nevertheless, we are making progress, and since this is a matter of political cooperation, I hope that there will soon also be *de jure* relations between Greece and Israel.

**Mr Blumenfeld.** — (D) May I ask the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers whether he can give us a more substantial reply in his capacity as President of the Council of Ministers. What is at stake here is not EPC, but questions involving cooperation and Community obligations, and the answers we have been given up till now have been unsatisfactory.

**Mr Van der Klaauw.** — (NL) Mr President, I am replying here in the framework of European political cooperation, and I have already made it plain that this matter is not the subject of discussion in this context. I welcome what has been said about the development of relations between Greece and Israel. As I said before, it is undoubtedly very important for Member States to have normal and good relations with those countries with which we frequently have economic and political contacts. I can assure you, Mr President, that if there is anyone aware of this at this moment, it is I myself, in view of the task I have undertaken with regard to the Middle East.

**Mr Beyer de Ryke.** — (F) Mr President, I am not sure whether I should be taking the floor at this stage, since it appears to me that there are two problems that meet here. There is Mr Berkhouwer's question, but there is also the motion for a resolution which I shall be tabling on the same subject — diplomatic relations between Greece and Israel. For my part, although I am one of the cosignatories of the motion, I should like to express my reservations about the motion I myself signed, which may somewhat surprise you. I feel that, if I could express a wish . . .

**President.** — I must rule you out of order, since you should be putting a short supplementary.

I call Question No 95, by Ms Clwyd (H-671/80):

In view of the confusion in Question Time of the last session (Wednesday, 17 December), when the President-in-Office ruled that questions tabled for answer were inadmissible, would he now explain which questions to the Foreign Ministers cannot be answered by the Foreign Ministers?

**Mr Van der Klaauw, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.** — (NL) I would again remind you of the letter of 10 May 1976 from Mr Thorn, the then Luxembourg Foreign Minister, to Mr Spénale, the then President of the European Parliament, on the subject of parliamentary questions. This lays down — and I quote another part of the letter — that it is not possible to give an agreed reply to questions on matters which have not previously been studied in the context of political cooperation or on which no Community stance has yet been reached. In accordance with the Luxembourg and Copenhagen reports, cooperation on foreign policy is in fact totally subject to the rule requiring the agreement of all the Member States. It is also possible that the need for maximum confidentiality prevents detailed replies being given on a particular question in open sitting. In this context, I would also remind you — and I again quote Mr Thorn — that the quarterly meetings with the Political Affairs Committee provide an opportunity to deal in all openness with questions which could not be discussed in plenary session.

The rules governing political cooperation generally do not provide for answers to be given to questions concerning the individual policies being followed by one or more Member States. That is what Mr Thorn's letter says, and the contents of that letter remain fully valid.

**Ms Clwyd.** — I am as confused by that answer as I was at the last part-session in Luxembourg, when questions which were put down by Members were ruled one after the other as inadmissible. It is not clear to me precisely what the President-in-Office was trying to say. Perhaps he would like to clarify the situation in writing so that Members do not waste their time putting down questions and coming to Question Time when the President-in-Office finds himself unable to answer them.

(Applause from certain quarters)

**Mr Van der Klaauw.** — (NL) The problem is of course that European political cooperation is extremely pragmatic, is not based on a treaty, and that the President-in-Office can only reply if agreement has been reached between all the foreign ministers. That is the only reply that I can give in the first in

**Van der Klaauw**

stance. I can then go on to try to develop my answer a little or to touch upon other questions, but the basic fact is that a number of questions are not discussed under political cooperation as such. This may happen in the long run — I sincerely hope so — but it is not the case at the moment. Things are getting better, but they take time.

**Mr Albers.** — (NL) Mr President, in view of this practice of not being able to give any answer, is it not particularly desirable for you to stick to what the agenda says, i.e. half an hour to be spent on this rather sterile affair and one hour on questions to the Council?

**President.** — Thank you for pointing that out.

**Mr Howell.** — I think this is one of the more important questions which we have put down for Question Time. It raises the whole issue of the purpose of Question Time in this House. I would ask the President-in-Office whether he feels he is doing a useful job by coming to this Chamber and answering questions as irrelevantly as he clearly does.

(Applause)

I say this very carefully as one who knows a great deal about confidentiality at this particular juncture. I have great respect for the problems of confidentiality which he deals with in his answer, and equally for the problems which he faces when considering what discussions have already taken place and what discussions have not; but I am becoming increasingly confused about the role he actually plays.

**Mr Rogers.** — Having presided over the last Question Time, referred to by Ms Clwyd, when the President of the Council refused to answer questions, I understood that it was not that the questions were inadmissible, but simply that the President-in-Office was refusing to answer them. May I ask the present President-in-Office whether he is indeed refusing to answer, or whether the Council of Ministers is telling the Parliament that it is none of our business?

**Mr Hutton.** — Would the President-in-Office not agree with me that this half-hour of Question Time is no more than a cosmetic sham to allow the Council of Ministers to pretend that it does serve the Parliament, and may I repeat Ms Clwyd's question to him, whether he will not give us in writing some guidelines as to the questions which we can ask and which he will answer?

(Applause from certain quarters)

**Mr Paisley.** — If the questions are inadmissible, why is it that they are accepted and put on the order-paper? In any other parliament, they would not be put on the order-paper for answering. Why is it that we have to waste our time by putting them down and then being told they cannot be answered? Surely the President's office, in association with the Council, should discuss the matter to see whether these questions are in order for an answer. Or is it, as Mr Rogers has said, a case of simply not answering?

**Mr Van der Klaauw.** — (NL) Since someone has again mentioned the Council, let me start by making it clear that I am not at the moment speaking on behalf of the Council of the European Communities. I am speaking in my capacity as President of the Foreign Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation. That is something different.

This European political cooperation does not lay down a single binding obligation for any Member State. An attempt is made to reach agreement, and if agreement is reached the President-in-Office can speak on behalf of the Ten. If a particular point is not being discussed in the political cooperation, or if no agreement has yet been reached on it, or if it is so confidential that it cannot be discussed in public, the President-in-Office can say nothing. He can only say something on the basis of an agreement.

Now comes the question — is there any point in Parliament's questions? My view is that they are of use, perhaps not at this particular moment, but with an eye to the future. It is possible to put these questions, and no minister is going to censor them. The only thing is that we will sometimes say that we cannot make a statement on a particular subject because no common stance has yet been reached on it. Nevertheless I think that your questions are useful with an eye to the future, since they make clear to the ministers the problems in which Parliament is interested. To that extent this is a good thing. The questions thus land on our desk, and we use them as a basis for our continuing efforts to make progress on our Community political attitudes, which are of such great importance for our cooperation in the Community.

**President.** — We come now to the questions to the Council of the European Communities.

I call Question No 59, by Mr Adam (H-603/80):

Considering the particular problems of sparsely populated rural areas, would the Council accept that a valuable extension of financial support in such areas would be the inclusion of small capital schemes and the extension to provide for revenue assistance, particularly where additional employment is created; does the Council also agree that the criteria for such aid should be revised, bearing in mind that not all such areas are currently eligible for assistance, and will the Council request

**President**

appropriate proposals from the Commission on these lines?

**Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers.** — (NL) In the context of the agricultural structures policy, it should be noted that less-favoured areas under the terms of Directive 75/268/EEC on mountain and hill farming in certain less-favoured areas must have, *inter alia*, a low or dwindling population predominantly dependent on agricultural activity, the accelerated decline of which would jeopardize the viability of the area concerned and its continued habitation. The ceiling on the compensatory allowances provided for by this Directive has recently been increased to 97 ECU.

Furthermore, in the framework of an overall review of the Community's agricultural structures policy, the Council is currently studying other proposals designed *inter alia* to introduce greater flexibility into the conditions for access to farm development plans, which should also encourage investment in the modernization of farms in sparsely populated rural areas.

Finally, the Council is in the process of studying three pilot projects for integrated development programmes in three sparsely populated areas, namely the Western Isles of Scotland, the French department of Lozère and the Belgian province of Luxembourg. These programmes cover a series of agricultural measures together with simultaneous implementation of extra-agricultural measures and involve the combined use of various Community financial instruments.

**Mr Adam.** — Mr President, I welcome some of the comments that the President-in-Office of the Council has just made regarding the integrated development programmes, but on the whole find the answer a bit disappointing and unimaginative because I was hoping that we would have some movement outside the area of agriculture as such. It is a fact, and I hope that the President-in-Office of the Council will accept it, that in rural areas job-creation schemes can be very much less costly than in urban areas. It sometimes takes much less in rural areas either to create a job or to retain a job than it does in the urban areas. Although the levels of unemployment in the rural areas may not be as high as they are in some of the urban areas, the effect on the populations is very substantial. What I would like the Council to do is to agree to look, with the Commission, at the way in which payments and schemes are put forward in rural areas. It should not always be the big schemes that take precedence. It is the small schemes that are needed in the rural areas, and not only ones that are concerned with agriculture. Would the President-in-Office of the Council undertake to look afresh at this situation in the light of some of the more encouraging remarks which he made

earlier and have a more imaginative approach to this problem?

**Mr Van der Mei.** — (NL) I think Mr Adam is the victim of a misunderstanding. He says that he welcomes my comments — and I think they were fairly detailed — but he nevertheless finds them disappointing because too little is happening outside the area of agriculture as such. This brings me to what I said was a misunderstanding. Part of my reply was to the effect that there were three pilot projects under study, and that these three projects involved extra-agricultural measures.

Secondly, I would point out to the Honourable Member that, to improve employment opportunities in structurally weak areas, the Community can offer aid not only from the Regional Fund, as he knows, but also from the Social Fund.

Thirdly, may I point out to him that this is a task not only for the Community, but also for the Member States, and that they too are doing something to help structurally disadvantaged areas.

Fourthly, I would point out that the three areas I indicated — the Western Isles of Scotland, the French department of Lozère and the Belgian province of Luxembourg — are the subject of the three pilot projects currently under study by the Council. This does not mean that the action will have to be restricted to these three regions. On the contrary, if experience in these three areas is positive, it is not impossible that the measures will be extended to other areas.

**Mr Kellett-Bowman.** — I should like to thank the President-in-Office for the sympathetic tone of his replies to this question, but I wonder if he would not be prepared to consider taking all the areas listed in the Less-Favoured Areas Directive and making them eligible for regional funding?

**Mr Van der Mei.** — (NL) At the start of my reply to Mr Adam's question I referred to the directive concerning mountain and hill farming and farming in certain less-favoured areas. Special measures can be introduced for these areas, and I think this also answers the point raised by the Honourable Member.

**Mr Habsburg.** — (D) In view of expected or possible events in Central and Eastern Europe, and other sources of tension, has the Council considered introducing measures to help those areas of the Federal Republic situated along the East German border, so as to prevent the flight from the land in these areas becoming even more acute than is currently the case?

**Mr Van der Mei.** — (NL) I would refer you to what I said in reply to Mr Adam's question — that there are

**Van der Mei**

various possibilities for action under the Regional Fund. The money from the Regional Fund can be used in the Federal Republic to help industry, handicrafts or services, as well as infrastructure projects. I think that such aid goes some way towards meeting the justified concern of the Honourable Member.

**Mr Hutton.** — Is the President-in-Office of the Council aware that the three main structural directives of 1972 come to the end of their lives next year? Is he further aware that in his paper on the future of the common agricultural policy, the late agricultural Commissioner pointed quite clearly in the direction of integrated development programmes as a replacement for these? May I ask him in the light of both of these facts when the Council will get on with it and get the pilot projects — only the pilot projects — for these IDPs into action so that we can get some results which will enable us to use these programmes?

**Mr Van der Mei.** — (NL) The Honourable Member refers to the three structural directives, and I think that Parliament is currently engaged in studying this question. As regards the pilot projects, I would remind you of what I said in my reply to Mr Adam's question, namely that the Council is currently looking into three pilot projects for three separate areas which I named. I even went further and said that, if practical experience with these programmes was positive, it was not impossible that they would be extended to other areas. If the Honourable Member is calling on the Council to study this question, I can only reply that we are already doing so.

**Mrs Ewing.** — May I thank the President-in-Office of the Council for the fact that the Western Isles in my constituency have been selected. I assure the Council that this has been greatly appreciated as these islands are the bastion of our culture and our language. This will help us to preserve the language, which, I think, is in the interests of all Europeans. Could I, however, also ask when it is going to start — as Mr Hutton said — and could I ask him to look at his files where he will see the request from all the authorities in my area: the regional councils, the Highlands and Islands Development Board, the National Farmers Union — I could go on, Sir — who all want the area to be extended somewhat? Could I ask if the President-in-Office of the Council could look at that problem?

**Mrs Lizin.** — (F) What exactly is the position with regard to the proposed integrated programme for the south of the Belgian province of Luxembourg and the possibility of extending it to the adjoining areas, which had been examined favourable at the preparatory stage? We have heard of no further moves on this question.

**Miss Brookes.** — Would the Council please consider the pilot schemes in North Wales which he has referred to, and will the Council give preference to coordinating financial and social aid such as the Social Fund and the Regional Fund and consider amalgamating them to create a rural policy which would cover not only agriculture, but also education, jobs, roads and tourism, thereby emphasizing rural policy, rather than proceeding item by item, so as to create one policy for these rural structural areas?

**Mr Dalsass.** — (D) I think I am acquainted with all the measures which are being or which can be implemented to help mountain areas. Over the years I have had to conclude that they are not adequate to ensure a living for the local population. There is an increasing danger of depopulation of mountain areas. Can the President-in-Office tell me whether the Council has ever discussed what additional and more specific measures could be taken to help the mountain areas and to prevent excessive depopulation, since this would damage not only agriculture but the economy as a whole?

**Mr Van der Mei.** — (NL) The first question refers to the importance of these measures for the maintenance of the culture and language of — if I understood the Honourable Member correctly — the Western Isles. I think that Mrs Brookes raised an important point in this respect. These measures are not aimed exclusively at strengthening agriculture and the economic structure. One of the aims must also be to make general living conditions in the areas in question as good as possible, and the factors mentioned by the Honourable Member — culture and language — play a special role in these general living conditions. I was also asked when the programmes would finally start. I have already said that the Council is studying the matter, and the programmes can be implemented as soon as we have completed our study.

The next question related to the pilot project for an integrated programme for the Belgian province of Luxembourg. I can only repeat: we are studying the matter, but our discussions are not quite finished.

I was also asked whether the region covered by this project could be extended. As I said before, this is something which can be looked into when we have gained experience with the initial projects.

The next question raised the possibility of coordinating aid from the Regional and Social Funds. That is an extremely attractive idea, but we must realize that these are two distinct funds, each of which has its own criteria for granting financial aid to completely different projects in the various Member States.

The last questioner drew our attention to mountain areas, and Mr Dalsass asked whether the measures

**Van der Mei**

already taken to help these areas were not in fact inadequate, since despite these measures the people were leaving the areas. The Honourable Member was presumably not referring to what has been done under the directive in question — because something has been done to make it considerably more attractive for people to remain living in such areas. The fact is that, as I said in my reply to Mr Adam's question, the aid available to these areas has been considerably increased, namely from 50 to 97 units of account. I think this measure can represent a considerable incentive for the people involved to remain living in mountain areas.

**President.** — Since the next three questions concern the same subject, they will be answered jointly:

— Question No 60, by Mr Pedini (H-615/80):

Can the Council tell the European Parliament when it proposes to introduce a European passport, given that it had intended to do so on 1 January 1978?

— Question No 61, by Mr Habsburg (H-616/80):

Will the Council explain why it has so far failed to comply with the demands of the European Parliament for the introduction of a European passport?

— Question No 62, by Mr Berkhouwer (H-660/80):

May we hope that 1981 will see the introduction of the European passport, in line with the decision taken by the European Council at its meeting at the end of 1974, some six years ago?

**Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (NL) On 16 December 1980 the Council agreed to take a decision on the introduction of a uniform passport at its meeting in March 1981.

I know Mr Berkhouwer very well and am aware of the particular importance he attaches to this question.

**Mr Habsburg.** — (D) What obstacles have been preventing progress in this field up till now, and are there any other such obstacles?

**Mr Van der Mei.** — (NL) The obstacles relate to the languages, to the information to be included and to the reference to the Community on the cover of the passport. His further question was whether these obstacles still existed. To my regret I must inform you that this is indeed the case.

**Mr Berkhouwer.** — (NL) May I thank the President-in-Office for regarding me as the 'originator' of this matter, since I raised the point in October 1974 with the French President and the Summit Conference took this decision in December 1974. May I ask the following question: since it would appear that, once

again, certain quarters in one Member State are raising technical objections, is the Presidency of the Council aware that it is now high time this matter was brought to a successful conclusion? A decision adopted by the European Council of December 1974 should now finally be implemented in the spring of 1981. And is the Dutch Presidency — of which I am so proud — prepared to do everything it can to ensure that this matter is finally brought to a successful conclusion in March 1981? Surely the President-in-Office can tell us this without committing nine or ten Member States or what have you. For goodness' sake let him have the courage to say so here for a change.

**Mr Van der Mei.** — (NL) The Honourable Member referred to October 1974, when he was one of those responsible for raising this question. He also mentioned the long time which has elapsed since then without this matter — such a simple one at first sight — being brought to a successful conclusion. And finally he asked whether the Presidency would do everything it could to enable a decision to be reached in March. Mr President, the importance which both the Honourable Member and I myself attach to the question under discussion is such that, in answer to the question whether we will do everything in our power, I can give a wholehearted 'yes'.

**Mr Herman.** — (F) We are extremely grateful to the President-in-Office for this statement, and we are sure he will do his best. However, he has just said that there were still difficulties. Since the March 1981 meeting is no longer so far off, can he tell us whether the experts studying these problems at Coreper level will soon be reaching a solution and whether we can hope to see a decision in March 1981?

**Mr Van der Mei.** — (NL) Firstly, I can again stress that we will do everything we can to reach a decision on this question. I am informed that Coreper will be holding a meeting on this subject next week.

**Mr C. Jackson.** — Does the President-in-Office not agree that the real obstacle to a European passport has, in fact, been a lack of true political will? Can he really expect us to believe that had the Foreign Ministers given real priority to this, it would have taken so long? Will he undertake at least to put a metaphorical bomb underneath the civil servants dealing with it?

**Mr Hahn.** — (D) Mr President-in-Office, would you not agree with me that the objections which have been raised so far, i.e. the arguments in favour of not implementing the decisions already reached, are not convincing, and that, in particular, they will give the European public the impression that there is no genuine resolve to achieve European Union, with the result that the credibility of the governments who are

**Hahn**

constantly reiterating their resolve to achieve such union will be jeopardized?

**Mr Fuchs.** — (*D*) Mr President-in-Office, you mentioned that there were real difficulties, and I therefore have the impression that you are preparing us for yet another disappointment, perhaps in March. That would be the bitterest pill we here have ever had to swallow. May I therefore ask you whether you would agree with me that, after the major disappointment in December, another disappointment in March would really be a heavy blow to our joint efforts to achieve a European Union, that the European passport is something which is of great symbolic value for European unity, and that the Council, if it is serious about Europe, must therefore do everything in its power to achieve a positive result in March.

**Mr Van der Mei.** — (*NL*) Mr Jackson said that there was a lack of political will in this matter. I have already drawn attention to a number of problems which exist and which cannot be dismissed. Mr President, I think we shall see in March whether there is sufficient agreement between the various Member States for us to reach a decision.

Mr Hahn said that it was not so much a question of these problems, but that there was a lack of political will to overcome the problems. I will not agree with Mr Hahn's comments, because that would imply that it was already a foregone conclusion that no decision will be reached in March, and that is a view none of us wants to take.

Mr Fuchs said it would be a disappointment if no decision could be reached in March. Let me assure him once more that the Presidency will spare no effort to ensure that such a decision is in fact reached in March. Let me also remind him that this matter is to be discussed next week by Coreper.

**President.** — I call Question No 63, by Mrs Lizin (H-625/80):

Can the Council indicate what steps it intends to take to expedite the adoption of this Regulation, for which Parliament has demanded priority treatment and which the Council, under the Luxembourg Presidency, has promised on so many occasions to deal with but has not done so?

**Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (*NL*) The Council is currently examining a proposal for a regulation designed specifically for power stations sited in border regions and on international waterways and areas of water. The Dutch Presidency is fully aware of the importance of this issue and will be doing everything possible to arrive at a satisfactory result. I can assure the Honourable Member that the Luxembourg Presidency spared no effort in expediting

this matter, and that the Dutch Presidency is also fully aware of the importance of this problem and will be doing everything possible to arrive at a satisfactory result.

**Mrs Lizin.** — (*F*) Can the President-in-Office tell me what he means by a 'satisfactory result' — does he mean getting this point put on the agenda during his presidency and, if so, for discussion by what Council?

**Mr Van der Mei.** — (*NL*) I think there are two aspects to the question. Firstly, what are 'satisfactory results'? I think this would be anticipating the discussions which have still to take place in the Council. Secondly, when is this matter to be discussed by the Council? I think this will be one of the points for discussion by the next meeting of the Council of Energy Ministers.

**Mr Herman.** — (*F*) Mr President-in-Office, would you agree that the deadline laid down by the Treaties for obtaining prior authorization for investment for nuclear power stations in frontier areas, currently set at six months, is entirely inadequate in view of the time it now takes to build a power station, and that it should therefore be changed?

**Mr Van der Mei.** — (*NL*) I think this point could be included in the discussions.

**Mr Fuchs.** — (*D*) Mr President-in-Office, when you come to discuss the Regulation on the construction of nuclear power stations in border areas, will you also take account of the question of Community safety norms for nuclear power stations, which is in urgent need of a solution?

**Mr Van der Mei.** — (*NL*) This is another point which will undoubtedly play a part in our further discussions on this important issue.

**President.** — Question No 64 by Mr Moreland will be answered in writing.<sup>1</sup>

I call Question No 65, by Mr Bøgh (H-642/80):

From a report just published by Amnesty International, it appears that torture is still being practised in Spain during interrogations in prisons run by the police and the civil guard, that prisoners are being detained without judicial sanction and that the complaints of those who are ill-treated are being ignored by the authorities. With reference to the Joint Declaration by Parliament, the Council and the Commission of 5 April 1977 on the Member States' commitment to human rights and fundamental freedoms, I would like to ask whether the

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

**President**

Spanish Government has been appraised of this declaration, and what effects the above-mentioned report will have on future negotiations regarding Spain's accession?

**Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (NL) The Council would recall the basic importance which the Community attaches to respect for human rights. The Joint Declaration by the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission of 5 April 1977 and the Declaration on Democracy adopted by the European Council on 7 April 1978 bear witness to the Community's determination to ensure respect for these rights. The Council is convinced that Spain as a candidate for accession to the European Communities is aware of the underlying principles of the Treaties establishing the Communities, the resultant commitments and the content of the two above-mentioned Declarations.

At the ministerial meeting opening the accession negotiations, the Community recalled the fundamental principles — including that of respect for human rights — underlying the European Communities. In its reply the Spanish delegation stated that Spain shared this political determination to ensure respect for these values.

**Mr Bøgh.** — (DK) Let me be more specific. Will the Council, in its talks on Spain's accession to the Community, call upon the Spanish Government to make a statement on the conditions described so clearly and in such detail in Amnesty International's report?

**Mr Van der Mei.** — (NL) I think the reply I just gave to Mr Bøgh's question should have been enough to satisfy him. In the ministerial meeting held with Spain in the course of the accession negotiations, the Community side strongly emphasized the principles upon which the Community is based, while the Spanish side stated that it respected these principles.

**Mr Cecovini.** — (I) I have a great deal of admiration for Amnesty International's work in defence of human rights, but this work is — inevitably — based on information which is frequently influenced by politics, or even ideologies, and I would therefore not swear that all its accusations are completely based on facts. I could even give some examples to the contrary.

Spain, which will soon be joining the Community, has ratified the Human Rights Convention and expressly recognizes the right of individual appeal to the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg. I wonder whether, instead of passing judgments and making accusations which could leave their mark on future

relations, it would not be wiser to have further independent investigations.

**Mr Van de Mei.** — (NL) The Honourable Members' views on Amnesty International are naturally his own affair, but his second remark is perfectly right. He pointed out that Spain has signed and ratified the European Convention on Human Rights. He also drew attention to the fact that Spain intends — as from 1 July 1981, I think — to recognize the powers of the Human Rights Commission, including Article 25 which lays down the right of individual appeal. I think that the Honourable Member's latter remarks, in particular, were totally correct, and I agree with them.

**Mr Balfe.** — Does the Council accept that the many pronouncements this Chamber makes in favour of human rights in all other countries of the world would be further strengthened if this Community itself were to set up a committee to look at human rights and keep them under surveillance within the Member States of the Community?

*(Applause from the left)*

**Mr Van der Mei.** — (NL) I think the Honourable Member is making a mistake. If he had paid attention just now he would have heard me saying that there is such a thing as the European Human Rights Convention. This Convention provides us with a procedure with which we can achieve everything the Honourable Member called for in his question.

**Lord Douro.** — In answer to one of the supplementaries the President-in-Office made reference to the fact that as of 1 July the Spanish Government has committed itself to allowing the right of individual petition to the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg. He will, of course, be aware that this is more than can be said of all Member States of the Community. This report by Amnesty International is obviously disturbing, though it has not yet, of course, been substantiated. To put the matter into perspective I would like the President-in-Office to indicate the pleasure which I am sure the Council feels that Spain has committed itself to this very important right of individual petition, which is better than is the general state of affairs within the Member States of the Community.

**Mr Paisley.** — Would the Minister keep in mind that the accusations made by Amnesty International are not complete indictments of guilt; that they have to be examined? Other reports by Amnesty International did not stand up to proper scrutiny. Would he make it clear to the House that accusations by any organiz-

## Paisley

ation must be scrutinized before a decision or a condemnation can be made?

**Mr Blaney.** — May I ask the President-in-Office of the Council whether the doubts cast upon Amnesty International's report in respect of Spain should be taken seriously, considering that in the past Amnesty International's reports have been substantiated in the case of Ireland and later proved in the Court of Human Rights? Moreover, would he not agree that it is ludicrous for this Parliament to admonish an applicant State when it fails to take notice of the decisions taken in the Community with regard to the denial of human rights in my country, Ireland?

**Mr Motchane.** — (*F*) Is the Council aware of the fact that, with very few exceptions, the judiciary, the police and the police commanders in Spain are the same people who were exercising these functions under the Franco dictatorship? Does the President-in-Office not also fear, as I do, that this means he will unfortunately have to answer a number of questions and concerns which we have about the human rights situation in Spain in the coming months?

**Mr Van der Mei.** — (*NL*) Lord Douro pointed out that not all Member States of the Community take the same view as regards the possibilities offered under Article 25 concerning the individual right of petition. I was aware of this fact as well.

Mr Paisley again referred to Amnesty International's reports, and Mr Blaney also commented on them. You will appreciate that I do not want to give a general assessment of Amnesty International's reports — quite apart from the fact that the Council of Ministers has never discussed them. The last questioner asked whether the Council was aware of the fact that the judiciary and police in Spain were the same as under the Franco dictatorship. To be honest, I can only say that the Council does not have any data on the individuals forming the judiciary and police in Spain or on how long they have held their posts or what have you.

**Mr Israël.** — (*F*) The European Human Rights Convention unites 21 countries in the Council of Europe. It is conceivable that the European Community — the Community of the Ten — has closer internal links over human rights than the European Human Rights Convention. Do you not therefore think that, this link uniting 21 European countries is inadequate to ensure the necessary cohesion of the Europe of the Ten on human rights?

**Mr J. D. Taylor.** — In the light of Mr Blaney's accusations is the Minister aware that the denial of human rights in the matters of divorce, family planning and prison conditions in the Republic of Ireland is a

subject of concern to many of us in the whole island of Ireland? Is he aware that the Republic of Ireland is one of the few member nations of this Community which up to now has refused Amnesty International admission to that country?

**Mr Van der Mei.** — (*NL*) Mr Israël asked about the European Human Rights Convention and pointed out that the 21 countries in the Council of Europe represented a large grouping. If I understood him correctly, he asked whether it would not be better for the Community to have something similar.

Firstly, I would say that I consider it of great importance that the 21 members of the Council of Europe have ratified this Convention with each other. I think it would weaken cooperation under this Convention if the Community were to try to set up something in parallel to it.

Secondly, I would point out — as I did in my initial reply — that three Community institutions, namely the Council, the Commission and the Parliament, have issued a joint declaration on human rights. The cohesion which the Honourable Member called for within the Community is therefore already there and does not, in my view, need to be strengthened any further.

The last question again related to Amnesty International, or to where it was or was not allowed admission. I think the Honourable Member is perfectly aware that this not something on which I can reply on behalf of the Council.

**President.** — I call Question No 66, by Mr Turcat (H-648/80):

Following the rather vague discussions and declarations of principle of the European Council of 1 and 2 December 1980 on the fragmentation of industrial markets within the European Community, what more specific guidelines does the Council intend to lay down in order to create a European industrial market, both by encouraging closer links between industrialists from the various Member States and by promoting a favourable financial and legal climate and possibly also by adopting a number of joint protection measures?

**Mr Van der Mei, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (*NL*) The Honourable Member is clearly aware of the statements made by the European Council, which discussed the problems of industrial development and innovation. The competent authorities of the Community, and in particular the Commission in any proposals it makes to the Council, were asked to 'examine ways of eliminating the fragmentation of markets and improving incentives to innovation and the dissemination of knowledge'.

In more general vein, I would remind the Honourable Member of the regular action taken by the Commu-

**Van der Mei**

nity to maintain a coherent Community market and help strengthen it.

With respect to the promotion of a legal climate, the Council is well aware of the importance of harmonizing company law and of creating the conditions for greater inter-penetration of capital markets.

As far as the Honourable Member's proposal for adopting 'joint protection measures' is concerned, I would point out that the Community does not contemplate taking measures which might discriminate against its partners on the world market.

**Mr Turcat.** — (F) The President-in-Office has given only a partial answer. It related only to the industrial environment, although that is something in itself. However, the overall balance may appear somewhat unsatisfactory, or even very unsatisfactory, when our situation in some sectors — as has frequently been pointed out here — is in danger. Only yesterday the Commission again underlined its efforts in the undoubtedly important field of European standards, although there would appear to be a certain lack of understanding on the part of the Council in this respect. This morning, the President of the Commission also drew our attention to the efforts being made in joint research. You yourself, Mr President-in-Office, have just spoken about dissemination of scientific knowledge. However, my question also concerned industrial harmonization. Is the Council aware, as we are, of the indispensable nature of this harmonization if we want to survive in the world of tomorrow — in electronics and data processing, for example? Does he think that standards and joint research are enough? Does he envisage — and this is my supplementary — any other way of translating policy into action, of giving financial aid to major projects in certain sectors — projects which are the only ones likely to bring about this harmonization, as has been shown in the aerospace industry?

**Mr Welsh.** — Would the President-in-Office of the Council agree that a major obstacle to the evolution of the common industrial market is the consistent efforts of certain Member States to interfere with the free movement of goods through non-tariff barriers to trade which infringe the spirit if not the letter of the Treaty? Could he tell us whether the Dutch presidency has any plans to encourage the systematic abolition of such barriers to free circulation during its period of office?

**Miss Quin.** — I would like to ask in view of the fact that Mr Turcat's question mentions the possibility of joint protection measures, whether the President-in-Office of the Council, in consequence of the very disappointing discussions that seem to have taken

place between the EEC and Japan in the last couple of weeks, foresees that the Council will take any further action as far as the position of Japan is concerned and whether any joint protection measures are going to be envisaged?

**Mr Van der Mei.** — (NL) Mr Turcat has suggested that a large degree of harmonization is needed if we are to achieve a truly common market. I would agree with him fully on that. However, I would point out to him that much has already been done in this respect. More than one hundred directives have been adopted in order to abolish obstacles to free trade. Nearly all customs matters are covered by Community directives. Various directives have been adopted on the gradual harmonization of company law, among them a directive harmonizing the annual accounts of more than one million companies in the European Community — I repeat, more than one million companies.

As far as the capital market is concerned, the Council adopted in 1979 a directive coordinating the conditions under which shares can be admitted for official quotation on stock markets. Over the last few years directives have also been adopted on fiscal harmonization and the fight against international fraud and tax evasion. I could give you more examples, but this is a clear indication that these matters have not escaped the attention of the Council in the past. Moreover, I can assure him that we shall continue in future to spare no effort to ensure that the single common market is achieved and that it functions properly.

The Honourable Member asked whether major projects could be made part of the joint research and financed in a particular way. The European Council has not discussed this particular point, but it is looking into the problem as a whole. It has instructed the Commission to look into the matter further, and we are awaiting the Commission's proposals on the subject.

Mr Welsh suggested that the so-called non-tariff barriers were the greatest obstacle and drew attention to the need for them to be abolished. In this context, I have already given you a whole range of measures which have meantime been introduced.

Miss Quin drew attention to the present situation with regard to relations between the Community and Japan and asked whether protective measures were going to be taken in this context as well. In the first place I can assure her that the Council attaches great importance to this subject, which it considers of major significance for relations between great industrial blocs and between countries in the world as a whole. Secondly, I can inform her that this subject will be discussed again next Tuesday at the Council meeting.

**President.** — Question Time is closed.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

5. *Urgent procedure*

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

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-879/80), tabled by Mrs Wieczorek and others, on the charges brought against 13 trade-union leaders in Brazil;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-884/80), tabled by Mrs Castle and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the intended closure of the Tate and Lyle cane sugar refinery in Liverpool;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-885/80), tabled by Mr Provan and others, on the British prisoners held in Iran;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-886/80), tabled by Miss Hooper and others, on the crisis in the sugar cane industry;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-887/80), tabled by Mrs Ewing and others on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats and Mr Maher and others, on a derogation to Community drivers' hours legislation in remote islands and depopulated and isolated areas;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-896/80), tabled by Mr Sarre and others, on the situation in the motor vehicle industry in the EEC;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-897/80), tabled by Mr Lyngé and others, on the intolerable pressure brought to bear by one Member State on another Member State.

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

Parliament will be consulted on these requests for urgent procedure tomorrow morning.

6. *Agenda for next sitting*

**President.** — The next sitting will be held at 10 a.m., 3 p.m. and 9 p.m. tomorrow, Thursday, 12 February 1981, with the following agenda:

- decision on the urgency of 12 motions for resolutions
- continuation of the debate on the Fourteenth General Report of the Commission and its programme for 1981 (followed by the vote on two motions for resolutions)
- joint debate on the Bocklet and Curry reports
- Gautier report on fisheries
- Brønlund Nielsen report on hormones
- Balfour report on convergence and budgetary questions
- Beumer report on book prices
- Prag report on linking work and training for young persons in the Community
- Nyborg report on exemption from VAT on certain imports
- Lenz report on EEC-Romania relations
- Lalor report on the Western Sahara
- Castellina report on STABEX
- Luster report on the compensation of victims of violence
- Malangre report on UK immigration controls
- Curry report on the Community apple market
- Colleselli report on wine-growing in the Community
- Key report on harmonization of social legislation in transport
- Kirk report on fishing quotas
- Provan report on bovine livestock
- Früh report on less-favoured regions in Germany

6 p.m.: Voting time

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 7.20 p.m.)*

## ANNEX

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

## I. Questions to the Commission

## 16. Question by Mr Curry (H-613/80)

Subject: National aids to farmers

Does the Commission consider the national aid of ff 4·100 million promised by the French Government to its farmers to be legal under EEC rules; what discussions have taken place with the French Government and if the aid is in contravention to the rules what does the Commission intend to do about it?

*Answer*

Following reports in the press in December of the French Government's intention to pay aids to farmers, the Commission has twice reminded the French authorities of their obligation to notify such aids in accordance with the Treaty rules. As yet we have received no reply. At the end of January a measure introducing income aids for farmers was published in the French Official Journal, and this is now being studied by the Commission.

\*

\* \*

## 17. Question by Mr Hutton (H-619/80)

Subject: Common agricultural policy

What role does the Commission see for forestry in the development of the common agricultural policy?

*Answer*

I would refer the honourable Member to the reply which my predecessor gave to him at the Parliament's Question Time in January.

At a time when signs of over-production are apparent in several sectors of farming, we must certainly take a fresh look at the possible uses of marginal land, and at ways of increasing the Community's supply of wood. There are also important considerations from the point of view of the environment and land-use policy.

The Commission therefore wishes to make progress in forestry policy, but we also need a positive response from the Council on the proposals which we have already submitted.

\*

\* \*

## 18. Question by Mr Galland (H-661/80)

Subject: Implementation of strict standards for earthquake-proof buildings

Following El Asnam, Naples and Lucania, will the Commission be seeking to impose strict regulations on earthquake-proof construction for all types of buildings in the Community in order to limit substantially the extent of disasters? Can the Commission also state what would be the financial impact of such regulations on building costs?

*Answer*

1. Within the Community Germany, France and Italy have regulations governing the construction of buildings in earthquake zones.

2. More advanced methods of calculating the structural safety of buildings are currently being developed in various countries. The Commission feels that the proper course in the circumstances would be to coordinate national efforts in this regard and to formulate Community regulations.

Common regulations of this kind would enable the construction industries in the Community to work together in rebuilding areas affected by earthquakes inside and outside the Community.

It must be remembered that the number of earthquake-prone areas will grow as a result of Greece's accession and the future entry of Spain and Portugal.

3. The Commission therefore decided to set up a working party on earthquakes. The task of the group, consisting of national experts, will be to use existing regulations as a basis for drawing up a proposal for Community rules on the structural safety of buildings in earthquake zones.

4. There is a very conservative estimate on the question of costs. For earthquakes of moderate intensity the extra cost would be 5-10 %; for serious earthquakes, more than 15 %.

\*

\* \*

*19. Question by Sir Peter Vanneck (H-663/80)*

Subject: Tariffs applied to imports of defence and defence-related equipment from the USA

Have any Member States waived the tariffs on imports of defence and defence-related equipment manufactured in the USA?

*Answer*

The Commission has already replied in the affirmative to this question in its answers to a number of written questions<sup>1</sup>. Its knowledge of the actual situation in the individual Member States, however, is incomplete. This applies both to the type of weapons and equipment concerned and to the volume of imports into the respective Member States. Information concerning trade in weapons and military equipment is treated confidentially by the Member States, and therefore the Commission's information comes only from press reports. The Member States justify their attitude in this matter by an interpretation of Article 223 (1) (b) of the EEC Treaty which has been contested by the Commission on numerous occasions.

\*

\* \*

*20. Question by Mr Normanton (H-666/80)*

Subject: Education for management

In the light of the resolution of the Annual Report of the ACP/EEC Consultative Assembly meeting in Luxembourg on 24-26 September 1980, when will the Commission be in a position to make proposals for the establishment of a Business and Management College for the Lomé States?

*Answer*

The Commission attaches great importance to the training of administrators from ACP States and the training of the managerial staff necessary for the development of the institutions and industries of the ACP States.

<sup>1</sup> Answers to Written Questions (see Annex):

- Nos 324 and 325/79 by Mr De Courcy Ling;
- No 335/79 by Mr Van Miert;
- No 227/80 by Mr Radoux.

It supports African institutes which specialize in these subjects and has financed courses on the spot and in Europe for ACP nationals within the framework of the different multiannual training programmes.

The creation of a Business and Management College could take the form of a regional project in the one or more ACP States or a regional organization for its creation could be set up.

One might also envisage, initially at least, the strengthening by appropriate means of technical assistance, seminars and training awards for ACP management personnel, using existing institutions and courses to which the Commission will draw the attention of the ACP States when the training programmes are set up.

\*

\*   \*

*21. Question by Mr Albers (H-675/80)*

Subject: Port authorities of Le Havre

How has it been made possible for the port authorities of Le Havre to offer special advantages to third countries in the form of a free-trade zone with sheds for the storage of goods?

*Answer*

The authorities in most ports make arrangements with the national customs authorities with a view to establishing customs sheds for the storage of goods. As far as the Commission is aware, the arrangements in Le Havre are no different from those in other Community ports.

\*

\*   \*

*22. Question by Mr Seligman (H-677/80)*

Subject: Cheaper off-peak air fares

In view of the strong demand for substantially cheaper off-peak air fares by people who do not need to travel at a specific time of day, what action does the Commission propose to take to encourage the adoption of such proposals as the British Caledonian Miniprix scheme?

*Answer*

In July 1979 the Commission published a memorandum on the 'contribution of the European Communities to the development of air transport services' which contained a number of suggestions to improve the structure of air transport and included the question of air fares in the Community. The European Parliament delivered its opinion on this memorandum in October 1980 in the form of two resolutions.

Furthermore, the Commission is currently studying the various fares for scheduled flights in the Community in order to draw up a report on this matter as soon as possible. The Commission intends to use this as a basis for taking appropriate initiatives.

The Commission would also draw the attention of the honourable Member to its proposal on inter-regional air transport services of October 1980. Article 8 of this proposal sets out a number of criteria for authorizing fares, which ought to make it possible for cheaper off-peak air fares to be offered where they are considered commercially attractive by the airlines concerned and are in reasonable relation to the operating costs involved.

\*

\*   \*

## 23. Question by Mr Colla (H-680/80)

Subject: Policy on ports

According to the Commission, what are the results of the discussions which have been taking place for several years between the Commission and the seaports to establish to what extent there is a need for a European policy on ports, and in this context can the Commission confirm that the Seaports Division of the Directorate-General for Transport is being closed down?

*Answer*

Aware of the interest in seaports which Parliament has always expressed, the Commission is engaged in preparing a report on the talks it has had with the major Community seaports in the last nine years. This report will be submitted to Parliament in the near future.

The main fact which emerged from these talks is that the opinion in most ports is that measures at Community level are not required to avoid distortion of competition among the various ports and that there is no need to develop a policy on ports as such since the sea transport and land transport sectors (which meet at the ports) can be dealt with better separately.

I can confirm that the Division of Economic Studies, Statistics and Seaports in the Directorate-General for Transport has been closed down and that the staff are now engaged on work which merits greater priority. This was part of a reorganization plan which cut the number of divisions in the Directorate-General by a third.

The appropriate departments of the Directorate-General and other Commission departments are always ready to have talks with the ports on matters of mutual interest for which certain departments may be responsible.

\*

\* \*

## 24. Question by Mr Newton Dunn (H-681/80)

Subject: Results of dough-milling test in United Kingdom

Is the Commission completely satisfied with the results produced by the dough-milling test in the United Kingdom, and if not, what proposals does the Commission have for making the test more appropriate there?

*Answer*

The Commission considers that the dough-milling test is in itself satisfactory in the United Kingdom as in other Member States. It cannot however without other criteria demonstrate adequately the bread-making quality of the dough subjected to test.

This test is at present applied together with the Hagberg test. The Commission considers even this to be insufficient and will propose this year as in previous years to add a further criterion related to protein content.

\*

\* \*

## 25. Question by Mrs Lizin (H-682/80)

Subject: Harmonization of third-party liability ceilings for nuclear power station operators

With reference to the Commission's answer of 30 October 1980 to Written Question No 1167/80 by Mr Damseaux<sup>1</sup> which showed that the ceiling on third-party liability of nuclear plant operators varies in the Member States from 6 234 932 EUA in Italy to 156 347 260 EUA in the Federal Republic of

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 312 of 29 November 1980, p. 43.

Germany, will the Commission consider drawing up a proposal for a Council regulation aimed at the harmonization of the liability ceiling throughout the Community so as to establish an adequate minimum ceiling in the interests both of fair competition and of the well-being of the Community's citizens?

*Answer*

The Commission considers it unnecessary to submit to the Council specific proposals for the harmonization of the maximum third-party liability of nuclear plant operators throughout the Community. Its first concern is to induce those Member States which have not yet ratified the OECD agreements on nuclear liability (Paris Convention of 29 July 1960 and the supplementary Brussels Convention of 31 January 1963) to do so. The minimum liability ceilings established in these OECD agreements are in any case now being reviewed.

\*

\* \*

*27. Question by Mr Seefeld (H-684/80)*

Subject: Uniform passport<sup>2</sup>

What difficulties are still being raised by EC Member States, and if so by which States, to the introduction of a uniform passport for all EC citizens and what action is being taken to achieve at long last this perceptible expression of unification?

*Answer*

It is with very keen interest that the Commission follows the progress towards the creation of a European passport union. The first step in this direction is the introduction of a standard form for passports. The Member States have been working on this project through the Council since the Paris summit meeting of 9 and 10 December 1974. The commission plays an active role in these discussions. The talks are difficult and the Member States have agreed on many but not all details. It is the Commission's hope that work on the introduction of a uniform passport will have a successful outcome as early as possible. The Council discussed the matter on 16 December 1980 and a political decision is expected during the March sitting.

\*

\* \*

*31. Question by Mr Flanagan (H-688/80)*

Subject: Constraints upon investment activity

Will the Commission give a detailed explanation of its comment that 'experience has shown, at least in some Member States, that the lack of mature projects and delay of administrative procedures often exert a more effective constraint upon investment activity than the availability of funds?'<sup>3</sup>

*Answer*

The phrase to which the honourable Member refers appears in Chapter 3 of the Annual Economic Report 1980-81, in the section relating to budgetary policy problems in the Community countries. It refers, in particular, to one of the economic policy measures which could be used should activity in 1981 not recover as firmly as forecast. In that case, activity could be given additional support by some acceleration of the execution of public investment programmes. The question of whether, in a period of recession, the investment programmes of public departments or undertakings can be executed so as to help stabilize activity is of great importance, since these programmes are one of the rare categories

<sup>2</sup> See questions by Mr Habsburg and Mr Berkhouwer on the same subject.

<sup>3</sup> Annual Economic Report 1980-81. Com(80) 596 Final, p. 12.

of public expenditure which governments can modify in the short term. In practice, however, it has proved much easier to hold back the execution of public investment programmes than to accelerate it. The authorities responsible for implementing programmes — usually, the local authorities — do not always have, in all the member countries, an adequate number of projects which can be started rapidly once the general economic situation requires this. This can often be explained not only by a lack of planning at local level, but also by insufficient coordination between the different sectors of government and by administrative procedures which do not accord with requirements.

\*

\*   \*

*32. Question by Mr Lalor (H-689/80)*

Subject: Limiting oil supplies

Can the Commission state what will be the likely effect on Community oil supplies of the recently announced Saudi Arabian limit to its oil production of 10 million barrels a day?

*Answer*

Since the beginning of hostilities between Iran and Iraq and the virtually total stoppage of oil exports which has resulted, Saudi Arabia and other producer countries have announced that they would increase production in order to partially offset the stoppage of supplies.

The announcement by the Saudi Arabian Government of its intention to maintain its oil exports at the level of 10 million barrels a day and, secondly, to extend the temporary contracts it had signed in the last quarter of 1980 with a number of countries directly affected by the virtually total shutdown of exports from Iran and Iraq — in particular France, Italy and Greece, in the case of the Community countries — is clearly a reassuring sign.

\*

\*   \*

*34. Question by Mr Lynge (H-696/80)*

Subject: Translation of official documents into the language of Greenland

On 1 November 1980 the Greenland Government took over responsibility for the section of the European Community sea situated within 200 nautical miles of the coast of Greenland. Will the Commission arrange for the translation into the language of Greenland of all official documents concerning the future fisheries policy?

*Answer*

1. The current position on the rules governing the languages of the institutions of the Community, determined pursuant to Article 217 of the EEC Treaty, is laid down essentially by Council Regulation No 1 of 15 April 1958 determining the rules governing the languages of the European Economic Community<sup>1</sup>, as amended by the Act of Accession of 1972<sup>2</sup> and lastly by the Act of Accession of the Hellenic Republic.<sup>3</sup>

The Commission is therefore bound by these provisions which determine seven as the number of the official languages of the Community institutions. Official documents are therefore published in these languages.

<sup>1</sup> OJ 17 of 6 October 1958, p. 385/58.

<sup>2</sup> OJ L 73 of 27 March 1972, p. 14/see Articles 29 and 158 of the Act and Annex I, Section XIV, 1; see Article 8 of the Act for the status in law of the provisions.

<sup>3</sup> Act concerning the conditions of accession of the Hellenic Republic and the adjustments to the Treaties (not yet in force) contains provisions similar to those in the Act of Accession of 1972 (see Articles 8, 21 and 150 and Annex 1, Section XVI, 1 in OJ L 291 of 19 November, p. 17).

2. However, it is true that as part of its information policy the Commission has sometimes had certain documents translated into the language of Greenland as well as into Irish and Welsh. But it could never under any circumstances accept this as a general rule requiring it to provide translations in languages other than the official languages.

\*

\*   \*

*35. Question by Mr Bangemann (H-700/80)*

Subject: Control of butter exports to the Soviet Union

How does the Commission propose to bring the export of butter to the Soviet Union under control when food preparations (CCT Heading — 2.107.G.VII.VIII) consisting of 70 % butter and 30 % cocoa butter can still be exported with a refund rate of 146.48 ECU per 100 kg?

*Answer*

I can assure the honourable Member that as soon as it became apparent that substantial quantities of these butter mixtures were being prefixed for export, with the possibility that they might be exported to the Soviet Union, the Commission took immediate action. First of all, on 7 January, it suspended the possibility of prefixing the export refund for these products. Then, on 17 January, it withdrew the export refund for all destinations. The Commission is now preparing a measure which will permit us to differentiate the export refunds for these so-called non-Annex II products according to their destination, and this will ensure adequate control in future.

\*

\*   \*

*36. Question by Mrs Ewing (H-701/80)*

Subject: Common fisheries policy

Will the Commission comment on the up-to-date situation in negotiation of a common fisheries policy?

*Answer*

The Council of Ministers is meeting today and tomorrow in Brussels to pursue its discussions on fisheries and the Commission very much hopes that it will reach agreement.

\*

\*   \*

*37. Question by Mr Megahy (H-703/80)*

Subject: Allocation of portfolios

To what extent were there any representations by Heads of Government of Member States in respect of the allocation of portfolios to Members of the new Commission?

*Answer*

Before taking office, I made a point of visiting the Heads of Government of each of the Member States in order to learn of their intentions with regard to the appointment of the Members of the new Commission and to discover what areas were of particular concern to them with regard to the development of Community policies. The information I was able to gather during this series of talks was

most valuable to me at a time when I had to formulate my ideas on the broad lines of policy I would need to put before the Commission in the months to come, and, in the shorter term, on the proposals I would have to make concerning the allocation of portfolios.

In the early days of the present Commission's term of office, a Head of Government confirmed to me the tenor of the talks we had had, and I listened with all due attention.

\*

\* \*

*38. Question by Mr Nicolson (H-710/80)*

Subject: The European Foundation

The question of setting up a European Foundation, the principle object of which was to provide resources to spread knowledge of and support for the European Community, was last discussed at a Foreign Affairs Council in December 1978 and no conclusions were reached. Can the Commission tell me if it is intended to proceed with these proposals or if not what the plans are to improve understanding of the Community by the peoples both of the Member States and of other countries and is the Commission aware that as a result of a spontaneous initiative a trust is being formed to improve mutual understanding between the peoples of North America and the European Community?

*Answer*

Under the terms of the decision of the European Council held in Copenhagen on 8 and 9 April 1978, the European Foundation ought to have been set up by an agreement between the Member States meeting within the Council. Negotiations which took place to this end, and with which the Commission was closely associated, have not yet led to such an agreement, since major problems remain to be solved.

The Commission believes the European Foundation to be an essential instrument for the promotion of mutual understanding between the peoples of the Community. It hopes that negotiations within the Council will be resumed and intends, as in the past, to put forward such proposals as may lead to their successful conclusion.

The Commission is not aware of the existence of a project to form an organization to improve mutual understanding between the peoples of North America and the European Community to which the honourable Member refers.

\*

\* \*

*39. Question by Mr Paisley (H-711/80)*

Subject: Agricultural industry of Northern Ireland

In view of the fact that conditions peculiar to Northern Ireland agriculture, particularly in relation to the price of feedstuffs, mean that in the past year Northern Ireland farmers earned £ 42 million less than they would have earned if they were accorded the same level of return as their counterparts on the United Kingdom mainland, will the Commission undertake a study of the problems of the agricultural industry of Northern Ireland with a view to recommending special measures of assistance and special provisions in the annual price review?

*Answer*

In framing its proposals for prices and other measures the Commission will take account of the development of agriculture in Northern Ireland as well as other regions of the Community.

I would remind the honourable Member that proposals have already been submitted by the Commission, within the general package of structural measures, which would help to solve the agricultural problems of Northern Ireland in the cereals and animal-feed sectors. I hope the Council will adopt these proposals rapidly.

\*

\* \*

## 40. Question by Mr Berkhoutwer (H-713/80)

Subject: Projects undertaken with the aid of Community finance

Is the Commission prepared to encourage measures to ensure that in those municipalities of the Member States where projects are undertaken with the aid of Community finance this fact is brought to the knowledge of the public by means of hoardings erected on their borders or by other methods?

*Answer*

The Commission considers that putting up signboards is a good way of publicising certain types of financial grants, particularly those for major infrastructure projects, and has persuaded the Member States to accept the principle of this form of publicity for infrastructure projects assisted by the European Regional Development Fund. Referring to Article 10 of the ERDF Regulation, the Commission has been able to convince the Member States to undertake to put up, on the sites of projects of a certain size, signboards stating that the projects are part-financed by the Fund. An annual tally is kept of these signboards and increasing numbers are being put up in the Member States.

The Commission is trying to extend this form of publicity both for similar projects assisted by other financial instruments and for grants to private beneficiaries. For example, in the letters announcing the grant of aid from the EAGGF Guidance Section for structural improvement projects, the recipients are asked to make public acknowledgment of the aid, *inter alia* by the means advocated by the honourable Member. However, under the current rules, the beneficiaries cannot be required to do so.

\*

\* \*

## 41. Question by Mrs Squarzialupi (H-716/80)

Subject: Water Decade proclaimed by the World Health Organization

What contribution does the Commission intend to make to the 1981-90 Water Decade proclaimed by the World Health Organization, either as regards fostering an awareness of and safeguarding the water resources of the Ten Member States or as regards technical and financial assistance for the developing countries in the location and rational use of water resources?

*Answer*

Action for the protection and treatment of fresh water is recognized as having priority in the environmental action programme and the Commission intends to carry on with this action. Investigation of surface water and groundwater resources will also continue.

In the case of technical and economic aid for developing countries, the Commission applies the well known principles of Community policy on cooperation. This policy is based on the priorities indicated by the recipient countries. The aim of the policy is to complement the efforts of the recipient countries. As far as water resources in any country are concerned, the Commission is therefore ready to accord the degree of priority which the country itself determines in this sector for the Water Decade 1981-90.

\*

\* \*

## 44. Question by Mr Cottrell (H-721/80)

Subject: 'Cassis de Dijon' judgment

With regard to what has become known as the 'Cassis de Dijon' judgment by the European Court (Case 120/78) has the Commission fully considered the implications of this decision concerning domestic food standards legislation prevailing within individual Member States? If so, what does it expect such implications to be and would the Commission accept that one possible effect could be the derogation of standards in general — and in that event what proposals will the Commission make in the near future to take this into account?

*Answer*

After a thorough analysis of the 'Cassis de Dijon' judgment which was confirmed, moreover, by the 'Gilli' judgment of 26 June 1980, the Commission sent a letter on the content, interpretation and implications of this judgment to all the Member States. This letter was also forwarded to the European Parliament and the Council for information (and published in OJ C 256 of 3 October 1980, p. 2).

The Commission is fully aware of the implications of this judgment in particular as regards the food market.

I would re-emphasize that where no provisions of Community law exist, the Member States of the Community are free to lay down the conditions for the manufacture and marketing of products within their territory. Such regulations, however, must not prevent imports of goods from other Member States which have been manufactured in compliance with the provisions and normal commercial practices of those Member States and have been lawfully marketed there, except where the regulations in question meet the exemption criteria set out in the 'Cassis de Dijon' judgment of the Court of Justice.

Compliance with this basic tenet prevents compartmentalization of national markets and leads at the same time to freer and a greater volume of trade within the Community. The interests of the consumer are also taken into account, since he is offered a more extensive range of goods and is able to buy products complying not only with the standards but also the individual characteristics and traditions of the various Member States.

Moreover, the principle confirmed by the Court of Justice can and will not lead to the wholesale and systematic abolition of all provisions currently in force in the Member States. The Commission may only judge these provisions in the context of an individual case, and naturally the criteria laid down by the Court of Justice as well as the specific circumstances of each individual case will be taken into account.

On the other hand, the Community legislator has also to ensure that trade within the Community develops harmoniously. He is therefore always called upon to lay down through Community norms the conditions for the marketing of a product, whenever this is necessary in the interests of the proper functioning of the common market or for other reasons, such as environmental or consumer policy considerations.

\*

\*   \*

*45. Question by Mr Hopper (H-722/80)*

Subject: Loans made by the Commission

What efforts have been made to recover loans made by the Commission which are in default?

*Answer*

For NIC and Euratom loans there have been no defaults.

Of a total of almost 3 000 ECSC loans there are 3 which are in default and these represent 0.33 % of the total outstanding debts of the ECSC. A sum has been set aside under the appropriate provisions to cover these loans. But as the loans were secured by collateral the Commission is currently in the process of realising the guarantees and hopes that the amounts outstanding will be recovered in full.

\*

\*   \*

*47. Question by Mr Fernandez (H-731/80)*

Subject: Petrol prices in Member States

Can the Commission list comparative pump prices for petrol in the Ten Member States and explain the disparities? Can it explain, in particular, why it is that certain Member States, such as Belgium, are reducing the price of petrol while others, such as France, are increasing it, allegedly because of the rising price of oil?

*Answer*

Since June 1979 the Commission has been publishing a weekly analysis of oil prices with the aim of making the price formation mechanisms more transparent. Consumer prices of the main oil products in each Member State are given in the various national currencies approximately once a month. Bulletin No 77<sup>1</sup> of 18 December 1980 listed the pump prices of normal and super grade petrol in the various Member States on 15 October 1980.

On this date the average pump prices for super grade petrol in the Member States, converted into dollars at constant prices<sup>2</sup>, showed a difference of close to 30 % between the highest price (\$ 839.18 per 1 000 litres in Denmark) and the lowest price (\$ 655.69 in Germany). The basic reason for these price differences — which fluctuate greatly according to the time of year, the product and the country in question — is the different scale of taxation on oil products in each Member State. A less significant factor is the difference in prices before tax. Reasons for differences in this respect include market structures and transport and distribution costs which vary from country to country and the price mechanism peculiar to each country and which, within the Community, ranges from complete freedom through recommendations to controlled prices.

The Commission is concerned about excessive price differences which could affect competition. During 1981 it will pursue its action in this area within meetings of Council Ministers for Energy and for Economic and Financial Affairs.

\*

\*   \*   \*

*48. Question by Mrs De March (H-732/80)*

Subject: Resumption of food aid supplies for Vietnam

Can the Commission give details of relations between the EEC and Vietnam with respect to food aid, in particular since its decision to suspend the supply of food aid to this country?

*Answer*

Since the suspension of direct Community food aid to Vietnam in July 1979 the Commission has contributed to a number of specific food aid programmes organized in Vietnam by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees and by Caritas Germanica. During 1980 the Community thus provided 2 700 tonnes of rice (approximately 7 300 tonnes of cereals), 270 tonnes of milk and 150 tonnes of butteroil for Cambodian refugees in camps near Ho Chi Minh City. This food aid was distributed under the supervision of the UNHCR. Furthermore, as part of its food aid programme for 1980, the Community decided to provide an additional 1 296 tonnes of rice (approximately 3 500 tonnes of cereals) for this programme. During 1980 the Commission also supplied Caritas Germanica with 500 tonnes of skimmed milk powder and 50 tonnes of butteroil for women and children affected by the floods in Vietnam.

The Commission will continue to show a keen interest in the development of the food supply situation in Vietnam and will consider carefully all requests for food aid to this country which are submitted by the international bodies.

\*

\*   \*   \*

*50. Question by Mrs Desmond (H-736/80)*

Subject: Aid from the Community Disaster Fund for the Blackwater Valley, Munster

Can the Commission state whether the Irish Government has applied for aid for the Blackwater Valley area in Munster, Ireland, which was recently devastated by serious flooding?

<sup>1</sup> Annex 1.

<sup>2</sup> Annex 2.

*Answer*

The Irish Government has not applied to the Commission for emergency aid to assist the victims of the floods in the Blackwater Valley region of Munster in Ireland.

\*

\* \*

*51. Question by Mr Kavanagh (H-737/80)*

Subject: Crisis in the Irish fertilizer industry

Is the Commission aware of the current crisis in the Irish fertilizer industry, particularly serious in view of the important role played by this industry in the Irish economy, both in agriculture and in providing jobs; what aid can be made available by the Commission to support this essential industry, and what measures can be applied to ensure the prevention of redundancies already threatened?

*Answer*

The Commission is unable to comment at this stage on the current situation in the Irish fertilizer industry. It has instructed its departments to gather the necessary information.

\*

\* \*

*52. Question by Mr Maher (H-742/80)*

Subject: The setting up of a task force to control inflation in the different countries of the Community

Since Community policies are becoming less and less meaningful to those people in Member States where inflation is out of control, would the Commission be prepared to set up a task force to advise on how this problem can be more effectively controlled?

*Answer*

The Commission believes that the existing mechanisms for coordinating economic policies, in particular those mechanisms provided for in the Council decision of 18 February 1974 as also those within the European Monetary System afford a suitable framework for conducting the indispensable concerted battle against inflation and for achieving a reduction in the disparities in price rises within the Community.

As the Commission reaffirmed in the Annual Economic Report for 1980-1981 which it sent last autumn to Parliament and to the Council, and which the latter adopted in December, it accords a very special priority to the battle against inflation. The Commission believes that 'the underlying objective of medium-term economic policy must be to increase employment while improving price stability and competitiveness' and that the action of Member States should aim in the first place, in particular by appropriate budgetary and monetary management, at a definite and substantial deceleration in the rate of inflation, this being accompanied by a new convergence. In the longer term the Commission believes that the anti-inflationary policy should be based above all on an improvement in productivity deriving in particular from the expansion of industries possessing growth potential for the future and from an increased investment effort.

Certainly most of the instruments to be implemented in order to achieve these objectives fall within the competence of the Member States. However, the Community too has an important role to play: that of establishing the framework within which the various Member States can coordinate their economic policies; it also has the responsibility for using its own financial, monetary and structural policy instruments with a view to helping to achieve these objectives.

In this respect the Commission is fully aware of its responsibilities and will continue to bear them to the full.

\*

\* \*

*53. Question by Mrs Tove Nielsen (H-750/80)*

Subject: State option to purchase Danish North Sea oil

Will the Commission examine the Danish Government's imposition of a State option to purchase Danish North Sea oil to determine whether it is in the spirit of EEC cooperation and compatible with the provision of the Treaty of Rome that competition within the Community should not be distorted?

*Answer*

With a view to being fully informed the Commission has put a number of questions to the Danish authorities.

\*  
\* \*

*54. Question by Mr Bonde (H-744/80)*

Subject: Regional development in Denmark

Will the Commission alter its decision so that Kalundborg can continue to enjoy the status of recognized development area?

*Answer*

The Commission decision to which the honourable Member refers was taken in December 1980 and reflected the Commission's doubts as to whether the social and economic situation in Kalundborg justified support for the area. In accordance with Article 93 (2) of the EEC Treaty, the Commission gave notice to the Danish Government to submit its comments on the Commission opinion. The Commission has now received these comments from Denmark and they are currently being studied by the Commission departments. An opinion will be reached as soon as possible.

\*  
\* \*

*55. Question by Mr Collins (H-746/80)*

Subject: Protection of public from sub-standard seeds

Will the Commission agree that while its action to protect the public from the risk of buying sub-standard seed is laudable in some ways in itself, it has the side effect of destroying many of the traditional species of plant which have been available to gardeners and horticulturalists experiencing difficult and variable growing environments; and will the Commission therefore indicate whether or not it is likely to be its intention to stimulate research in this area with a view to ensuring continued production of many of the traditional varieties of vegetable which have excellent qualities which commend them to non-commercial growers?

*Answer*

The Community system does not have the side-effect of destroying traditional varieties of seed.

The Commission is already taking action to prevent the loss of plant material as a genetic resource, and is willing to study ideas for further action in this field.

\*  
\* \*

*56. Question by Mr Donnez (H-747/80)*

Subject: Application of Article 58 of the ECSC Treaty to the steel industry

Can the Commission confirm reports to the effect that for the first quarter of 1981 certain European

steel producers obtained an increase in their production quotas on the grounds that they had made an omission in the production declarations for the previous years?

*Answer*

Some companies did in fact obtain an increase in production quotas because of discrepancies between declared and actual production. The Commission verified the accuracy of data by on-the-spot inspections in most cases and then made the necessary quota adjustments on the basis of actual production. If these omissions are the result of any infringement of the provisions of the ECSC Treaty, the Commission will take all necessary action with regard to the companies in question.

\*

\* \*

*57. Question by Mr Boyes (H-749/80)*

Subject: Steel anti-crisis plans

Would the Commission state why its anti-crisis measures for the steel industry are not working in all steel-producing Member States, e.g. the industry in the UK is under pressure because of cheap steel imports from other EEC countries?

*Answer*

Subject to the limitations of the steel quota scheme, steel is free to move between the countries of the Community. The movement is influenced by relative price levels and these have been affected by the strengthening of the pound, which, since the beginning of 1980, has gained approximately 25 % in value in terms of the ECU.

In spite of this, the recent level of UK steel imports has not been unduly high.

During the last five months of 1980 imports from the rest of the Community were only 616 000 tonnes, compared with 934 000 tonnes in the corresponding period of 1979, a reduction of 34 %.

\*

\* \*

*58. Question by Ms Quin (H-751/80)*

Subject: Council regulation establishing supplementary measures in favour of the United Kingdom.

In Article 2 of the proposal for a Council regulation establishing supplementary measures in favour of the United Kingdom submitted by the Commission to the Council on 12 June 1980, housing in the public sector was mentioned as a possible beneficiary of these supplementary measures. In the final regulation (27 October 1980) this reference was omitted. What were the reasons for this omission from the final regulation?

*Answer*

In adopting the Regulation No 2744/80, on the basis of the proposal of the Commission, the Council considered that it was preferable not to have in the text of the regulation a limited list of categories of eligible investments in infrastructure, but to have instead general eligibility criteria. These general eligibility criteria do not exclude, however, housing in the public sector.

\*

\* \*

## II. Questions to the Council

## 64. Question by Mr Moreland (H-640/80)

Subject: Commission Portfolios

At it is the responsibility of the Commission to produce proposals for Council and Parliament consideration and be the 'powerhouse' of ideas for the Community does the Council believe that the Community is well served if a Commissioner retains a portfolio for too long, for example, over four years?

*Answer*

The distribution of portfolios among Members of the Commission is the responsibility of the Commission alone.

\*

\* \*

## 68. Question by Mrs Ewing (H-705/80)

Subject: 1981 — Year of the Handicapped

Will the President-in-Office state what action the Council proposes to take to mark 1981 as the Year of the Handicapped?

*Answer*

The Commission has not so far submitted any proposals or communications to the Council regarding specific action to mark 1981 as the Year of the Handicapped.

The Council would nevertheless point out that since 1974 the Community has been engaged in action on the occupational rehabilitation of handicapped persons and that the European Social Fund reserves some of its resources for contributions to financing projects carried out by the Member States involving the integration or reintegration of handicapped persons into working life.

\*

\* \*

## 73. Question by Mr Collins (H-669/80)

Subject: European Foundation

What further steps have been taken to ensure the establishment in Paris of the European Foundation on the basis agreed by the European Council and what arrangements are the Council currently making to further this proposal?

*Answer*

Although the general outline of the Foundation was sketched by the European Council and the objective remains as stated, it has not yet been possible to establish a system for the operation of the Foundation and more especially to lay down specific financing arrangements.

At its meeting on 15 and 16 December 1980, the Council again discussed the matter. The Presidency was forced to conclude that unfortunately the positions of the delegations had not altered since 1978. Therefore the prerequisites for unanimous agreement on the detailed arrangements for setting up the Foundation have not yet been met.

\*

\* \*

*74. Question by Ms Clwyd (H-670/80)*

Subject: Beef

There is reported to be 20 000 tons of beef in store in the UK alone. According to a statement of Michael Silver, President of the Imported Meat Trade Association, it should be possible to sell cheap meat from Common Market stores to schools, hospitals and to pensioners.

In view of the high cost of storage and the proportion of the common agricultural policy spent on storage, would the Council care to take up the suggestion?

*Answer*

The Council is aware of the problem of temporary surplus stocks of beef and veal in the Community. In Regulation No 805/68 it gave the Commission authority in principle to dispose of such stocks. In Regulation No 98/69 it laid down general implementing rules. On a previous occasion — in the 1974/1975 marketing year — it also laid down general rules governing the sale of beef and veal at reduced prices to certain categories of consumer (Regulation No 1856/74).

It is therefore a matter for the Commission, which is responsible for managing the beef and veal market, to decide whether such measures should be introduced and, as in the past, either to take the necessary measures on its own authority or to submit measures not authorized under existing Community rules to the Council for approval.

\*

\* \*

*75. Question by Mr Delatte (H-673/80)*

Subject: Supply of foodstuffs to Poland

The Council decided in Brussels on 15 and 18 December 1980 to supply foodstuffs to Poland at prices 15 % below world levels, the cost of this wholly justified operation to the Community being estimated at 30 million EUA. Which policy does the Council consider this operation to fall under, and consequently to which budget heading will the expenditure of 30 million EUA be charged?

*Answer*

The Council decision of 16 December 1980 making it possible for Poland to purchase varying quantities of agricultural products at favourable prices was an exceptional measure.

Politically, the decision stemmed from the European Council meeting in Luxembourg on 1 and 2 December 1980. The Member States had declared on that occasion that they were willing to respond as far as possible to the requests for economic support which had been submitted by Poland.

Technically, the decision is implemented as part of the common agricultural policy. The Commission grants export refunds for the sale of the products in question and this enables Poland to purchase these products at prices below world levels.

On the budgetary side, the cost of this operation is borne by the EAGGF out of the available funds under the 1980 budget.

If Poland makes full use of the favourable purchasing conditions offered by the Community, the cost may rise to approximately 30 million EUA.

\*

\* \*

*77. Question by Mr Albers (H-676/80)*

Subject: Visa requirements for Turkish workers

In view of the particularly prejudicial effects involved, will the Council endeavour to bring about a change in the policy pursued by several Member States concerning the obligation for Turkish workers

to obtain visas, especially those who, by virtue of their many years of residence in the Community and their contribution to productivity, deserve to be regarded as fellow European citizens and to be given permanent work and residence permits?

*Answer*

It must be said first of all that, with due regard for international obligations of which the Ankara agreement is a part, the entry of non-EEC nationals to the territory of the Community is the exclusive responsibility of each Member State.

The Community follows this matter with keen interest, however, especially in view of the Association Agreement which has existed between Turkey and the Community since 1963. At the meeting of the EEC-Turkey Association Committee on 3 December 1980 the Community assured the Turkish delegation that the authorities in the Member States concerned would give all due attention to Turkish concern at the effects — humanitarian, social and economic in particular — of the introduction of visa requirements.

As for the specific case to which the honourable Member refers and which concerns Turkish workers who have been resident for a long time in a Member State of the Community, national regulations state that workers with a residence and work permit do not require a visa for re-entry to the Member State or that there will be no difficulty in obtaining a visa.

\*

\* \*

*80. Question by Mr Schwartzberg (H-706/80)*

Subject: Improvement of the Luns-Westerterp procedure

Is the Council prepared to improve the procedure for consultation with the European Parliament on external Community agreements instituted under the presidency of the Dutch Ministers, Luns and Westerterp?

*Answer*

By virtue of the Luns-Westerterp procedure Parliament is kept informed of developments at every stage of negotiation. The Council feels that these arrangements are fully adequate for their purpose. However, the Council is ready to examine any practical measures for improving still more the efficiency of these arrangements.

\*

\* \*

*82. Question by Mr Oebler (H-712/80)*

Subject: Applications for loans under Article 56 of the ECSC Treaty

In October 1980 the governments of three Member States, namely France, the United Kingdom and Belgium, applied to the Commission, pursuant to Article 56 of the ECSC Treaty, for loans of 300 million EUA, 140 million EUA and 160-180 million EUA respectively. Would the Council explain how the Community can grant such loans at a time when certain governments are refusing to pay their contribution to the budgets recently adopted and why the Council, although the matter has been referred to it on several occasions by the Commission, has still not been able to take a decision?

*Answer*

Every ECSC authority, and particularly the Council, pays a great deal of attention to the social and economic aspects of the crisis affecting the steel industry in Europe, with the particular aim of mitigating the effects on jobs of restructuring the steel industry.

The present problem stems from the fact that in the Commission's view the ECSC, which has its own system of financial resources, is not in a position to satisfy as it would like all the applications which are being submitted at the moment by the Member States. As a result, the Commission felt that a call for external resources was necessary.

It was the Commission's view that these resources should be sought in the general budget of the Communities. Some delegations — including a number from applicant countries — have expressed

reservations about a solution of this kind. If non-ECSC aid is to be offered, the source for such aid must be decided.

The Council has asked the Commission for its further views and will consider the matter again in the coming weeks, and in particular at the meeting of 3 March.

\*

\* \*

*83. Question by Lord Dowro (H-715/80)*

Subject: Jamaica

What steps is the Council taking to provide aid to the new Jamaican Government?

*Answer*

In the same way as any ACP Member of the Lomé Convention, Jamaica is able to benefit from the wide range of development aid available under the two ACP-EEC Conventions in which the chapters on financial and technical cooperation, stabilization of export earnings, industrial and agricultural cooperation, the new system of measures relating to mineral products and the Protocols on Sugar and Rum are of particular importance to that country.

Within the limits of available resources and of the powers of Community institutions, the current situation of Jamaica is taken into account in the application of the provisions of the ACP-EEC Convention

\*

\* \*

*86. Question by Mr Herman (H-729/80)*

Subject: Decision on the place(s) of work of the European Parliament

Given the obvious importance of this question for the smooth running of the European Parliament, will the Council give an assurance that it will make appropriate contacts with Parliament in good time before the Conference of Representatives of the Governments of the Member States takes a final decision on the place(s) of work of the European Parliament?

*Answer*

It is the responsibility of the Conference of Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, to which the honourable Member refers, to decide on the seat of the institutions of the European Communities. It will therefore also be the responsibility of the Conference, when the time comes, to decide whether to make appropriate contacts with the institutions concerned.

\*

\* \*

*87. Question by Sir James Scott-Hopkins (H-734/80)*

Subject: EEC officials' salaries

Can the Council explain how it has got itself into such an appalling mess, such as breaking undertakings which should never have been entered into and granting salary increases while calling on Member States not to do so?

*Answer*

Given that the Commission has publicly announced its intention of instituting legal proceedings against the Council before the Court of Justice concerning the matters evoked by the honourable Member, the Council considers it inappropriate to reply at the present time.

## SITTING OF THURSDAY, 12 FEBRUARY 1981

## Contents

1. Approval of minutes: Point of order: Mr Ryan . . . . .	178	Cerretti; Mr Albers; Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Thorn (Commission) . . . . .	203
2. Decision on urgency: Mr Turcat; Mr Konrad Schon; Mr von Wogau; Mr Fich; Mr Lyngé; Mr Klepsch; Mr Brøndlund Nielsen; Mr Bøgh; Mr de la Malène; Mr Bettiza; Mr Antoniozzi; Mr Mibr; Mr Klepsch; Mr Christopher Jackson; Mrs Castle; Miss Hooper; Mr Klepsch; Mr Louwes; Mrs Castle; Mr Provan; Mr Beyer de Ryke; Mrs Ewing; Mrs Castle; Mr Moreland; Mr Maher; Mr McCartin; Mr Israël; Mr Sarre; Mr Delorozoy; Mr Herman; Mr Glinne; Mr Bonaccini; Mr de la Malène; Mr Lyngé; Mr Gautier; Mr Prag; Mr Motchane . . . . .	179	9. Votes: Fergusson motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-877/80/rev. II): Commission's programme of work: Explanation of vote: Mr Christopher Jackson . . . . . Mr Fergusson; Mr Haagerup; Mr Arndt; Mr Fantì; Mr Lalor . . . . . Point of order: Mr Forth . . . . . Mr Fich; Mr Glinne . . . . . Explanation of vote: Mr Colla . . . . . Point of order: Mr Pannella . . . . . Explanations of vote: Mr Welsh; Mr Kirk; Mr Fantì; Mr Radoux; Mr Pannella; Mr Romualdi; Mr Albers; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Hansch; Mr Sarre; Mr Arndt; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Schmid; Mr Ferri; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Haralampopoulos . . . . . Point of order: Mr Tyrrell; Mr Bangemann; Mr Ryan . . . . . Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	226 226 228 228 228 228
3. Agenda: Mr Glinne; Sir James Scott-Hopkins; Mr Klepsch; Mr Glinne; Mr Fantì; Mr Klepsch; Mr Lalor . . . . .	190	10. Agenda: Mr Prag . . . . .	234
4. Presentation of the Fourteenth General Report of the Commission and its programme of work for 1981 (continuation): Mr Pasmazoglou; Mr Romualdi; Mr De Goede; Mr Thorn (Commission); Mr Hänsch; Mr Jonker; Lady Elles; Mr Kappos; Mr Galland; Mr Nyborg . . . . .	193	11. Regulation on the common organization of the market in sugar — Sugar quotas of the French overseas departments — Joint debate on the Bocklet report (Doc. 1-839/80) and the Curry report (Doc. 1-748/80) (Committee on Agriculture): Mr Bocklet, rapporteur . . . . . Point of order: Mr Rogers . . . . . Mr Curry, rapporteur . . . . . Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Vergès; Mr Vié; Mr Dalsager . . . . .	229 233 234 235 235 235 236
5. Welcome . . . . .	202	12. Regulation on the common organization of the market in fishery products — Report (Doc. 1-841/80) by Mr Gautier (Committee on Agriculture):	
6. Urgent procedure . . . . .	202		
7. Membership of Parliament — Verification of credentials . . . . .	203		
8. Presentation of the Fourteenth General Report of the Commission and its programme of work for 1981 (continuation): Mr Delors; Mr Adonnino; Mr Dalakouras; Mr Kirk; Mr Pannella; Mrs De March; Mr Cecovini; Mr Fanton; Mr Bøgh; Mr Gondicas; Mr Gautier; Mr Fischbach; Mr Curry; Mr Fernandez; Mr Delatte; Mr Fotilas; Mr Spinelli; Mrs Cassanmagnano			

<i>Mr Gautier, rapporteur</i> . . . . .	238	<i>Mr Ceravolo, draftsman of an opinion</i> . . .	250
13. <i>Urgent procedure</i> . . . . .	239	<i>Mrs Scrivener; Mr Davern; Mrs Castle; Mr Clinton; Mr Sherlock; Mr Maher; Mr Brøndlund Nielsen; Mr Dalsager</i> . . . . .	251
14. <i>Regulation on the common organization of the market in fishery products (continuation)</i>		16. <i>Membership of Parliament</i> . . . . .	257
<i>Point of order: Mr Hord</i> . . . . .	239	17. <i>Convergence and budgetary questions — Report (Doc. 1-136/80/rev.) by Mr Balfour (Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs):</i>	
<i>Mr Contogeorgis (Commission); Miss Quin; Mr Helms; Mr Battersby; Mr Papapietro; Mr Vié; Mr Provan; Mr Turner; Mr Contogeorgis; Mrs Ewing</i> . . . . .	240	<i>Mr Balfour, rapporteur</i> . . . . .	257
15. <i>Regulation on hormones — Report (Doc. 1-840/80) by Mr Brøndlund Nielsen (Committee on Agriculture):</i>		<i>Mr Orlandi; Mr Herman; Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Delorozoy; Mr Vié; Mr Tugendhat (Commission)</i> . . . . .	259
<i>Mr Brøndlund Nielsen, rapporteur</i> . . . . .	247	18. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i> . . . . .	263
<i>Mr Dalsager (Commission); Mr Seeler; Mr Helms; Mr Hord</i> . . . . .	247		

## IN THE CHAIR: MR ZAGARI

*Vice-President*

*(The sitting was opened at 10 a.m.)*

**President.** — The sitting is open.

### 1. *Approval of minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

I call Mr Ryan.

**Mr Ryan.** — Mr President, with regard to the minutes of yesterday's proceedings and on a point of order, I wish to point out that a spot check of the vote of the final adoption of the Maij-Weggen report yesterday covering 16 votes, revealed that four of the votes were incorrectly recorded. It seems to me, Mr President, that a 25 % error in any vote means that the validity of that vote is subject to considerable doubt. The errors which I detected were as follows: a Member who was absent and who has not been in Luxembourg this week and in respect of whom no card was inserted in the machine — of that I am satisfied — was recorded as voting in favour of the report. Furthermore the number of the seat attributed to that Member in the record is not the number of his seat. A second Member who was also absent and has not been

in Luxembourg this week, is recorded as voting 'No' and the number of the seat is again incorrectly recorded: it is not the number of this seat but that of the seat of the Member sitting beside him. The Member beside him was in fact present, it was Mr John Hume, whom I can see clearly and who, I am satisfied, voted; but the record states that he was absent. In respect of another Member who was absent and acknowledges that he was absent, the record shows the wrong number.

Mr President, as I said, this indicates that the vote on the Maij-Weggen report yesterday cannot be accepted as valid. It seems to me that Parliament and the Bureau should say to the manufacturers of this expensive, irritating and inefficient toy that they should take it out and refund the money to Parliament. It also seems to me unsafe to use that system ever again. We certainly should not use it today.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Mr Ryan, I do not think there can be any question about the result of the vote as announced. Nevertheless, I shall refer the technical aspect of the matter you have raised to the Bureau.

Naturally, if some Members feel that there has been an irregularity, they are entitled to make the error known. But, whatever the number of errors, I do not think the overall results will be affected.

Since there are no more comments, the minutes of proceedings are approved.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Documents received: see Minutes of proceedings.

2. *Decision on urgency*

**President.** — The next item is the decision on the urgency of various motions for resolutions.

We shall begin with the *Turcat motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-836/80): Alternative energy sources.*

I call Mr Turcat.

**Mr Turcat.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, there is of course no more urgent matter than the rational use of energy and alternative sources. There is a need for urgency here, if we want to shed some light on circumstances which are paradoxical and obscure, and indeed ridiculous, and which prevent us from taking any action.

Everyone knows that we have to push up the ceiling of expenditure on projects connected with energy saving and alternative sources. But — and here is the rub — the ceiling has been set unilaterally by the Council, as we see it by bending the rules, if I may paraphrase what a Head of Government said recently. This has been going on for almost three years. At the start, in fact, Parliament was consulted on an outline regulation and an implementing regulation which, contrary to the Commission proposal, contained no financial provisions. Subsequently, without consulting us, the Council adopted separate regulations and fixed a ceiling on expenditure. The same thing can happen today as regards any change to the ceiling. Consequently, we are wasting our time by discussing the substance of this matter.

After hearing the opinion of the Committee on Budgets, whose reasons we accepted totally, the Committee on Energy and Research unanimously decided to delegate me to make this request for urgency which is designed to trigger off the conciliation procedure which the Council has hitherto avoided. We hope that the Council will take a positive view and respond to our desire to reach an agreement as a matter of urgency on this vital question.

**President.** — I call Mr Schön.

**Mr Konrad Schön.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of my group and as a member of the Committee on the Budget, I should like to support the request for urgency. As the previous speaker said, it is generally agreed that the two regulations should come into force as soon as possible. It was very largely thanks to the joint efforts of the Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Energy and Research — naturally taking other points into consideration too — that the point was made that these two regulations cannot be allowed to undermine this House's bud-

getary powers, which is precisely what would happen if a maximum limit were fixed. Rather than increasing the amounts, a new item should have been inserted in the budget. That would be in line with the policy pursued so far not only by the Committee on Budgets, but also by the whole House. I would therefore ask the House to support the request for urgent procedure.

*(Parliament adopted urgent procedure — the item was placed on the agenda of the next day's sitting)*

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We now move on to the *motion for a resolution by Mr von Wogau (Doc. 1-861/80): Tax-free allowances for travellers within the Community.*

I call Mr von Wogau.

**Mr von Wogau.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the motion for a resolution I have tabled on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs is concerned with increasing the tax-free allowances for travellers within the Community, in other words, to what amount people can take things from one country to another without being subjected to bureaucratic border checks and levies.

Last year, the European Parliament unanimously adopted a resolution calling for the tax-free allowance to be raised by steps to 300 ECU and for the restrictions on the importable amounts of coffee, tea and wine to be lifted.

The Council of Ministers discussed this question last of the central elements of the Treaty of Rome and the central mandate we and the Community have been given. In my opinion, it is of the greatest possible importance that we should be able — even at difficult economic times — to make progress in this field. We directly-elected Members — and in particular those of us who want to be re-elected — should have a vested interest in showing that the Community is capable of coming up with practical and tangible benefits for its people.

The Council of Ministers discussed this question last year, but failed to reach any agreement. If these concessions are to come into effect in time for this summer's holiday period, the Council will have to tackle the question again in March at the latest. For that reason, I would ask you to support the request for urgent procedure.

**President.** — I call Mr Fich.

**Mr Fich.** — (DK) Mr President, I should like to oppose the adoption of urgent procedure in this case. Urgent procedure has been requested in the interests of tourists, but I am sure the tourists have never called for the kind of thing contained in this proposal. I am sure that, to a greater extent, it reflects a desire on the part of certain businessmen in those Member States which have the lowest border levies at the present time. I must say that, particularly in view of the terminology used, I regard this as a provocation aimed at the Danish Government and hence the Danish people, who are after all responsible for electing the government. I am therefore pleased to say that the Socialist Group decided two days ago to vote against urgent procedure in this case. One may take a fairly practical view of the matter and say that there is a certain amount of movement. Progress is slow but sure, and there is no reason to take such drastic measures. I believe that the Danish Government will probably not be the least bit concerned whether or not we adopt this resolution — not because it cares nothing about Parliament itself, but because it will regard the recommendation as pretty idiotic. If this House really wants to exert more influence — and that is, after all, what we are usually after here — it seems to me that we must desist from this kind of foolish behaviour.

There is a good argument for not agreeing to urgent procedure in this case, which is that a perusal of the text will reveal what political problems the proposal will create. I am sure you will all agree that it would be better to refer this matter back to committee — and therefore vote against urgent procedure — so that the committee can re-examine the matter thoroughly. I am against urgent procedure, Mr President.

*(Parliament adopted urgent procedure — the item was placed on the agenda of the next day's sitting.)*

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We now move on to the *motion for a resolution by Mr Lyngge and others (Doc. 1-880/80): Relationship between Danish and Greenland catch quotas.*

I call Mr Lyngge.

**Mr Lyngge.** — (DK) Mr President, the European Community has a number of populations or population groups which are especially dependent on fishing: in Ireland, the United Kingdom, Western Jutland, Brittany and, more particularly, in Greenland. The policy pursued to date by the Commission or the Council has been that these coastal populations should

be given special treatment inasmuch as the areas away from the national mainland should get an exclusive coastal zone and the populations concerned should be given the right to exploit their full fishing capacity within the total permitted catch quota.

This sensible solution is now being undermined as far as Greenland is concerned. This urgent motion for a resolution is concerned with quite deliberate undermining tactics on the part of the Commission, the aim being to play the Danish and Greenland fishermen off against each other. Greenland is not only particularly dependent on fishing — like so many other parts of Europe. Greenland is a developing country, and for that reason, the situation has always been that it has been permitted to enlarge its fishing capacity from year to year and its share of the total permissible catch quotas without any problem. Now, though, the Commission is saying that any increase in Greenland's fishing capacity should be offset by a corresponding reduction in Danish fishing. We now have the unprecedented situation of the Commission trying to drive a wedge between Denmark and Greenland. This is an intolerable situation for both Greenland and Denmark, which is why I — along with the other signatories to this motion for a resolution — should like to have this matter debated by urgent procedure. The 1981 fisheries negotiations are still underway; indeed, they are now entering a decisive phase, and that is why this matter is so pressing. It is becoming more urgent from day to day. For that reason, Mr President, I request the adoption of urgent procedure in this case.

**President.** — The Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) has the floor.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) Mr President, I appreciate that this problem is of great concern to Mr Lyngge, but it is practically impossible for this House to check all the facts set out in this text. That is why we have a subcommittee on fishing. If that is not the kind of thing it is supposed to deal with, I do not know what is.

If the House has to deal with matters like this in the form of requests for urgent procedure, Mr Lyngge must realize perfectly well that there is no way we can have a thorough discussion of the problem. The fact is that, if urgent procedure were decided, the whole thing would be over and done with in two minutes tomorrow, and that is hardly what I would call a thorough debate.

It would be far better to refuse urgent procedure, to refer the motion for a resolution — which I personally find interesting — to the Committee on Agriculture, which is responsible for fishing matters, and then to submit the report of the sub-committee on fishing to the whole House. After all, we are expecting a report

**Klepsch**

in any case in view of the imminent conclusion of the fisheries negotiations. I do not think there are any grounds for approving urgent procedure today.

**President.** — The Liberal and Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mr Brøndlund Nielsen.** — (DK) Mr President, I should like to recommend the House to support the request for urgent procedure on Mr Lyngge's motion for a resolution on the relationship between Danish and Greenland catch quotas. I should like, Mr President, to draw the House's attention to the fact that we have two motions for a resolution on this particular problem, the other being the last in the list of resolutions waiting for a decision on urgent procedure.

As regards the two motions for a resolution we are being asked to decide on now, I would say that the first of these is extremely important and calls out for Parliament's approval. I think it important for us to stress the matter dealt with in this document. We have — and this applies just as much to the Committee on Agriculture and the sub-committee on fishing — always treated the question of the coastal populations who are particularly dependent on fishing with the utmost seriousness. But discussing that here will not solve the problem, Mr Klepsch. In these matters — as in so many others — we must have Parliament's backing once a problem becomes serious. It is not enough just to discuss the matter in committee. Once things come to a head, we must have the backing of the whole House. I believe that this is important here, where what is at stake is a coastal population as utterly dependent on fishing as is the case in Greenland.

On the question of apportioning the Danish and Greenland catch quotas, I should like to say that we should concentrate on the third paragraph, which draws attention to the highly relevant geographical fact that the Baltic Sea and the North Sea on the one hand and the Denmark Strait and the Davis Strait on the other are some considerable distance apart and cannot therefore be dealt with under the same quota system.

Mr President, having made that point, I must say very briefly that I do not intend to ask for the floor — should it come up for discussion — on Mr Lyngge's next request for urgent procedure, which should not, in my opinion be granted. Quite frankly, I am very sorry that this point should have come up. I regard this second point on which Mr Lyngge has accumulated a variety of signatures — and I am slightly surprised at the identity of the signatories — as an attempt to sow dissension between two Member States and to exploit existing political differences by trying to exacerbate certain national differences. I would therefore urge this House most strongly to reject the request for urgent procedure. But the point we are dealing with

now, Mr President, is a reasonable and sensible point calling for support for a coastal population which is totally dependent on fishing. I would recommend this House most strongly to support the policy which has consistently been pursued in the Committee on Agriculture and the sub-committee on fishing on supporting these coastal populations.

**President.** — I call Mr Bøgh on a point of order.

**Mr Bøgh.** — (DK) I wish to protest most strongly against what we have just witnessed here, whereby a Member speaking on one subject takes the opportunity to make propaganda for a resolution which is coming later. That kind of behaviour is quite simply improper, and I would ask the President to reprimand Mr Brøndlund Nielsen for his behaviour.

*(Parliament rejected the request for urgent procedure — the motion for a resolution was referred to the appropriate committee)*

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-882/80) by Mr Israël and others: Visit by President Sadat to Parliament.*

I call Mr de la Malène.

**Mr de la Malène.** — (F) Mr President, I shall be careful not to go into this subject in any way as there will be a debate on the matter if the House votes in favour of urgent procedure. I do not think that long speeches are needed to show that this matter is urgent after President Sadat's visit. This is reason enough in my view to justify urgency.

**President.** — The Liberal and Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mr Bettiza.** — (I) Mr President, we support the request for urgent procedure in respect of Mr Israël's motion. Generally speaking, we consider the statement contained in the motion to be apposite, in the light of the remarkable speech delivered here in Parliament by President Sadat. If urgency is adopted, however, the Liberal and Democratic Group reserves the right to table an amendment to the text of the motion.

*(Parliament adopted urgent procedure — the item was placed on the agenda of the next day's sitting)*

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-883/80) by Mr Antoniozzi and others: Community aid to Calabria for the damage caused by the recent floods.*

I call Mr Antoniozzi.

**Mr Antoniozzi.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this request for urgency is justified by the fact that the events of recent weeks have occurred for the first time in at least a century. Exceptional natural phenomena have caused tremendous damage to small townships. Rain, flooding and heavy snowstorms have made things difficult, particularly for people in country areas, and have ravaged livestock.

We are asking for aid from the appropriations set aside for emergency aid, and we also want these events to be borne in mind when money from the Regional and Social Funds is being allocated.

*(Parliament adopted urgent procedure — the item was placed on the agenda of the next day's sitting)*

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-879/80) by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul and others: Charges brought against 13 trade union leaders in Brazil.*

Mr Klepsch, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Vergeer, Mr Michel, Mr Vandewiele, Mr Van der Gun, Mrs Majj-Weggen, Mr Hoffmann, Mr Beumer, Mr Katzer, Mr Barbi and Mr Diligent have also endorsed this motion on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

I call Mr Mihr.

**Mr Mihr.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, court proceedings are currently in progress against the trade union leader Ignacio da Silva — known as Lula — and twelve other trade unionists because of the major strike organized by the ABC unions in April and May of this year in San Benato. The accused were kept in custody for a time before being charged by the military public prosecutor in Sao Paulo on 1 July 1980 before a special military court, which is only convened in cases of violations of the 'National Security Law'. The thirteen trade unionists are accused of violations of Article 36 (11) of this so-called law. The article in question carries a penalty of between 2 and 12 years' imprisonment for 'incitement to acts of collective defiance of the law'.

The trial is now in its final phase, and the verdict will probably be delivered by the military judges on 16 or 17 February. Even within Brazilian legal circles, the verdict is seen as a purely political move. The 'crime' of which the trade unionists stand accused consists merely of having organized a strike and having called for collective bargaining, which is a perfectly normal phenomenon over here, but which was declared illegal by the industrial court in Brazil. Not long ago, this House discussed a report on the cooperation agreement between the European Community and Brazil and admonished the Brazilian Government to promote social justice. That was the decision taken by this House on 16 January 1981.

We think it essential for this House to protest against what is going on. Because of the imminent deadline for delivery of the verdict, we must do so as quickly as possible.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — The Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) has the floor.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) Mr President, I wish to speak in favour of urgent procedure. Very briefly, I should like to explain why my group is in favour of urgent procedure and associates itself fully with this motion for a resolution.

The court's verdict is expected for the beginning of next week, which means that any appeal on our part must be forthcoming this week. That is why we think the matter is truly urgent.

**President.** — The European Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mr C. M. Jackson.** — Mr President, I wish to speak against urgent procedure in this matter. As with so many other issues of human rights, this certainly merits investigation but not urgent procedure. The law making it technically illegal to strike has been in operation in Brazil for many years. The trade unionists have been charged, but they have not yet been sentenced. There is therefore no urgency in that. If, when they are sentenced, they are sentenced to imprisonment, there is nothing irreversible in that. There is no question of urgency therefore there. All this, according to information which I have received from opposition Members of Parliament in Brazil, takes place against the background of an increasingly liberal situation concerning human rights.

I put it to you, colleagues, that there is no reason for urgency in this. There is every reason indeed for it to be submitted to the Political Affairs Committee and to its Human Rights Subcommittee for a proper investi-

**Jackson**

gation, which could, perhaps, compare the situation of trade unionists in Brazil with the situation of trade unions in the USSR.

*(Parliament adopted urgent procedure — the item was placed on the agenda of the next day's sitting)*

**President.** — We shall now consider the *motions for resolutions by Mrs Castle and others (Doc. 1-884/80) and by Miss Hooper and others (Doc. 1-886/80): Sugar cane industry.*

*(Parliament decided to take a single vote on the urgency of the two motions for resolutions)*

I call Mrs Castle.

**Mrs Castle.** — Mr President, the resolution I am moving raises a matter which is not only very urgent but affects the policy of the whole Community. Tate and Lyle are not only a British firm, they are the biggest cane-sugar refiners in the Community; and this firm has announced that in April it is to close its cane-sugar refinery in Liverpool, with the loss of over 1 500 jobs and normal working guaranteed only up to 3 April. Now, of course, this closure is a disaster for this area of Britain, where unemployment is already running at over 15 %; but that in itself, I recognize, would not justify my raising it as a matter of urgency if it were not for the consequences of the closure, which are directly related to Community policy and to Community responsibility, for this cane-sugar refinery is both the instrument and the victim of Community sugar policy.

As we all know, the Community is solemnly pledged under the Lomé Convention to import 1.3 million tonnes of cane sugar every year from the ACP countries, which are poor developing countries and many of whose economies are totally dependent on sugar production; and of this quantity of 1.3 million tonnes, the United Kingdom has traditionally taken 1.2 million tonnes, thus shouldering the main burden of dealing with this obligation the Community has under Lomé.

The bulk of these cane-sugar imports have been refined by Tate and Lyle, but the closure of the Liverpool refinery will mean a loss of 300 000 tonnes of cane-sugar refining capacity. The firm says it hopes to absorb some of the cane sugar in its other plants, but it cannot guarantee to refine the whole of the cane-sugar imports it did before. That is the issue that this Parliament has got to face, because the great question now is how the Community can continue to absorb the cane sugar from the Lomé countries to which it is solemnly pledged particularly in the light of our failure to control beet-sugar production in the Community so as to leave room for cane.

We shall be discussing this afternoon the wider question of sugar policy, but what we are seeking to do in this motion is to get urgent action to prevent the closure of this refinery in a few weeks' time. Some people have suggested that the closure has been postponed. I assure the Parliament I have checked up on that in the last few days, and that is not true.

The ACP countries have expressed their alarm at this situation. The High Commissioner in London for Guyana has sent me a copy of a statement issued by the main cane-sugar supplying countries. I will quote a few words of it:

The Governments of the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries, which are the principal suppliers of cane sugar to the UK, reacted strongly to today's announcement by Tate and Lyle Limited that it is to close its sugar refinery in Liverpool. This closure will reduce UK cane-sugar refining capacity to a level which is less than the quantity of their sugar traditionally imported each year into the UK and in respect of which firm undertakings were given by the British Government at the time of joining the EEC.

This is a weakening of the only bridge over which cane sugar can gain its guaranteed access to the EEC. So in this motion, Mr President, we are asking for immediate action by the Commission. We are calling on it to consider urgently what help it can give to prevent this closure and what steps it intends to take to ensure maintenance of adequate cane-sugar refining capacity in the Community.

Secondly, we ask the Commission to report urgently on this matter to the Parliament, and that would mean it would have to report next month. If anybody votes against the adoption of urgent procedure on this issue, he will in effect be voting for the continued closure of this refinery and voting to disregard this Community's obligations to the developing countries under Lomé. The European Democrats have a similar motion, though I think ours goes further in certain respects. In any case, I hope they will support theirs. We could then put the two sets of proposals together and really get some action and get it in time, Mr President. This is an issue in which the interests of one of the poorest regions in Britain coincide with the interests of some of the poorest countries in the world, and it is an issue in which the conscience of the Community must be involved. I plead with this Parliament to face the responsibilities it entered into so solemnly at Lomé: let us have urgent consideration of this matter by the Commission and a report next month.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — I call Miss Hooper.

**Miss Hooper.** — The purpose of our motion is also to prevent the closure of the Tate and Lyle refinery in

**Hooper**

Liverpool, in which I have a very deep personal interest, since I am the Member of Parliament for Liverpool.

I will try to go over the reasons why we consider this matter urgent and to leave the substance of the debate until tomorrow.

Members of this Parliament have received the assurance of the Chairman of Tate and Lyle that the closure of the Liverpool refinery will not take place in April as announced if a decision is taken on the beet-sugar quotas outlined by Mr Gundelach in 1979 for the 1980 harvest. Last year, and again this year, no decision was taken by the Council on the proposed cuts, in spite of request to do so by the sugar-cane refining industry and the ACP countries. I therefore urge this Parliament to consider the effects this closure would have and to send a strong recommendation to the next meeting of the Agricultural Ministers, due to take place at the end of February.

There is a further reason for urgent debate, and this affects those Members of our Parliament who are due to attend the Consultative Assembly of the ACP countries in Sierra Leone in two weeks' time. They will need to know the stand taken by this Parliament on their behalf, since the Community's commitment to the ACP countries has no more practical manifestation than in the agreements to import cane sugar, and the closure of the refinery in Liverpool puts this in doubt. So the livelihood of millions in the ACP countries is at stake.

Finally, there is the social problem, to which Mrs Castle has already referred — the social problem in Liverpool, where unemployment in certain areas reaches 27 %. This refinery is in the heart of the city. It has already lost over 1 000 jobs over the last few years as a result of Community sugar policy. Moreover, it has an excellent record of labour relations. Only urgent action can help the cause of the 1 600 employees who remain. I therefore beg the Parliament to support these two motions and to make it possible for a debate to be held tomorrow.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — The Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) has the floor.

**Mr Klepsch.** — *(D)* Mr President, I am sorry, but I have been instructed by my group to speak against urgent procedure on both motions for a resolution.

The justifications for both these motions for a resolution contain severe criticism of our Committee on Agriculture. If, as is alleged, shortcomings in the Commission and the Council were evident, the Committee on Agriculture should have addressed itself

to the matter and brought it to our attention. That was not, however, the case. Now, all of a sudden, a refinery is to be closed down, and the House is being asked to discuss the matter. I gather from what has been said that it is not yet entirely certain whether the plant will really be closed down; it would appear that the whole thing depends on negotiations. In my opinion, this is a classic case for investigation by the relevant committee. I cannot imagine that, in the two minutes we shall have available tomorrow, we shall be able to do anything really decisive in this matter.

I have the greatest possible respect for Miss Hooper and Mrs Castle, and I fully appreciate that, when one's constituency is dealt such a devastating blow as this, one feels bound to try to draw the whole House's attention to the problem. We discussed this matter only very recently in our group in terms of a similar problem, and we came to the conclusion that, if we were all to try to get problems from our constituencies discussed in the House by way of urgent procedure, we should finish up discussing nothing but urgent matters. I believe that fully justifies our opinion that the whole matter should be referred to committee. I understand from what Miss Hooper and Mrs Castle had to say that there is sufficient time before the end of February for the committee to make contact with the Commission on this question. I am therefore of the opinion that urgent procedure is not called for.

*(Protests from certain quarters)*

**President.** — The Liberal and Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mr Louwes.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I should like very briefly to set out the views of my group on the request for urgent procedure for the two motions for a resolution. My Group will be voting against the adoption of urgent procedure. The Liverpool issue is undoubtedly a problem, but the adoption of urgent procedure and what will by definition be a superficial debate in this House will do nothing to change that.

As regard the allegedly urgent nature of the matter, I should just like to deal with two problems of a long-term nature. Firstly, the refining of cane sugar is a process which is becoming more obsolete from day to day. On the continent of Europe, practically all refineries have been closed for years now. It is an outdated and energy-wasting way of producing sugar. That is the long-term situation.

Secondly, the Liverpool refinery is outdated and Tate and Lyle have known for years now that the works would have to be closed down and have invested nothing in the plant over that time because they realized that the whole process would become redundant.

Very briefly, then, there is no future either for cane sugar refining or for this works in particular. It there-

Louwes

fore follows that there is no need to adopt urgent procedure. What we have here is a long-term development. Of course, we fully appreciate the problems, but they only very indirectly affect the Community's sugar policy. If we want to give direct assistance to the ACP countries in West Africa on 24 February, we must suggest that they should produce their own sugar rather than exporting raw cane sugar to Europe. I believe that that would be a more constructive solution than having an urgent and superficial debate on the subject here tomorrow at short notice. We shall therefore be voting against urgent procedure, Mr President.

*(Parliament adopted urgent procedure)*

**President.** — I propose that these motions for resolutions be placed on the agenda of today's sitting for joint debate with the reports by Mr Bocklet (Doc. 1-839/80) and Mr Curry (Doc. 1-748/80) on the same subject.

Are there any objections?

I call Mrs Castle.

**Mrs Castle.** — Can I please ask you to explain a little more clearly what you meant by saying that this item would be discussed with the Bocklet report. When will the vote on urgency be taken? This is the important point because it has been accepted as an ordinary motion of urgency and I should have thought it would be taken tomorrow in the ordinary way like these two motions for urgency because they are dealing with a quite separate point from the Bocklet report. There is nothing in that report that touches on this particular point. I know, because I have studied it with care.

**President.** — Mrs Castle, in my view there is a connection between these points. At any rate, there will be a vote on this motion for a resolution at the end of the joint debate.

I call Mrs Castle.

**Mrs Castle.** — This is a separate point which cannot appropriately be discussed in the context of the Bocklet report. It calls for specific action by the Commission and a report next month. I would plead we deal with it in the normal way in the morning.

*(Parliament decided to place the motion for a resolution on the agenda of the next day's sitting)*

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-885/80) by Mr Provan and others: British prisoners held in Iran.*

I call Mr Provan.

**Mr Provan.** — If anybody cares to look at the motion for a resolution and the signatures to it, he will see a broad measure of support across the floor of the Chamber, but one name is missing, Mr President. I refer to Mrs Castle, who would like to be associated with this and has worked very hard to try and assist me in this matter, and for that I am grateful.

This is the first part-session at which we have been able to discuss this sort of matter since the release of the American hostages and the release of these hostages will have a significant effect on reducing tension in the Middle East. The four British prisoners, who are not hostages, have been held since 10 August. Three of them are missionaries, and the fourth, Andrew Pike, worked for the Dutch helicopter company.

We have no quarrel with Iran, Mr President, no desire to interfere in their affairs, or to influence how they run their affairs, or who they choose to govern them.

Extreme difficulties are faced by diplomats when externally Iran is involved in a war and internally a post-revolutionary state prevails.

The people of Iran are acutely aware of what Europe says about their country. It has a free press and the people are well-informed. In the post revolutionary fervour that has gripped the country, it is probable that misunderstandings have been created in the turmoil of events. Thus false accusations have come to be made. But the chief prosecutor and others in authority in Iran have stated that there are no charges to be answered and that those charges were false.

Iran, Mr President, is an important country in the Middle East. Iran is an important country in our eyes and we would wish to return to traditional friendship. This motion is urgent for that reason. Traditional friendship is not possible when European nationals are detained.

*(Applause from the European Democratic Group)*

**President.** — The Liberal and Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mr Beyer de Ryke.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, to my mind this motion is absolutely essential and to such an extent that discussion is not even necessary. Quite clearly, the only justification we need is to remember that a country which takes hostages

**Beyer de Ryke**

ostracizes itself from the international community. Now that the American hostages have been freed after all they have been through and after all the bargaining and dealing and paying of ransoms, and now that the American journalist, Cynthia Dwyer, managed finally last Tuesday to leave Tehran, it would be criminal if we did not concern ourselves with the last British hostages held in Iranian prisons. We cannot just leave them there and forget about them, and it is to stop this happening that we have brought this motion before the House. My Group and I myself are in favour of urgency.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

*(Parliament adopted urgent procedure — the item was placed on the agenda of the next day's sitting)*

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-887/80) by Mrs Ewing and others: Derogation to Community drivers' hours legislation in remote islands and depopulated and isolated areas.*

I call Mrs Ewing.

**Mrs Ewing.** — Mr President, since tabling my motion I have obtained much broader support than the signatures might suggest. There were problems of printing this week, as many of you know. I have signatures from Mr Pöttering, Mrs Rabbethge, Mr Louwes, Mrs Buchan, Ms Clwyd, Mr Boyes, and many others have indicated support, including Mr Dalakouras. So I have been able to get support from the groups and across nationalities. I would now like to address myself to two very simple matters: first, why this is urgent and second, what I am actually asking for.

First of all, it might be said that there is no case for urgency because there is already the Key report. There are two things I would like to say here: first of all, it is a matter of regret to me, supporting the report as I do, that it is unlikely to be reached. One has only to take a realistic look at the agenda today, at all the motions for urgency granted today. Secondly, the Key report is a general report and although I support it all the way it really cannot call on the Commission to do this specific thing immediately.

Now I would like to explain what it is I am asking for. I am not asking for a new derogation on drivers' hours — I am asking for a small extension of an existing derogation to be agreed to by the Commission and put into effect immediately. This small derogation is for two days in the week only, leaving total driving hours — weekly, fortnightly — the same. I am asking that on two days, in special areas of the Community, we

may have one extra hour for the kind of vehicle mentioned in indent four only of the resolution.

I am not asking this for the Highlands and Islands of Scotland only; this is not a Scottish extension. This would apply to almost the whole of Denmark, I am informed; to parts of Wales; to parts of England; to parts of Italy; to much of Ireland. If it were not that Greece was enjoying a special position at the moment it would apply, I am told, to almost all of Greece. I feel therefore that I am not making a constituency point but a European point. I am asking for flexibility, which is something on which Mr Tindemans spoke so well yesterday. Flexibility for all the peripheral areas in Europe.

Here are my criteria: all island-based hauliers and those more than 50 miles from a motorway. After all, it takes an hour to get to a motorway. Have any of you seen lorries getting on and off small ferries? Do you know that ferries do not always arrive on time? Do you know that there are vast parts of the Community with no motorways at all and no railway trains? So there is no alternative.

Do you realize that one of the reasons for asking for the extension is the very spirit of European cooperation which this Community has engendered? In a spirit of cooperation many people needing supplies got together and said 'Let's have a slightly bigger lorry'. We are not talking about juggernauts, I assure you — you could not get a juggernaut onto our ferries, and you could not get a juggernaut onto single-track roads. Well, these cooperatives got together — farmers and others down at the Mull of Kintyre — but their cooperation has now come to nothing because you still cannot drive for more than 8 hours.

Do you know that this means that many lorry drivers will have to stop on a moor, 50 miles from a township, overnight? Many of them make 30 deliveries — in the Ruhrland and other densely populated areas your lorries usually make only one delivery.

Now this is all very time-consuming. We do not want the European law to be an ass. Can I give you just one example of how it would be an ass? You can take fish from Wick to Peterhead, but under the present derogation you cannot take the boxes back except in two days. Am I to ask them to put a dead fish in each box? Must fruit and vegetables for the Western Isles go rotten?

The point I am making here is a European one. It is not one that can really be dealt with under Key. I make it on behalf of all the peripheral areas and I ask Members from the densely populated areas to consider them.

**President.** — I call Mrs Castle.

**Mrs Castle.** — Mr President, we are all of us always very impressed by Mrs Ewing's vigorous fight for her people's interest in her constituency and I admire her for it and I sympathize with her. But I would just say this to her. I think she is asking too much of this Parliament in expecting us to hurry through a decision on an important matter like this simply on the say-so of one speech by her. I speak as a former minister of transport who, before Britain ever joined the European Community, reduced lorry drivers' permitted hours as an essential contribution to safety. I know she is asking for only a limited derogation, but I think it is of such importance and of such complication that we should not rush it through without consideration in a committee. I think therefore it should go to the committee so that all the aspects can be examined. We could then find out whether she has made a case which did not interfere with the concern of all of us for maintaining the road safety legislation we have introduced.

**President.** — The European Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mr Moreland.** — Mr President, I am happy to make what might be a unique statement, namely that I entirely support Mrs Castle. I happen to support the basic idea that Mrs Ewing is putting forward and, indeed, my group has continually pressed the Commission for derogations and not just this derogation only, in this area. Nevertheless, I think it is improper of Mrs Ewing to use the procedures of the Parliament in this way. We do have a report on this subject, the Key report, which is to be debated this week.

The Key report, which deals with this topic, is to be debated this week. Indeed we have amendments relating to Mrs Ewing's point from Mrs Ewing herself. In other words, she is asking for urgent debate on the one hand and putting these amendments down on the other hand so that one wonders if her left hand knows what her right hand is doing. I really do not think that this Parliament should vote for urgency on this matter, as it would give confidence to what appears to be the mixed-up mind of Mrs Ewing. Therefore we oppose urgency.

I would add to that we would have had this derogation a long time ago had it not been for two factors. One, I am ashamed to say, is that my country failed to obey a European Court order on the introduction of social measures in transport, and, secondly because this has been raised many times in the Parliament by Mrs Ewing. She has been rude time and time again to the Commission and it is no wonder that they have refused so far to grant her derogation.

**President.** — I call Mr Maher.

**Mr Maher.** — Mr President, I can be very brief. I want to support this proposal by Mrs Ewing, because I feel very strongly that this Parliament should do everything it can towards alleviating the problems of the more isolated areas in the Community. There are many more of them than in Scotland. I think we should try to do so without delay, because already these regions are suffering from grave disadvantages. In many ways they are becoming depopulated, and anything we can do towards making life more bearable in these areas, should be done as a matter of urgency. I think the fact that an urgency motion has been tabled indicates that there are some people conscious of this. Unfortunately many of the excellent recommendations coming from the Commission often take years to implement, and you cannot blame people if they get frustrated and as a consequence want to treat these matters in an urgent way.

My final point, Mr President, is that while it may seem from the centre that some of these blanket proposals are very fair, on the other hand they cannot as blanket proposals without derogations, take account of very special circumstances in very special areas. I think that is what Mrs Ewing is trying to say. So, I would support the idea of having a discussion on this right away.

**President.** — The Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) has the floor.

**Mr McCartin.** — I am speaking for the peripheral regions, rather than for the European People's Party. I want to state that I agree essentially with the case that has been made by Mrs Ewing. I think this underlines for us once again the fact that in a situation of divergence and increasingly diverging economies between the centre of Europe and the peripheral regions. . .

**President.** — Mr McCartin, as you are not down to speak on behalf of your group, I am afraid I cannot allow you to continue.

I call Mr Israël on a point of order.

**Mr Israël.** — (F) With your leave, Mr President, I should like to ask Mr Moreland to use more polite and fitting language when speaking about Mrs Ewing.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

*(Parliament adopted urgent procedure — the item was placed on the agenda of the next day's sitting)*

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-896/80) by Mr Sarre and others: Motor vehicle industry in the EEC.*

I call Mr Sarre.

**Mr Sarre.** — (*F*) I can be very brief because I shall not be going into the matter. If there is anything which is urgent and on which Parliament needs to make a clear statement of its views, it is the problem of the car industry in Europe. Why is the matter urgent? A vitally important new factor has recently emerged. I am referring to the breakdown of the talks between the EEC and Japan, but I am also referring to the announcement of agreements between a number of Japanese companies and other European companies, for example, the decision of a Japanese firm to build a car factory in the United Kingdom which from 1985 will be making 200 000 vehicles a year. I know the House discussed the situation of the European motor vehicle industry last month and, according to the Bonaccini report, if talks break down they have to be restarted on a more solid basis. It is for this reason — and also because the Council of Ministers is due to meet in the next few days — that I think that Parliament should as a matter of urgency make its views known and urge the Council to protect the market in Europe so that car production, which is such a vital sector for the industry of our countries, can be preserved, put back on its feet and even encouraged.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, there are times when the question of urgency is a subjective matter. Objectively speaking, however, I think that in order to protect the car industry and its workers Parliament should make a clear statement and call on the Council of Ministers to take swift action, by which I mean at its next meeting.

(*Applause from various quarters*)

**President.** — I call Mr Delorozoy.

**Mr Delorozoy.** — (*F*) Mr President, in support of the eloquent plea for urgency we have just heard from Mr Sarre, I want to add that a number of countries and firms, in dealing with Japan and the companies there, are currently employing tactics which are increasingly confused and this only makes things worse for the European car industry. Things are getting worse very quickly, and this fact justifies urgency and justifies our calling on the Council to deal with the matter forthwith. As Mr Sarre said a moment ago, we had a wide-ranging debate on the car industry last month, and it would be ridiculous to reject urgency and to refer this motion to a debate which has already taken place. The motion which has been submitted is the logical outcome of last month's

debate and cannot be rejected. If you ask me, we have to vote in favour of urgency.

(*Applause from various quarters*)

**President.** — The Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) has the floor.

**Mr Herman.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the concern which has prompted this request for urgency is fully shared by my group. However, we do not feel that another debate is needed now, one month after Parliament's adoption of Mr Bonaccini's excellent report. Paragraph 8 of the resolution in the report states:

If these contacts and negotiations fail to secure the necessary results, the Community must quickly adopt the measures that are essential for the legitimate protection of its market.

In view of the stage we are at in our work today, it seems pointless to me to have a fresh debate just to say this all over again. However, in the knowledge that the Council of Ministers will be meeting to discuss this matter next week, my group is putting forward two constructive proposals. Firstly, we want to ask the President of Parliament to write to the President-in-Office of the Council before next week's meeting in order to draw attention to the Bonaccini report and paragraph 8 of the resolution.

As for the second proposal, during the March part-session our group intends to table an oral question with debate to the Council and the Commission on the outcome of the Council's consideration of this matter. I hope that everyone who wanted an urgent debate will join us in tabling this question.

**President.** — The Socialist Group has the floor.

**Mr Glinne.** — (*F*) Mr President, the Socialist Group supports this request for urgency which has been submitted. Naturally, we remember the debate on the Bonaccini report which was held not so long ago. The report was very relevant to this issue for which urgency has been requested. The fact of the matter, urgency has been requested. The fact of the matter, Member States to adopt a strictly bilateral response to the problem of Japanese car imports that I think it important for Parliament to make another clear and up-to-date statement on the problem as a whole. It is for this basic reason, Mr President, that our group feels we should devote some time tomorrow to this serious and alarming problem.

**President.** — The Communist and Allies Group has the floor.

**Mr Bonaccini.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, our group shares the anxious concern expressed in Mr Sarre's motion for a resolution and we shall therefore be voting in favour of urgent procedure. I must confess, however, that we are also interested by Mr Herman's proposal, and in a sense it is more complete. If I may, Mr President, I suggest that after the vote you accept in any case the proposal put forward by Mr Herman.

**President.** — The Group of European Progressive Democrats has the floor.

**Mr de la Malène.** — (F) I want to say very quickly, Mr President, that our group will support this request for urgency. The concern which most Europeans feel about the crisis in the automobile industry is too great to put up with the extraordinary slowness in the way our institutions work. It is vital for us to make a display — even if it is no more than that — of our concern and our impatience. If only for this reason, we shall be supporting urgency.

*(Parliament adopted urgent procedure — the item was placed on the agenda of the next day's sitting)*

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-97/80) by Mr Lyngé and others: Intolerable pressure brought to bear by one Member State on another Member State.*

I call Mr Lyngé.

**Mr Lyngé.** — (DK) Mr President, I should like first of all to draw your attention to a minor linguistic error which I believe has crept into all the language versions of the text. The last part of the fifth paragraph of the preamble says that the TAC 'would constitute a serious threat to the young cod stocks off Eastern Greenland'. This should read: '... might constitute a serious threat to young cod stocks off Eastern Greenland'. That was just by way of introduction.

As we all know, Mr President, the fisheries negotiations are proving difficult — indeed, heated at times... There appear to be a lot of Members who take no interest in this matter. I must ask the President to call for order in the House!

But since that is how things are, we must expect things to get a little heated in this House too. It is intolerable that a fisheries policy has still not been forthcoming. It is intolerable that European fishermen are prevented from going out and getting on with the fishing because the politicians cannot reach agreement. But however

difficult the situation, it cannot justify a Member State having recourse to self-help. Self-help within the European Community can only mean — and in this case has meant — the strong dictating the terms and riding roughshod over the weak. I am speaking here as a representative of the weakest nation of all in the Community — Greenland. We had never expected anything like this to happen, and it has come as something of a shock to us to realize that we are to be trodden underfoot. But no such thing will happen while I am still around to protest in this House. When the United Kingdom declared its illegal pout box in the North Sea, the Danes still had enough respect for their partner to keep out of the said waters — even when the Court of Justice pronounced the United Kingdom to be in the wrong — until the matter was settled through negotiations. But when Greenland demands protection for its threatened cod stocks until agreement has been reached on a quota, the Germans issue threats and force their way into our waters, irrespective of what our biologists and politicians have to say on the matter. This question must be debated in this House, where Members discuss to their hearts' content the oppression of the weak by the strong in all manner of places far away from the Community. Should it not, Mr President, be a matter of urgency for this House that a small and weak element within the Community believes itself to be likewise oppressed? What must the strong members of the Community do to the weaker elements before this House regards it as a matter of urgency? Mr President, I hereby request the adoption of urgent procedure.

**President.** — I call Mr Gautier.

**Mr Gautier.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as you all know, the Federal German Government is a coalition of social democrats and liberals. I feel bound to say that we have no intention of addressing ourselves to the government's urgent matters. I do not want to discuss the substance of this motion for a resolution — the fact is that we cannot accept it as it stands because, for one thing, parts of it are simply not right — at least from our point of view — and, for another, because it cries out for discussion at the very least. We are being asked here as a matter of urgency to discuss or vote on a matter which was discussed at an unofficial meeting of the Council, where the German Liberal Minister of Agriculture, Mr Ertl — who, let us not forget, is a Bavarian — sometimes tends to use the somewhat colourful language typical of a Bavarian. He has been known to refer to the French Agriculture Minister as an idiot, and the European Parliament did not concern itself with that. I am against this House using urgent procedure to discuss matters which, for one thing, we cannot investigate and which, for another, have already been settled. The fact is that this dispute between Germany and Denmark about formalities is now dead and buried.

**Gautier**

Secondly, if you talk about blackmail, you must expect to be confronted with the question who is blackmailing whom. A person can apply blackmail by simply raising his voice or by refusing to play ball. When, for instance, Member States set out to destroy the German deep-sea fishing industry for the sake of 200 tonnes of salmon, it seems to me that that could quite justifiably be called blackmail.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

I therefore take the view that this matter, which has never been brought up officially, should be the subject of calm and collected discussions among us. The appropriate place for such discussions would be the Committee on Agriculture and not tomorrow's meeting of the whole House, when — as we know — things tend to get somewhat hectic.

Finally, let me make the point that if there is anything really urgent to be discussed in the fisheries sector, it is surely last night's breakdown of the Council negotiations.

*(Applause)*

That is the point we must bring up later, and I shall be referring to it in the course of the debate on the Commission's report. That is really an urgent problem, unlike the question of the remarks one minister makes to another in the Council.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The European Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mr Prag.** — Mr President, I intend to stick to the question of urgency and not abuse this opportunity to speak of the substance, as previous speakers have been doing. I am not against the substance of this resolution — not at all. It looks appealing to me, although it is not a subject on which I am very expert. I want to talk about the abuse of urgent procedure which is going on. Ten motions, Mr President, have already been granted urgent procedure this morning. Votes were cast for reasons of constituency, party or nationality. The one thing which is forgotten is the credibility of this Parliament and the order of its business. We see that most of this morning has been taken up in debating whether we grant urgent procedure; most of tomorrow will be taken up in debating these motions; and Parliament's real business is cast aside.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

I have a particular interest, because my own report from the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment on job training for the young people of this Community, not of Mexico or Brazil, but of this Community was on the agenda on Tuesday; it was on

the agenda on Wednesday, and it is again on the agenda, with, I think, nineteen other motions, for debate today. When it was written, there were 2½ million young people under 25 unemployed in the Community: today, there are not 2½ million, but 3½ million. That is a measure of the disruption of this Parliament's business by motions for debate by urgent procedure.

*(Applause)*

And what for? For a superficial two-minute sprint debate on a Friday? . . .

. . . although I admit that their subjects are occasionally of some importance. We do ourselves no credit, Mr President. I have again uttered my puny protest, but when, when, Mr President, are we going to do something about it? As you may have gathered, I am against urgent procedure for this motion.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Mr Prag, I can assure that the Bureau has been dealing with this matter and will continue to deal with it.

I call Mr Motchane.

**Mr Motchane.** — *(F)* Mr President, I am sure we all appreciate the comments we have just heard but this request for urgency, the one tabled by Mr Lyngø, has a symbolic value which ought to be clear to each and every one of us. It might seem a trivial problem to men and women who live in a country with a broad-based economy but it is a vital matter for what we have heard is the weakest society in this Community of ours. It is for this reason, and without prejudging the issue at stake, that I think the House should show that it adopts a serious attitude to the general and magnanimous ideas that are usually voiced here. If the Community has decided to show the same degree of sympathy and attention to everyone who lives within our borders, it is for this very reason that I trust this request for urgency will be adopted. In this way we shall be living up to what we say.

*(Parliament rejected the request for urgent procedure — the motion for a resolution was referred to the appropriate committee)*

### 3. Agenda

**President.** — I call Mr Glinne to speak on the agenda.

**Mr Glinne.** — Mr President, for the benefit of the House I want to mention the organization of business

**Glinne**

today, with special reference to Item 336: Report (Doc. 1-532/80), drawn up by Mr Lalor on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on the Western Sahara.

I must say that we in the Socialist Group are somewhat embarrassed and put out by the fact that this item is still on the agenda. What has happened in fact is that the deadline for tabling amendments has expired and it is now impossible for anyone to table an amendment to the text. It will have to be adopted or rejected as it stands, without any kind of alteration, which to say the least is rather odd from the point of view of proper parliamentary procedure.

How has this all come about? Why has the deadline expired without any amendments being tabled? The reason — as my fellow group chairman will recall — is that when we got together at the meeting chaired by Mrs Veil last Monday we agreed to defer consideration of this item and that in order to do this the members of the Political Affairs Committee were going to ask Mr Rumor to request reference to committee, which he is entitled to do. Anyway, for a variety of reasons which I am not going to go into at this point, this procedure could not be followed. We ought to remember, however, that a considerable number of new factors have arisen, or are in the process of arising, which affect this matter. Among these are the new consideration of the matter by the OAU, the talks which several Members of Parliament are going to have with their ACP opposite numbers at the forthcoming meeting in Freetown, a series of diplomatic initiatives from several countries in North Africa, the fact that our colleagues in the Maghreb delegation have not had sufficient opportunity to say what they think, and so on.

In short, if we keep Item 336 on the agenda, it will be adopted in the worst possible circumstances. As a result, it is my privilege on behalf of the Socialist Group to make an urgent plea for this item to be postponed until the next part-session, so that the House does not have to make a final statement on the matter before amendments have been tabled, because these amendments will have been tabled in the light of more recent events. Quite frankly, Mr President, it is out of the question for Parliament to decide on Item 336 today unless there has been an opportunity to consider the amendments.

IN THE CHAIR: MR DE FERRANTI

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Sir James.

**Sir James Scott-Hopkins.** — I am speaking against, Mr President. As I understand it, it is not under

Rule 32 that Mr Glinne has got to his feet and moved this motion. He is moving, not to refer this item to committee, which, of course, he has no right to do, but to defer it until March. I do not know under what particular rule he is doing that, and I think the argument he has put forward is extremely flimsy. We have had this report for a very long time in front of us. There have been ample opportunities to put down all the amendments one wanted to. The situation, although it is changing, is essentially no different today from what it was before, and it will not change all that much between now and March. As to the Political Affairs Committee, it is my information that the Bureau of that committee decided not to ask for it to be referred to committee, nor for it to be deferred until March.

So I find it extraordinary that the chairman of the Socialist Group should have acted in this way. Perhaps he has internal reasons for so doing: I do not know nor do I question that, but I would ask the House to maintain this on the order-paper. It is something that should be discussed and be disposed of during this part-session. All the information is in our hands, and as for arguing that we have to wait until the Lomé committee meets in Sierra Leone, we might as well wait until the Council of Ministers next meets and so on, that is an argument which would go on for ever if one adopted that course. I would ask the House to maintain this item on the agenda. This is the wish of my group and I believe it is the wish of the Political Affairs Committee as well.

**President.** — I call Mr Klepsch.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (*D*) Mr President, I should like to raise a point of order. I would appreciate further information as it is not clear to me from what the previous two speakers had to say what we are really talking about. I would ask you to clarify whether what is being moved here is a referral to committee or a proposal on the part of Mr Glinne to have this item adjourned to the next part-session. There is a considerable difference between the two things. I had originally assumed — and that is what I assumed from Mr Scott-Hopkins too — that what we were talking about was a proposal for the item to be referred to committee. That is something I could under no circumstances agree to, because the process must be completed in the proper manner. However, if Mr Glinne is moving that discussion of this item be simply adjourned to the next part-session, I should appreciate confirmation of the fact. If he is seeking to justify such a move by the fact that his group would like to table amendments, and if this will not involve the Political Affairs Committee being involved again, then of course we have an entirely new situation.

We have never prevented any group from tabling amendments, and we do not want to give the impres-

**Klepsch**

sion that that is what we are seeking to do today. But I would urge that this matter be clarified beforehand so that we do not have to reconvene the Political Affairs Committee when we thought we had simply reached a gentlemen's agreement. My group does not want to have the Political Affairs Committee reconvened. I hope I have made myself clear. You will appreciate, Mr President, that it is important that this House be made aware of the true nature of the proposal, because the written proposal we have before us makes a different point.

**President.** — I should like to ask Mr Glinne to clarify, both for myself and for the whole House, that what is being moved here is an adjournment of the debate.

**Mr Glinne.** — (*F*) I have been misunderstood by my colleagues. I was not proposing reference to committee but simply postponement of the debate until the next part-session. The basic reason for this is that events have occurred in such a way this week that we can no longer table the amendments we wanted to on this text. It was in all good faith that we delayed tabling amendments because at the beginning of the week it had been agreed that the matter would be referred to committee.

**President.** — I call Mr Fanti.

**Mr Fanti.** — (*I*) Mr President, I want to speak in support of Mr Glinne's proposal. I say this because — and I think it is only right that everyone in the House should know — there was discussion of this matter at the meeting of the group chairmen and, if I remember rightly, it was agreed for the sake of updating the facts to ask the Political Affairs Committee if it was willing to take another look at the document, because we all felt that recent events had overtaken it.

As far as I am aware, the request was rejected by some of the Political Affairs Committee. I am therefore even more inclined to support Mr Glinne's proposal, so that the groups, including mine, can table amendments to bring the document on the Western Sahara up to date — for want of a more forceful term — and more in line with the current political situation. I therefore support the proposal and ask the House to adopt it.

**President.** — I call Mr Klepsch.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (*D*) Mr President, I should like to move that this point we voted on at 6 p.m. today; in other words, we should decide at 6 p.m. today whether or not to adjourn the vote to the next part-session. If we were to take the vote right now, I should be in a difficult position. I have received instructions

from my group on a different matter. My group has given me a mandate to vote on a move to have this matter referred back to committee. Now, however, a different proposal has been made, and I should like to ask its author not to insist on the vote being taken immediately, but to agree to have the vote taken at 6 p.m. today. I think Mr Scott-Hopkins would go along with me in this, because we must clarify our attitude to a new situation.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — I call Mr Lalor.

**Mr Lalor.** — Mr President, I am very anxious to speak on this for just a few moments. I cannot understand all the manoeuvring to defer this report of mine on the Sahara. This report was adopted by the Political Affairs Committee as far back as 22 October last. Quite frankly, as a new Member of this House, I cannot understand why this item was not on the agenda in December last or in January. I am wondering what conspiracy is afoot to prevent this report from being presented to this House.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

Mr President, I feel that the machinations that have been going on here since Monday morning in order to prevent this are an insult to the dignity of this House and should not be allowed.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

I have heard leaders of two groups saying here that, due to the manner in which the work has been conducted here during the week, an opportunity has not been available to Members or groups in this House to table amendments. I want to say that the amendments are in. In view of the long-standing existence of this report, I can see no reason why any Member could not have tabled an amendment in good time, so that the report could be taken.

There are very many resolutions on the agenda, and I cannot understand why my report and resolution on the Sahara should be the one to be cut off. On Monday last, when the agenda for the whole week was being determined, Lord Bethell raised the question. He had heard some rumour, I had not. Unfortunately, the rapporteur in this instance was the last man to hear of what was going on. The question was raised by Lord Bethell on Monday last, and he was told there was no question of the matter being taken off the agenda. I have carried on ever since on that understanding.

*(Applause from the right)*

**Lalor**

Mr President, I do not want to embarrass you, but I do not see why at this late stage a decision already taken by Parliament should be reversed or why the question should be raised of taking it off the agenda by a vote at 6 p.m. this evening or at any other time. I think that we should go ahead with the agenda as agreed by this Parliament earlier on this week.

*(Applause from the right — Parliament decided to take a decision on the matter at 6 p.m.)*

4. *Presentation of the Fourteenth General Report of the Commission and its programme of work for 1981 (continuation)*

**President.** — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the presentation of the Fourteenth General Report of the Commission of the European Communities Activities of the Communities in 1980 and of the Commission's annual programme of work for 1981.

I call Mr Pesmazoglou.

**Mr Pesmazoglou.** — *(EL)* Mr President, Mr Thorn's report on the Community's work programme for 1981 is an important text worthy of the Community's serious task in these difficult times. It was a far-sighted, determined and imaginative statement. I feel bound to extend to the President, Mr Thorn, and the members of the Commission our warmest congratulations and our best wishes for success.

I also consider it very important that the representatives of all the political groups in the European Parliament have stressed that in 1981 the success of the Community's efforts depends to a very large extent on the confirmation of its autonomy in international affairs. This also applies to the need for a fresh start which would convince all the nations in the world that the European Community is determined to play its full part in the fight against inflation and in tackling the international economic crisis and unemployment.

I should like to single out three points for comment from those made by Mr Thorn in his presentation of the work programme. The first concerns the changes to be made to the Community institutions, which we all consider to be of fundamental importance in that they are intended to strengthen cooperation between the European Parliament, the Commission and of course the Council and the European Council, the latter being the forum in which the heads of State and government of the European Community meet. However, the review and rearrangement of these institutions must take place, as Mr Thorn said, in a Community spirit, which means without moving towards a two-or-more-tier Europe, which would undermine the Community's internal cohesion and

weaken its presence in international affairs. This is the first point on which I wished to comment.

The second point concerns the review of the common agricultural policy. Mr Thorn very cautiously used the term *aménagements*, 'adjustments', and very wisely pointed out that we must remain firmly attached to the principles laid down in the Treaty of Rome. I firmly support this and would stress that it is most important for all the Mediterranean countries of the Community, i.e. Greece, Italy, France and soon the two new Member States, that protection for Mediterranean produce under the CAP should be stepped up. However, in order to bring about such a new common agricultural policy, policy guidelines must be changed in other areas also, and here I am referring particularly to trade policy and consumer protection. I refer to trade policy because the European Community, which is one of the most powerful agricultural and industrial entities in the world, must not be dependent — no matter how dependent it is in practice — on very large imports of vegetable protein and animal feedstuffs. And I refer to consumer protection because there is still considerable scope for increasing the consumption of fruit and vegetables to the level which exists both in other Community countries and in other industrialized countries.

The third point concerns the field of application and the activity of the Regional Fund. Here I should like to stress our interest in the extension of the Community's Regional Fund to include aid to projects of social importance such as schools, universities and hospitals, and at the same time in the setting up of a permanent European solidarity fund to deal with disasters such as those which struck Italy in 1980 and also those caused in recent months in Greece by floods and frost. These changes would be in keeping with the spirit of the whole policy which Mr Thorn presented to the European Parliament yesterday with such force and eloquence.

**President.** — I call Mr Romualdi.

**Mr Romualdi.** — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, during his presentation of the Commission's work programme Mr Thorn delivered a speech which has wide-ranging political implications and which is also very evocative, a speech which according to some is pessimistic but in my opinion is merely realistic, far removed from the world of make-believe and illusion, and I thank him for this very reason. However, we would be insincere were we not to confess that we are troubled by some points and by some omissions. We have noted all the new factors which ought to characterize future relations between the various institutions of the Community. But President Thorn will no doubt concur that very little attention was paid, in this section of his speech, to the underlying spirit of the report of the Three Wise Men

**Romualdi**

and in particular to the Rey report, which was adopted by this House, on the institutional and political tasks of the Commission and its relationship with Parliament itself.

Naturally, we too wish to see a Commission which is the powerhouse and executive of Community policies. We want to see a Commission which is constantly gaining in independence and which has to account for its actions before Parliament. But how can we achieve all this? Here we are supposed to debate on the basis of the Treaties. Similarly, the point raised by Mr Thorn on majority decisions in the Council is a question of interpretation of the Treaties. But this question, in which the true issue is the Commission's independence, cannot be entirely dealt with here but must be tackled by national Parliaments, which are the only bodies able to impose on governments a Europe-oriented policy, not just in words but in deeds, which means putting at our disposal the means to carry out such a policy. For this reason we now appeal, as Europeans, to the major political forces in Europe, and, as Italians, to the major political groups forming the government of Italy.

Mr Thorn did not refer to terrorism, even though this problem exists both inside and outside Europe and poses an increasingly serious threat. In the agreement reached during the Dublin Summit and in other documents, this problem was highlighted, guidelines were laid down and certain commitments were made which it would be serious and dangerous to leave by the wayside.

There was no mention either of how we can face up to natural disasters — to which one of our fellow Members referred previously — and how we can continue to aid that part of Southern Italy which was hit by the earthquake; I mention this because it is a problem which is closely tied up with regional and social policy, which is definitely going through a crisis and for which we must do something.

Other omissions concerned the agreements with Yugoslavia, Romania and Poland. What is the state of affairs in the agreement with Yugoslavia? That country is wallowing in an unprecedented economic and social crisis which they have no means of checking or opposing. Why has the Yugoslavian agreement not functioned? On the subject of Poland, Mr Berlinguer spoke at one and the same time about caution and anarchy. Perhaps this might merely be an alibi used to justify, whilst outwardly protesting, an occupation of that country.

We agree with Mr Thorn on the subject of the new Lomé Convention, which could, however, do with some further clarification.

Little or nothing was said about the various crises which have for some time been ravaging the steel, car and textile industries, as well as the energy sector and

agricultural affairs, which are more and more difficult to control

As far as we are concerned, it seems a good idea to reconsider ways and means of bolstering the Commission by giving it the firm and decisive backing of Parliament, just as Mr Thorn asked — and this we cannot deny him — a Parliament which Mr Sadat's visit and his important speech — both of which were hailed by the President of Parliament as historic events — have more or less succeeded in placing in the centre of the world stage, even if many people both inside and outside this House pretended to be unaware of this significance. This implies a strengthening of Parliament's position, which is above all political, naturally enough, although not in a battle with the Council or with the individual governments which compose it, which should, however, realize once and for all that whatever their strength and their prestige they cannot go it alone and there is no way they can, with their incomplete agreements, become valid interlocutors with the two super-powers and that no one nation in Europe is up to meeting the challenge offered by other powerful national communities, such as Japan, whereas the Community is largely capable of so doing. This is the problem of the one-way street which Mr Thorn talked about, and if Europe can follow this path it will be able to overcome its own crises and once more become a great power. Europe has the civilization and the moral and economic strength to achieve this, and it must take pride in serving its own interests and those of world-wide freedom, peace and security. It is up to Mr Thorn, his Commission and us all to work towards this goal.

**IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE**

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr De Goede.

**Mr De Goede.** — (NL) Mr President, the introductory speech we heard yesterday has served to enhance Mr Thorn's already considerable reputation, and I should like to add my congratulations. He began by pointing out that his Commission was the first to present its programme to a directly-elected European Parliament, and he indicated at a number of points in his speech that his Commission appreciated the importance of this elected House. We must, of course, wait and see what fruit these declarations will bear, but I myself am encouraged by the fact that Mr Andriessen has been made responsible for fostering relations with this House. There is a modest little pile of well-known reports — for instance, those of the

**De Goede**

Three Wise Men and of Mr Rey — to give him all the help he needs when it comes to carrying out this aspect of his duties and to ensure that he does not confine himself to merely maintaining contacts between the Commission and the European Parliament. As I said, we shall be keeping a vigilant watch on developments.

Mr Thorn rightly referred to the advent of the second-generation Europe, but in my opinion, we must make sure that it does not become the second-rate Europe of which there is a danger at present. Of course, Mr Thorn was right to make the point that a Europe without the Community would be far worse off than a Europe with the Community, despite all its problems and shortcomings. Over the last thirty years, a Europe which used to be torn apart by genocidal warfare and in which protectionism and poverty were familiar phenomena has known peace and prosperity. I believe that our Community as a very good thing — that is why I am here. To be sure, we have failed to bring into being a genuinely European identity and to arouse a real understanding of Europe in the people we represent. That is what we are lacking, and it is a damaging state of affairs. It is even, in my opinion, in the long run the greatest threat of all to the future of the Community. If, for instance, we as a Community fail to get to grips with the ever more menacing spectre of unemployment, if unemployment among young people continues at its present appalling level, we shall lose all credibility in the eyes of our own people and the upshot of that will be grass-roots pressure for a return to protectionism. Europe would then have been relegated to second-rate status.

Of course, this is precisely what Mr Thorn himself said. Substantial progress will have to be made between now and 1985 — at least, that is my interpretation of what he referred to as 'consolidation'. If we fail to make progress, Europe may well 'fall apart at the seams'.

Mr Thorn rightly said that there must be a dialogue on the way our institutions work. In my view, though, a definite policy on the part of the Commission would do more than a dialogue to lead us out of the blind alley we have got into. That is why it is so necessary for this Commission to act in harmony, decisively and energetically — unlike the previous Commission, where all too often Members tended to allow the interests of their own countries to prevail over those of the Community. That much was evident from the recent debates on the budget. The Members of the Commission are the guardians of the Community's interests.

Mr President, I go along with the points that have been made on the virtues of a practical approach, solidarity and security. But as you very well know, Mr Thorn, we shall be expecting more than just fine words. We want to see you set to work with all due speed to put these demands into practice.

To save time, I shall merely associate myself with what Mr Tindemans had to say on relations with the United States. In my view, Europe must not be content to dance to Uncle Sam's tune, but at the same time we must stick together. That applies particularly to foreign policy, but also to economic policy. The problems in the steel, shipbuilding and car industries, our relations with Japan and the energy situation clearly show that if we think we can all paddle our own canoes, the problems will only get worse and worse. That is why cooperation is so essential, that is why we need to hold discussions with the United States and Japan. We must reduce our dependence on foreign sources of energy, in view of the fact that 40 % of our energy supplies come from the OPEC countries. The gigantic investment programmes such as the 400 thousand million units of account to be spent in the period 1980 to 1990 represent an enormous challenge for the Commission, for this House and for the Council. I wish the new Commission all the very best, and much success in the work it has set itself to do.

**President.** — The Commission has the floor.

**Mr Thorn, President of the Commission.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am not going to reply in detail yet. I reserve the right to do that as the last speaker, after I have heard all your comments. Now I should just like to say a couple of words by way of explanation, not to say justification and apology.

Yesterday, in some speeches, there was some criticism — not that I am not used to it — from Mr Glinne, Sir James and my friend Mr Bangemann, and I noticed that many of you wondered what the Commission's programme was and felt that my speech did not present enough aspects of it. It was then that I realized that there had been a misunderstanding. As I in fact said in the second page of my speech, the new Commission wanted to make an innovation for the elected parliament and instead of simply producing a memorandum annexed to the speech, it decided to draft its programme in writing. It was to be to all Members of Parliament and we were to defend it — today or whenever you wish — in the debate which would be devoted to it. In short, my speech was intended as a political speech, introducing the programme and commenting on it.

Well, I was greatly surprised when speaking to some of you, to learn that you had not been able to read this programme, you had not even received it when I was making my speech. And it is only now, after making some enquiries, that I realize that the programme which was drawn up last Wednesday within the Commission, and sent directly to the printers which it left on Friday to be sent to you, had, let us say as a result of a technical hitch, to be reprinted on Monday, did not arrive here until Tuesday and was unpacked

**Thorn**

with some hours delay because of the visit of President Sadat. I therefore apologize for this misunderstanding. The speech was only intended as an introduction and a commentary. The programme is this publication which should have arrived, which you should have received, on Monday, but which only came today. I beg your pardon once again and just wished to explain this to you.

**President.** — I call Mr Hänsch.

**Mr Hänsch.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am very grateful to Mr Thorn for clarifying matters for us, something which I think we all felt was very important. Of course, he is now in the thankless position that every President of the Commission gets into when he presents his programme here. He can — or rather, should — take one of two lines. Either he sets out a detailed programme, in which case he comes in from criticism from everyone who was expecting a political speech, or he gives a political speech, in which case he is criticized by all those who were expecting to hear a detailed programme. You, Mr Thorn, have taken up a position somewhere between the two — partly because of technical problems — but I think we shall still be able to come to terms in the debate.

Having said that, I must say that you found plenty of fine words in your political speech; however, even allowing for the fact that you have given us a written programme, I should have liked you to be a little more specific to flesh out these fine words. You have written out a cheque — so to speak — and we hope and expect that you will be in a position to cash it over the next four years.

It was pleasing to hear that you want the Commission to revert to an independent role *vis-à-vis* the Council and that you intend to put an end to the process by which the Commission is degenerating into a mere secretariat of the Council. It was pleasing to hear you say that the Council will have to revert to the majority decision procedure provided for in the Treaties, although you made certain reservations which I am sure the majority of this House would go along with.

We too realize that things are no longer as they were when the Treaties were signed, and indeed, can never be the same again. But, Mr President, it is just not enough to go round uttering the magic words 'the Council must decide... must decide... must decide...' again and again. What this House wants to hear is something more specific.

You were right to say that the European Community needs to be enlarged *and* strengthened. But are you not perhaps putting illusion before analysis here? You gave us no indication of how this is supposed to work. For instance, what institutional solutions will the

Commission be proposing to ensure that the Community remains operative even after the Nine have become the Twelve? We are only deceiving ourselves if we think that an enlarged Community could even maintain its present state of integration without a redistribution of the institutional load and without reforming its decision-making procedures.

We go along with you in wanting to see the emergence of political union in the form of European Union. But what precisely should be done about it now? The point is not to speak with one voice to the rest of the world, to the United States or to the Third World; what really matters is what we have to say, and on that score, I do not think your report went far enough. Of course, we need good will, but good will alone will not bring about political union. Over the last few months, we have got more and more used to hearing ministers from a variety of Member States say that what we must work towards is political union, in other words, European Union. The foreign minister of my own country has been a particularly prominent advocate of the idea. We are pleased to hear these fine words, and we should like to think that they are meant seriously. But we expect any government that likes to talk about political union to refrain from undermining the budgetary powers of this directly-elected Parliament for the sake of a few dozen million units of account. Those governments which advocate political union must be prepared to draw the institutional conclusions.

You were right to say, Mr Thorn, that the people of the Community are not particularly interested in our institutional wrangles. But the people must — and will — take an interest in what becomes of this Parliament, which was elected directly in 1979 by more than 100 million people.

You called for the restoration of peace between the Community institutions. After all, who is in favour of open warfare? But do we not need at least the natural rivalry and the natural tensions between the European institutions? If what you mean by the restoration of peace is the status quo, it is something this House cannot accept. We cannot and will not allow the representatives of 260 million people in the Community to exert no more influence that the Supreme Soviet in a country which is not exactly renowned for its democratic ways just for the sake of institutional peace. A directly-elected Parliament which takes itself and its mandate seriously is duty-bound to adopt an attitude of stubborn resolve if it is ever to gain more influence on the formulation of European policy. You gave us an assurance that you will respect and take seriously the role of this House. Please do not try to fob us off with fine words — we shall make sure that you stick to your word, and you will very soon have an opportunity to show that the inter-institutional three-way conversation is more than just an elaborate charade.

## Hänsch

I would have expected the Commission, which — as you said — has set out to be the powerhouse of the Community, to say what it intends to do to honour the pledge given by the Heads of Government in 1974 to 'extend the competence of the European Assembly, in particular by granting it certain powers in the Community's legislative process'. Do we, or do we not, have your support in this, Mr Thorn? During your period of office, we expect the Commission to give us its full support in any attempt to implement the terms of the Treaties to the very limit. The influence of the European Parliament must be increased. The point is not to achieve or to reinstate what has always been the legal right of the Parliament, namely that our opinions be taken seriously by the Commission and the Council. We expect you to take an active part in the formulation and conclusion of inter-institutional agreements in this respect. The reason, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, why I attach so much importance to this point is because, Mr Thorn, you said two things which I should like to underline.

Firstly, you said that, by 1985, either our Community will have progressed, or it will not even be what it is today, it will be falling apart at the seams. Secondly, there is a universal re-emergence of national reflexes. Not least among the factors contributing to the further development of the Community is the fact that, by the second direct elections to the European Parliament in 1984, we must make the people of Europe feel that it is worth while turning out to vote a second time and that their votes will really have a decisive influence on European policy and are not being used merely to elect a consultative assembly. If we fail in this — and we can only succeed with the help of the Commission — we shall be destroying more than just the prestige and importance of the parliamentary ideal in Europe. We shall be leaving the field wide open to those nationalistic reflexes which you rightly referred to, and which we know from reading our history books were the cause of Europe's downfall. We must fight these forces if Europe is to survive.

In the part of your speech dealing with the Community institutions, you expressed a number of good ideas and made a number of worthwhile suggestions. We — that is, this House — will be coming back to them. We shall be looking to you to show that you can back up the fine words with deeds.

**President.** — I call Mr Jonker.

**Mr Jonker.** — (NL) Mr President, a number of speakers — like Mr Tindemans yesterday — have already said with what interest we listened to Mr Thorn's statement on behalf of the Commission. He has been known to us for years as a good European, and we hope that he and his colleagues will be able to do all the things he spoke about regarding the institutional problems, especially relations between the Commission and Parliament.

We start with confidence in his ability to get things done, but I am sure Mr Thorn will not hold it against us if we Christian Democrats refrain from throwing our hats into the air until we can see concrete results. We have gained a certain amount of experience in these matters since the inaugural meeting of the directly-elected European Parliament. I have taken the trouble to reread the text of a major speech given by Mr Thorn's predecessor, Mr Jenkins, on 11 January 1979. It was a speech worthy of the great European Mr Jenkins, the recipient of the Schuman Prize. That speech of Mr Jenkins's in 1979 was an important milestone in relations between the European Parliament and the Commission. It was the time of the build-up to direct elections, and Mr Jenkins said that the Commission intended to anticipate the event. He promised — and you can check this; I am talking about January 1979 — that before submitting any proposal to the Council, the Commission would first of all find out whether it could count on the support of a majority in the European Parliament. That was not the first time something like that has been said in this House. I am not deliberately trying to go over old ground again, and there is no need for Mr Thorn to reply to my remarks. I merely thought it necessary to make these remarks for the purposes of my own arguments.

The point is: what has become of all this? The answer is that there has been no change in relations between the Commission and the European Parliament. We have simply been marking time, and I should like to give you two examples of what I mean from matters we have discussed here in public.

First of all, let us take a look at the question of Greek accession. The Commission and the Council conducted negotiations on the enlargement of the Community, and decided that there should be another 24 Members of the European Parliament, but we were not consulted on the matter. It was a decision which concerned us, but which was taken without consulting us.

Secondly, let me remind you that the Commission once told us the Council intended to take such-and-such a decision costing so-and-so much in the agricultural sector, that the Commission itself was against the proposal, but would we, the European Parliament, care to give an opinion on the Commission's proposals which the Commission itself was not in favour of. Our reply was that things could not go on like that. We pointed out that the Commission should have withdrawn its proposals to ensure that the Council could not take a wrong decision.

I repeat: I am not trying to go over old ground again, but simply to make you realize that we shall only applaud your efforts once we can see that definite improvements have been made. We have heard plenty of fine words yesterday and today. I was pleased to hear them, and I have every confidence in them. What is more important, my group has confidence in them.

**Jonker**

There are, however, two points I should like to make. Firstly, the Commission has declared its readiness to place the dialogue with the European Parliament on a new footing. That, in our opinion, is a matter of the utmost importance. But the ways and means of doing this, the Commission goes on to say, will be decided later. The second point is that the words 'European Parliament' appear nowhere in the memorandum Mr Thorn just referred to, in the list of priorities and, for that matter, in the whole document. I read the document through from cover to cover last night. That is really a surprising fact.

As regards the first point, the dialogue with the European Parliament, I should like to ask the Commission to devote some attention to the report drawn by a well-known former President of the Commission, Mr Rey, who was also a member of this House for many years. His report was adopted by this House, and its main proposal was that the dialogue between our two institutions should be fostered by way of an inter-institutional agreement. The Rey report calls on the new Commission under Mr Thorn — and this is what it says here in this decision taken by Parliament — immediately after its appointment to conclude an inter-institutional agreement with the European Parliament. As I said earlier, the idea was further developed in Mr Jenkins's speech in 1979. It is all there in black and white.

We Christian Democrats are perfectly well aware that it is practically impossible to expect the Thorn Commission to conclude an inter-institutional agreement with this House today or next week. We appreciate that there are very important legal issues involved here. That is why we should like to offer the Commission a little assistance. We should like to ask the Commission quite bluntly whether it is prepared to conclude an inter-institutional agreement of this kind with this House. Is the Thorn Commission prepared to go along with the policy espoused by a large majority of this House?

I hope that Mr Thorn will be able to reply to this urgent question at the end of the debate.

That, Mr President, is why we have tabled our motion for a resolution, one which is intended to help and to give the Commission the time to formulate an inter-institutional agreement along these lines by 1 October 1981. Very briefly, what the agreement must cover is a better consultation procedure. We are asking the Commission to help us should we wish to establish a better consultation procedure with the Council. We are asking the Commission to accord us better treatment where amendments have been adopted, and in the case of initiatives in the legislative field. If the Commission is prepared to go along with these requests, we hope it will include them in the report to be produced by 1 October.

I can well imagine that the Thorn Commission has better ideas, and I can also imagine that it will sometimes not entirely agree with us. But the most important thing is that the dialogue between the Commission and the directly-elected European Parliament should get going in this field. We are giving you until 1 October, and we are giving you the benefit of the doubt because we have confidence in the Commission in view of what you said regarding your position *vis-à-vis* the Council. I shall say no more on this matter. The Commission must try to re-establish and maintain its role as the true powerhouse of European integration.

Mr President, we hope that a positive response will be forthcoming. We also hope that the Commission realizes that, in putting forward these proposals for improving relations between the Commission and the European Parliament, we have only one thing in mind, and that is to strengthen the respective positions of both institutions. That is why a permanent dialogue between our two institutions is so necessary. We would appeal to the Thorn Commission to take the opportunity it is being offered. This House is not asking to have the last word in all matters; what we have in mind for the time being is a better consultation procedure. We want to be involved in the decision-making procedure; we want to improve our relations with the Commission within the framework of the Treaties. It must be obvious to you that the Commission only stands to gain from this kind of relationship between it and the European Parliament. It can only emerge stronger if it is prepared to share with us, to some extent, the political power bestowed on it by the Treaties by way of the gradual development of a generally accepted law of convention. We Christian Democrats do not anticipate a conflict situation. We hope that, over its four years in office, the Thorn Commission will make an invaluable contribution towards the democratization of the Community.

That will be to the good not only of democracy within the Community and relations between our two institutions — it will be to the good of the whole Community and all its people. After all, it is for the good of the people of Europe that we are here at all. Our two guiding principles should be, firstly, the strengthening of our two institutions, and secondly, the democratization of the Community.

**President.** — I call Lady Elles.

**Lady Elles.** — I would just like to take this opportunity to thank President Thorn for his explanation of what happened over the documents. I hope he will now realize why some rather unfavourable remarks were made yesterday. I know he will take this as an expression not of regret or of apology but rather of mutual understanding between our institutions that we can have these discussions; we can clarify what goes

**Lady Elles**

wrong even if it is on such a minor matter as the distribution of documents, because it is only on these bases that we actually build up our contacts and our confidence in one another. We are grateful to President Thorn for the way in which he has handled this matter.

Mr President, we have just heard about the proposals adopted in this House last year from the report of a very distinguished servant of the Community both in the Commission and in the Parliament, Mr Jean Rey. I of course will draw attention to one of the first paragraphs in that resolution which stated that at least one woman should serve on the Commission. I quite understand that the Commissioners who have heard yesterday's debate and the debates before may be a little reluctant, but I do assure them, nevertheless, that there are many many women in the Community who could actually do the job extremely well and I very much hope that the President will put both his feet down next time unless one Member State at least produces one woman out of the some 150 million in the Community.

Secondly, the other point that Mr Rey made very clearly was that the Commission in some way should get the approval of this Parliament. I think that this is a democratic process which President Thorn will be only too well aware of. He and other Commissioners will be aware of what has been going on in the United States quite recently. Not only will they know that General Haig was called before the Senate committee as the Secretary of State of the USA but they will also have read perhaps with interest the cross-examination which Mr William Clark had to undergo. Now of course we are quite certain and we have every confidence that the Commissioners, distinguished as they are, would answer 100 % of the questions put to them and give us the right answers. We are sure of that. In that case, since we are so sure and undoubtedly they are sure, we hope that next time round they will be prepared to submit to this kind of cross-examination, and we can assure them that we will be kind, courteous and gentle. Nevertheless, we shall want the answers which a parliament has the right to expect.

The third proposal was that a vote of confidence should be passed on the programme of the Commission. We have now had an explanation from the Christian Democrats of what they intend to do. I am not sure at this moment what my Group would like us to say on this issue. But the Commission will of course understand that we do want at some stage to be able to express confidence in that programme. It is for their benefit, not for ours. The Commission must know that they have the confidence of the people of this Parliament, who represent after all 270 million people in Europe. It cannot be to their advantage that there is any doubt as to the relations and trust which we have in each other and in our institutions.

One of the tasks of the Commission is to make proposals on policies as well as to execute them. But the role of this Parliament is to monitor, scrutinize and indeed to criticize those policies when we feel it is our obligation to do so. And I make it quite clear from the beginning that we of course intend to do so. I know also that the Commission and President Thorn will appreciate that we are fulfilling our task and our democratic obligations just as the Commission will be fulfilling its role in putting forward proposals.

We also have a duty under the Treaties to advise and give opinions on matters which are set out in the relevant articles in the Treaty of Rome in particular.

We would like the Commission to assure us that not only will they listen to those opinions and our advice but that these opinions and our advice will go to the Council in the form in which we send it from here. President Thorn himself already raised the doubts and hesitations which he has over some of the advisory committees that have been set up and the way that some Commission proposals are perhaps modified, if not distorted, in the communications between the Commission and the Council. Just as they are concerned about the communications from their institution so are we and we hope that the President will give an undertaking that the greatest respect will be given to our opinions and advice, with reasons being given if the Commission disagrees.

The second aspect of that particular problem is the question of draft directives which have long lain in the dusty drawers of some Commission directorates. We are well aware that we give an opinion on a draft directive and perhaps two or three years will pass before that draft directive is resurrected by somebody or other at some level. We are also well aware, as indeed the Commission is aware, that in this age things are changing very rapidly indeed. The economic and social situation today in the Community is not the same as it was even two or three years ago, and therefore the Parliament may well have a different view. It may be the same, but it may be different. I would ask the President that whenever important draft directives are resurrected and pushed forward, as they are now, having lain in a drawer or on the table for two years at least, they extend to us the common courtesy of giving us the chance to at least revise our former opinion if the need should arise. I think that this is a very important aspect of the relations between our two institutions.

And it is, of course, our task as representatives not only to present the Community's policy to the people of the Community but to ensure that the policies proposed by the Commission respond to the needs, demands and aspirations of those people. I want very briefly to single out some areas to which our Group attaches the greatest importance.

### Lady Elles

One, of course, is energy; it is no use saying that we have saved a lot of energy in the last year. It is not due solely to the miracle of being able to conserve energy. We know jolly well that it is because there are thousands of people with idle hands who are not able to work in the factories which were formerly using that energy.

So it is not so clear as might appear, and it is surely for the Community to start a dialogue with OPEC which, after all, virtually controls the entire world economy through the price levels of its oil products. Surely this is something which the Community should be looking at. Surely we need a nuclear energy policy which is more effective, which is more dynamic, which can ensure that the sources of energy are available to provide the jobs that we need for our future generations in this Community. If we sit back now and do nothing we shall be accused by the next generation of having sat on our hands and left them with no jobs, with no future and without the resources which are needed to ensure their livelihood.

Secondly, employment. We need to take a new look at employment. The unemployed are not, as we used to think of them, people who are idle, people who do not want to work. We have to provide not only the means to work, but the training and the methods whereby people have a chance to earn their living. We have to have a new look at this problem. We must realise that a diploma is not a passport to a job — it is merely a means of getting from one job to another. Everybody will have to have at least three jobs during his lifetime, and the sooner people realize this the better. It should not be called unemployment when people are turned out of one factory and retrained for another. It should be called some new word, like redeployment. Why should we stigmatize people as unemployed when we the politicians have failed to provide them with a way of earning their living?

And now I just want to say a brief word on youth because, after all, it will be the youth who will build the Community and support the Community when we are gone.

What proposals has the Commission for youth in order to turn Europe into a land of opportunity rather than a source of disillusionment? What have they done about proposals for a European Community Youth Service? Would the President give us an undertaking that they would support such a task, even if it were only a pile of projects? We have hundreds of young who would willingly transfer from one part of the Community to another, even for six months or a year. After all, this is the Year of the Disabled. Many young would go and help in homes for the disabled across the Community for very, very little cost. Our country could put it up immediately with some of our voluntary organizations if we had the minimal support from the Commission, both politically and financially. There are an enormous number of pilot projects that

come out of this Parliament that I hope the Commission will look at. We are not only concerned with global policies; we are concerned with small policies dealing with human beings who live in modest circumstances.

Finally, before I wind up, I would just like to say a word about the European Development Fund. If an exact knowledge of the past is an aid to the interpretation of the future, as Thucydides once said, let us look at the Court of Auditors' report on the European Development Fund. If that is the way that the moneys of the Community are going to support the Third World, an area which is of deep concern to all Members of Parliament in this House, to all shades of opinion, we are concerned that there should be economic and social development in countries which are among the poorest in the world.

But we do not seem satisfied with what has come out of that report and I hope very much that the Commission will look at the way that money is being spent, that projects are put on board which are suitable, which are adapted to the needs of the local people. If I could make just one suggestion, I would say that if the Commission undertook the one project of providing water wherever it was needed in the world, it would have made the greatest contribution to mankind, and they would have my support for ever if that were achieved.

To conclude, Mr President: one of our tasks is to bring to you the voices of the people of Europe so, through us, please listen to those voices. With our proposals, please listen to us on behalf of the 270 million people whom we have the honour to represent. It will be our task to try and improve the peace of Europe, to improve the position and prosperity of our electors and to see that the purposes, objectives and policies of the Commission are implemented. If this is not to be a dialogue of the deaf the Commission will know that they have our full support in building a Europe which provides peace, freedom and prosperity for all our people.

**President.** — I call Mr Kappos.

**Mr Kappos.** — (EL) Mr President, I consider it at the very least contradictory to speak about Europe when we only mean Western Europe and the capitalist countries of Europe, thereby erasing the Socialist countries from the map of Europe. We also feel it is contradictory to speak of and support the idea of European Union while in reality supporting nothing but the continued division of Europe.

Mr President, the Commission and Mr Thorn painted a grim picture of the EEC's future and, in order to overcome the problems, asked for more responsibilities of the national political bodies to be handed over

**Kappos**

to the EEC institutions. He asked for the abolition of the unanimity requirement and of the veto for matters which now require unanimity and at the same time asked for sacrifices from the people of all the Member States. These proposals inescapably pose the problem of the further restriction of national independence and sovereignty, especially of the small countries. They raise the problem of the extension of the powers of the Community institutions which are not actually elected and are not answerable to the people, i.e. they raise the problem of the extension of authoritarianism in the EEC. Lastly, the proposals raise the question of greater austerity for the workers in the Member States. This means, Mr President, that the nations are being asked to give up even more of their freedom and the workers are being asked to shoulder new burdens for the benefit of the monopolistic organization of the EEC. We, the Greek Communist Party, consider this to be both illogical and contradictory. Mr Thorn's proposals will have serious negative consequences for the Greek people, which has paid for this dependence not only with sweat but also with blood. This is precisely why the Greek Communist Party's answer to these proposals is to continue and step up the struggle for Greece's withdrawal from the EEC and to demonstrate its solidarity with the workers of Europe who are struggling against the extension of the EEC's supranational powers.

Mr Thorn wondered what our reasons were for adopting this attitude. The answer is love for our nation and love for the workers whose interests we defend not only with words but also with deeds and sacrifices.

*(Protests from the centre and right)*

**President.** — I call Mr Galland.

**Mr Galland.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I will try to be more realistic and less demagogic than the speaker who preceded me. Yesterday, President Thorn was loudly applauded at the end of his speech — I repeat, loudly applauded and indeed on practically all the benches of this House. Now, strangely, there has been a sudden wave of criticism with rumours of certain negative action against the Commission.

This apparent paradox calls for an explanation, which I am going to attempt to provide. In so doing I will explain and outline why the Liberal Group will not be associated at this stage with any hostile action against the Commission, since this would in our view be both unjust, demagogic and irresponsible.

I shall separate two aspects of President Thorn's speech, the political and institutional aspect on the one hand and the 'programmatic' aspect on the other. As regards the political aspect — and this is obviously the

most important aspect for a new Commission which is only one month old — we wish to applaud the courage, the political will, the clear opinions of the new Commission as they were expressed yesterday by President Thorn. European union, inter-institutional relations, the analysis of barriers to Community development, own resources, the determination to restore the Commission's initiating role, effective and exemplary relations with Parliament — these are all problems which the Commission is tackling head on. We asked this of the former Commission often enough — don't let's start criticizing the new one for taking a very clear position on central issues which are holding up the new start on European integration.

Of course, at a certain point frustration did arise and I want to speak here of the part of Mr Thorn's speech which dealt with the Commission's programme. But while we share this frustration, we believe, and I ask you to reflect on this also, that it was inevitable. In one month one cannot devise, prepare and propose a structured programme. A debate on this should take place in April at the earliest, to give the new Commission at least three months in which to work out and prepare its programme.

Mr Thorn, I wish however to point out our serious concern about what I would call the energy vacuum of the new Commission. Apparently, and this includes the additional written programme, practically none of the proposals which arose out of the very interesting energy debate in Parliament last month attracted your attention. There was nothing in the programme about convergence and a European centre for research into new and renewable energy resources. There was practically nothing about market unity and better harmonization of prices. Nothing about joint investment in new technologies. References to energy aid to the developing countries that were so vague as to be practically nothing. And nothing about the budgetary savings to be derived for Member States and therefore for taxpayers from a Community energy policy.

In fact on this basis, it must be said that your Commission still has no overall plan for laying the foundations of a Community energy policy. In the energy sphere, the Commission must make fewer analyses of the world situation and more proposals for the Community.

However, Mr President, the Liberal and Democratic Group is a responsible group, it realizes that you need more time to propose this Community energy policy, which is a topic on which you have already spoken on two occasions, in your various offices, before this House. However, it was my duty to draw your attention to the misgivings, I would say rather the serious concern, of the Liberal Group and also, I know, of the whole of Parliament's Committee on Energy, about the paucity of your current proposals on energy.

**Galland**

Mr Thorn, we have confidence in your Commission, we have not given up hope either, and it is in this spirit that we look forward to a proper programme, in particular on energy, in the next few months.

**President.** — I call Mr Nyborg.

**Mr Nyborg.** — (DK) Mr President, first of all I would like to welcome Mr Gaston Thorn. I have a hunch that Mr Thorn is just the right man to get the institutions to cooperate because he has previous first-hand inside experience of both the workings of Parliament and the Council.

I would like to raise just a few specific points, as it is simply not possible to comment on a whole programme in detail. I greatly welcome the fact that the President of the Commission has put it on record that the principles of the agricultural policy will be adhered to, with only minor adjustments being made to it. But I must at the same time seize this opportunity to point out once again that the co-responsibility levy is unacceptable and is in direct violation of Article 39 (1) a of the Treaty. Once again I urge that it be abolished.

As mentioned earlier, the introduction of a common fisheries policy is not only desirable but imperative. Recent developments in the Council of Ministers do not augur very well but we must constantly bear in mind that fishermen and others employed in allied industries, cannot continue living in the state of uncertainty which has existed now for many years. I regard this situation regarding the fisheries policy as being of such vital importance that, together with a large number of other members here in Parliament, I have proposed the setting up of a special Committee on Fisheries — a Committee on Fisheries, maritime and fresh-water, fish-farming and catches — which would thus be separated from agriculture. I was very pleased to note that the Commission has done this and that it has realized that fisheries is such an important sector that it cannot simply be lumped together with agriculture.

I also welcome the fact that the President has promised to take measures to effect large-scale energy savings, to develop new technologies, etc. These are vital areas, as is also environmental policy which is something which cannot be cleared up at national level because pollution knows no national bounds, it transcends national borders and for this reason it is a problem which should be dealt with at Community level.

I utter a sigh from the heart Mr Thorn, about the Communities' transport policy. We have spoken many fine words on this subject over the years, but no action has been taken. As you know, Parliament has contemplated taking an action against the Council in the Court because no progress is being made in the trans-

port sphere, even though this is provided for in the Treaties. A liberalization of the haulage business is highly desirable and for this reason I hope the Commission will once again give serious consideration to this question. Unfortunately in recent years the Commission has been very easily swayed whenever this question of driving licence quotas has been raised, because there is a feeling of powerlessness in the face of the Council which every time has refused to do anything effective about it. I hope that something will be done now, effectively and quickly, just as I hope that — if I may be permitted to put it in this way — you will wake up and do something about the unfair competition from Comecon countries, which is nothing other than dumping. We must do something about it. We cannot simply let it continue as it is doing.

Finally, I wish to call attention to the customs union which is one of the pillars of our Community. The customs union as such is a reality. We no longer have customs duties but we have something else instead, namely technical trade barriers. I must say that I am extremely pleased to see that the Commission plans to apply the procedure of framework directives under Article 155 as widely as possible in the future. That augurs well for future development, I feel, because business hours could then be cut down to one-third. Altogether I hope that the Commission will be a driving force in the effort to implement the policy laid down in the Treaties, thereby spurring on the Council also. There are sufficient problems to grapple with. I wish you good luck with them!

**5. Welcome**

**President.** — I have great pleasure in welcoming to the official gallery Mr Jaumann, Bavarian Minister of Economic Affairs.

(Applause)

**6. Urgent procedure**

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

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-908/80) by Mr Hord and others: Sales of butter to the Soviet Union;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-909/80) by Mr Adam and others: Parliament's agenda;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-910/80) by Mr Glinne and others: The Sahraoui people;

**President**

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-913/80) by Mr Coppieters and others; Nuclear accident at La Hague.

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

Parliament will be consulted on these requests at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

The proceedings will now be suspended until 3 p.m.

The House will rise.

*(The sitting was suspended at 1 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)*

## IN THE CHAIR: MR ROGERS

*Vice-President*

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

7. *Membership of Parliament — Verification of credentials*

**President.** — At its meeting today the Bureau verified the credentials of Mr Franz, whose appointment has already been announced. Pursuant to Rule 3 (1), the Bureau established that this appointment complied with the provisions of the Treaties. You are therefore requested to ratify this appointment.

Are there any objections?

This appointment is ratified.

Mr Maurits Coppieters has informed me of his resignation from the European Parliament in accordance with Article 12 (2), subsection 2, of the Act on direct elections. The Parliament takes note of the ensuing vacancy and informs the Member State concerned. This will be done forthwith.

8. *Presentation of the Fourteenth General Report of the Commission and its programme of work for 1981*  
(continuation)

**President.** — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the statement by Mr Thorn concerning the presentation of the Fourteenth General Report of the

Commission of the European Communities on the activities of the Communities in 1980 and of the Commission's annual programme of work for 1981.

I call Mr Delors.

**Mr Delors.** — *(F)* Mr President, as I listened to Mr Gaston Thorn's speech, which had been the focus of so much expectation both because of the personality of the President of the Commission and because a new Commission is a sort of epiphany for Europe, I wondered whether conviction and courage would be sufficient to reverse the fatal course of events which, in my humble opinion, is leading Europe towards decline.

Because undoubtedly Mr Thorn has shown conviction. He has reaffirmed his faith in Europe, taking account of the new circumstances which have arisen since its creation, and has also displayed courage because on two occasions he has made statements which are not likely to please all the governments. I would simply point out that on these occasions he used 'I' instead of 'we', which would tend to indicate either that the Commission as a college had not been able to consult together and agree on what he said, or that its President wanted in this way to proclaim his own convictions publicly. Having heard such a speech, I believe that our principal duty is to choose priorities, since the task is so great and our scepticism at times so overwhelming that an 'inventory' on the Prévost model cannot under any circumstances constitute a Commission programme. For this reason I will confine myself to discussing the diagnosis, to trying to tell you what I consider to be the central challenge and what the priorities might be.

First of all the diagnosis. On this point I share to a large extent the analysis made by Mr Thorn. In fact we face a paradoxical situation: on the one hand, the threat of the economic and commercial decline of Western European societies is indisputable, because even if we are still in a position of strength, the decline has already set in and an upswing is necessary. For economic and commercial decline would inevitably prevent any political upswing. Thus on the one hand we have this economic and social decline, and on other, if I may employ the expression used by the political economists, we have 'demand' for Europe.

In fact, in the past two years, whenever there has been a crisis in the world, the question asked everywhere is 'What is Europe doing? What is Europe doing about the Middle East? What is Europe doing about Afghanistan? What is Europe doing about the world economic disorder?' In my opinion it is this paradox which represents the Gordian knot of the present situation: never have we faced so many threats on the economic and commercial front and never has Europe been called on so much to give its opinion on world affairs and to contribute to peace, prosperity and

### Delors

greater justice. This is the paradoxical diagnosis which must, I feel, form the background to our reflections.

Since Mr Thorn has quoted all the challenges, I will not repeat them. But in my view it is not here that the central issue lies. The challenge facing us is one of imagination and will. We are in fact being hard pressed economically, threatened politically and confused intellectually by events. What is required of us is imagination and will. Believe me, fellow Members of Parliament who believe that Parliament can do everything, that if the solutions to the present situation were simple, one would not have waited for direct elections to the European Parliament to apply them. This challenge is all the greater in that the crisis has not simply been imposed from outside through the double oil shock or through the trend towards a world-wide economy. This challenge also comes from within, it arises out of an increasing inability to control economic and social phenomena in our countries. That is the real crisis. Concentrating solely on the external factors, would produce a distressing temptation to let things slide completely at home.

Unfortunately, I notice that the temptation to let things slide in this way is very widespread. Let me just quote two examples of this. I hear certain governments speak of political cooperation. Since it is difficult to progress with the economic and social construction of Europe, let us launch into political cooperation. However, this raises a simple question: will the political take precedence over the economic and social? It is often said that Europe is a commercial giant, a threatened economic power and a political dwarf. I would ask you: can Europe become an influential political power if its commercial and economic positions are being constantly eroded? That is the question.

Consequently, I cannot have faith in those who, not wishing to tackle the root of the problem — that is the difficulties of the economic and social construction of Europe — take refuge in concentrating on the political level.

Another temptation, which is very prevalent in this Parliament, and I say this bluntly, is that of institutional 'reform'. To listen to some people, changing the institutions would be enough to solve all the problems facing us. But no, ladies and gentlemen, that is not possible. If we agree on the depth of the crisis, if we have the humility to admit our powerlessness in the face of certain social, economic and political phenomena, then it is not by Parliament 'knocking out' the Council of Ministers, if only for a moment, that the problems will be solved.

*(Applause)*

This is why I always distrust and oppose all the hasty innovations and all the forms of institutional guerilla warfare which are constantly being proposed to us

and which are going to be proposed to us again. If that is how things were, the European Parliament would one day find itself 'silenced' by the Council. The governments will agree, if not to construct Europe, at least to relegate this Parliament to the position of Sleeping Beauty.

Instead, it appears to me that the first priority to guide both the Commission and Parliament should be the mandate of 30 May, which is an historic opportunity revive Europe. What does it involve? It involves making a new start on a sound basis, making a correct assessment of current policies, not simply of the common agricultural policy. What a mockery to hear some Members of Parliament contrast the excessive expenditure of the common agricultural policy with policies said to be good in themselves, such as the regional policy and the social policy! If we have the courage to scrutinize all these policies, we will see that there is a lot to criticize, a lot to reform in each of them.

It is also necessary, I believe, to take stock of European Union. What are the strengths and weaknesses of Europe? What can it reasonably do today in the economic sphere? That is what is lacking, and I am happy from this point of view that the President of the Commission mentioned industrial cooperation amongst his priorities. Because this is an important point: if, tomorrow, Europe sees its industry slip between its fingers, if, for example, the problem of the car, which is a symbol of and at the same time one of the foundations of our industrial societies, if a problem of this nature is not tackled at the relevant level, what is the point of discussing the rest? The mandate of 30 May also provides an opportunity for us to agree on Europe's objectives, because the last eighteen months have shown that views as to Europe's vocation differ greatly. On this I do not share Mr Gaston Thorn's optimism when he says, without more ado, that the enlargement and the strengthening of the Community can proceed hand in hand in a simple manner. No. Enlargement is politically necessary. It is our duty towards those young democracies. But enlargement does not of itself imply the strengthening of the Community. As it is we have not properly digested the transition from the Six to the Nine. What would it be like with twelve? We must honestly, frankly, reflect on the consequences of this enlargement and not take refuge in words which are more wishful thinking than a true solution.

Finally, we must agree on the rules of the game. The fact is, we cannot continue as we have done for two years proclaiming 'Europe Europe!' while at the same time behaving in an increasingly inward-looking and nationalistic manner. These two stands are incompatible. The British compromise must be the last gesture of this kind. Not that it has been the only one, let me hasten to say. The Luxembourg compromise also bears its share of responsibility.

## Delors

I should like, however, to comment further on this question of solidarity, which should be the golden rule amongst these rules of the game: there is deliberate solidarity, namely that which makes it possible to strengthen Europe, which should allow all Europeans to feel at home in Europe and to identify with each other. But there is a more elementary solidarity, which one tends to forget: *de facto* solidarity. Whenever a country takes an economic or financial decision which is contrary to the logic of Europe, it destroys a part of this Europe and hinders its progress. These are not my words, they come from a Commission document on economic policy and energy. Our solidarity is a matter of fact, and the recession which is at present affecting the whole of Europe, dangerously aggravating the unemployment problem — although there has been as yet no social upheaval — This recession, as a result of the cumulated free-for-all of recessionist policies, is the best example of this *de facto* solidarity. In other words, before making fine pronouncements on ideal solidarity, let us begin by paying attention to this real and tangible inter-dependence.

For us, elected eighteen months ago by universal suffrage, the sole aim is to restore hope, to reverse the trend. At present Europe only encounters indifference and scepticism. The governments have a tendency to become inward-looking, far more than emerged from Mr Thorn's speech yesterday. It would be easy for some people to regard Europe as the scapegoat, as the cause of their errors and their own failings. That must be changed, so in 1981 the trend must be reversed, one way or another, so as to restore hope. In this context I think that three points merit our attention, because I will not dwell on the programme annexed to Mr Gaston Thorn's speech: it contains all the chapters, but if I were to repeat the expression used by Mendès-France and say 'to govern is to choose', then there are three aims which appear to me to be essential, namely Community autonomy, the fight against unemployment and industrial recovery.

Community autonomy first of all: how can one speak of a Community if it is incapable of speaking with one voice on the great issues and in the important debates that affect the world. That is not possible, in fact there was a disastrous example of this recently, in October if I remember rightly, when the Council of Ministers met to adopt a position on Japan. Well, nothing has come of it yet.

(Applause)

Even worse, on the day when the director responsible for the Community's external trade relations returned empty-handed from Japan, one country proudly announced a Japanese investment there. I have nothing against Japanese investments in Europe, but the coincidence of the two events symbolizes the egocentrism and the refusal to accept *de facto* solidarity. Once again it is not a question of abstract ideas but of facts. If in the next twelve months we do not

succeed in speaking plainly to Japan and the United States, then it is not worth speaking of a 'Community'. Let us speak of a grouping, let us speak of a vague union, of an organization but please let there be no more talk of a Community. What we have to say to the Japanese is simple. Since Japan has become a major power, it must accept the rights and duties of a major power. In other words, it must open its markets to the outside world. One cannot play an international role and bear international responsibility without accepting the *quid pro quo* of its rights and advantages, namely its duties. From the point of view of both commercial policy and monetary policy, Japan must fulfil its obligations, otherwise the upshot will be that, as in 1929-35, it goes it alone and remains an outsider, in which case we must draw our conclusions accordingly.

(Applause)

Either Japan forms part of the international community and assumes its role in relation to the wealth and power it enjoys, or else it puts itself outside the rules of the game. The same reasoning applies in the case of the United States. What is meant by a policy based solely on the increase in interest rates and which does not give a damn about the effects of these rises — of up to 20 % on the rest of the world? Can a country which claims to share the leadership of the world with the USSR take that liberty? Can the Community continue to tolerate, can it resign itself to these soaring interest rates which jeopardize the main aspects of our economies and aggravate the recession in our countries?

(Applause)

How much longer will West Germany and Europe consent to pay, in the form of hundreds of millions more unemployed, for an American policy which neither succeeds in controlling inflation nor in restoring a world economic and monetary order? It is not a question of European egocentricity. Europe must speak with one voice in order to shoulder its international responsibilities. It is right to be concerned about the Middle East, it is right to table resolutions on this question, it is right to discuss the North-South Dialogue and to shed crocodile tears for the developing countries.

But, if we do not take a firm stand *vis-à-vis* those who are prosperous and who hold the key to part of the world's destiny, then it is not worth wasting our breath. We must start by putting our own house in order, by reaching an agreement and by speaking with one voice. That is European autonomy. It is not turning inward, it is not protectionism, it is equipping oneself with the means to exercise one's international responsibilities. And it is on this count that I for my part will judge the action of the Council of Ministers and of the Commission.

(Applause)

## Delors

The second priority is the struggle against unemployment. I never answer a journalist who asks me at what point unemployment becomes explosive. I simply point out that the present level of unemployment in Europe undermines everything: equal opportunity, social achievements, improved working conditions, inventiveness. It is the most vicious evil that can befall our countries and it will mean that twenty years from now we will all be second-rate powers. And when I say *powers*, I exaggerate, for in fact we shall be relegated to the level of subjects. Even if in the next two years we cannot find the miracle cure, we must at least reverse the trend. The fact is, we have the means to do this. What has happened in the past two years? I have pleaded — and I am not the only one, if I were there would be no point — I have pleaded that we should not launch into a destructive round of recessionist policies. My pleas have not been heard, our pleas have not been heard. There have been no Community loans, no measures have been introduced to ensure a minimum of activity. The result is that we still have inflation, an external trade deficit and a further two million unemployment. This is confirmation of the total failure of 'go-it-alone' policies, it is confirmation of the mental aberration which makes us believe that the monetary weapon is the only way to solve all our problems. When will we understand that it is not possible? The outcome of such a policy is that the worst off go further downhill and the least affected countries become afflicted in their turn.

Against the background of this lamentable trend, I for my part welcomed the suggestion by the Dutch Government at the last European Council to hold what is called — I don't know why — the 'Jumbo Conference'. I interpreted it as an exceptional effort, an act of political will, a consultation on some points which would make it possible to reverse the trend, to say 'No', increased unemployment is not inevitable; no, the more widespread inequality caused by unemployment is not unavoidable; no, the erosion of the social advantages already achieved is not inevitable. We are taking the bull by the horns, and are bringing in measures to change the trend. Everybody knows that, even with the best policy in the world, a return to full employment would require 5 to 10 years. But let us at least make a start! I am already thinking of the direct election of the next Parliament. Frankly, I for my part would not have the courage in the present circumstances to go before the electorate to plead in favour of Europe. That is impossible. It is unthinkable as long as we are incapable of reversing, if only slightly, the current trend. This, I feel, is why this conference must take place. It must be carefully prepared of course. What is the point of yet another conference if it serves no purpose? But as regards work sharing, the creation of public sector employment, industrial recovery, vigorous measures to control supply, and full and complete attunement to the new industrial revolution, Europe can seize its opportunity and take a few steps this year to improve

the climate and the trend. That is what is meant by restoring hope.

And finally, I raise the question of industrial cooperation, because this is related to employment. Industrial cooperation is the symbol of Europe's autonomy. What do we mean when we speak of industrial cooperation? It is an idea which is so simple that I scarcely dare to spell it out. Individually, at national level, we are too small to meet the dual challenge of the trend towards a world-wide economy and the new industrial revolution. Today it is against a background of groups of 300 to 400 million consumers that the standards of production are set, major innovations achieved and the great challenges met. Japan has an enormous sub-contracting market which it uses as it likes. It has outlets. The Americans have 300 million consumers. It is on such markets that the strength required to become subsequent exporters is built up. It is on these markets that the selection takes place which allows the successful mastering of the new industrial revolution. What are we appealing for? Whenever Community action can boost national efforts and company efforts, it must be taken, irrespective of any dogma — it is not a question of dirigism or liberalism but a question of realizing that there is government intervention in each of our countries. Whenever action gets underway, cooperation at European level is a valid response and one to which we must have recourse in a pragmatic manner, starting this year. An important test, I repeat, is the automobile. If nothing is done, then nothing will be possible. Undoubtedly, and I will conclude here, the greatest evil affecting Europe is resignation and indifference. What I was and am expecting is some well-designed, concerted, priority measures, which will mean that the Commission will have to be rigorous in selecting the proposals which it draws up and then implements. These measures must be selected and it is primarily these which in my opinion should have been mentioned in the speech by the President of the Commission. It is these few priority measures which we are waiting for. If they are introduced, we will be giving new hope to Europe and helping to disperse the gloom. And since everybody has concluded with a quotation, allow me to borrow one from Emmanuel Mounier, who said 'A well-placed rock can divert the stream'.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Adonnino.

**Mr Adonnino.** — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr President of the Commission, you outlined in your speech the general principles which will guide the Commission and the broad lines of its action with reference to the programme of work which has been distributed to us and which contains a wealth of working details. This is a set of good intentions which must naturally be subject to checks on whether they have actually been carried out.

**Adonnino**

Amongst the many hazards which the ship of the Community — whose helmsman you have been called upon to become, Mr Thorn — has to face in the present raging sea, the first reef you have to negotiate, which, even though it is not of the size of an iceberg, is nonetheless tricky enough, is that of how to find a solution to the problem of the second supplementary budget for 1980 and the 1981 budget.

The Commission has initiated the infringement procedure and stated that it is open to suggestions on how to solve the problem. This is the attitude to adopt and we should go along with it. Nonetheless, some details are needed, and I intend to supply them on behalf of my Group. Discussion, Mr Thorn, cannot take place on the principles. The budgets have been definitively adopted and now have to be executed by all those who are charged with implementing them. The procedures have been carried out according to regulations and each institution has had the chance to exercise its particular prerogatives as fully as it wished. The principle of an annual and specific budget cannot be called into question, since it has been observed to a large extent by Parliament, which even restored in its final version those parts which in all likelihood were going to be left out. Notwithstanding this fact, problems still remain, such as the extent to which 1980 funds may be used in 1981 as a result of the automatic carry-over. The dialogue needs to be carried on with the governments which opposed expenditure, in order to try to convince them of the need to find a final destination for the larger items of expenditure, that such expenditure is absolutely necessary and must be fully used and that in this way Community objectives may be reached. The dispute here is not of a technical but of a political nature, and political issues are ill-suited — unless this proves absolutely necessary — to being resolved by solemn assertions.

As you also mentioned, Mr Thorn, the Community has no need of crises but rather of changes in its institutions. These changes might well even be achieved at the outset by a correct and flexible interpretation of the existing legislation.

Mr President, the solution of the budget dispute, by questioning not the way in which funds have been allocated but rather the use to which funds are put, raises the question of the reply which the Commission must give by June 1981 to the questions put to it by the Council on 30 May 1980, on reorganizing Community policies and the financial problems appertaining to this.

The terms of the Council's question can be defined in a number of ways. The reply which you, the Commission, ought to give may be based on a wide variety of outlooks. The first answer you might give could be based on a narrow outlook, which would simply aim at avoiding any repetition in the near future of what have been termed 'unacceptable situations'. Another reply — and this is the direction which we urge you to

follow, Mr Thorn — would instead consist of broadening the horizons of your investigation and of your proposals, this to be achieved by rethinking the objectives, reworking the instruments and strict control of the suitability of expenditure with respect to the objectives sought and of the validity of the results obtained, of the cost-effectiveness of such expenditure and the inter-relationship between the various items of expenditure, both amongst themselves and in conjunction with expenditure by individual Member States. The President of the Council mentioned some interesting ideas, but even on these I feel that there is a need to go somewhat deeper. The points which we, as the Parliamentary delegation, very often heard raised by the Council during the budget procedure concerned the link which exists between the increase in Community public spending and in national public spending. As I see it, the problem — as I have already had occasion to explain in this House — is that there is no comparability between the two situations, even though they are closely linked.

That is why, Mr President, my Group feels that the action of the Commission ought to be assessed according to its determination and ability to draw up an overall doctrine for Community public spending, a doctrine which also takes into account the relationship between the economic policies of the various Member States. It is essential that these policies should not interfere with Community policy and that they should be interlocking, with a view to laying down the lines along which the Commission's options should travel, as well as for the options which the Council and Parliament must take, and to ensuring that any future, disputes, even if they are of a legislative or institutional nature, can be disputes of a specifically economic nature which are definitely much better suited to the ends and aims of our committee.

Mr President, whilst remaining within the limits of the time allotted to me, I should like to make one final remark. As part of the assessment of the various policies, I should like, this House to examine the possibility of, or the need for, an overall Community policy on tourism, one which would go far beyond what is laid down in the two 1976 Directives, which are restricted to general statements of principle, and the 1980 Directive, which is restricted to a very specific sector. These are my views, Mr President, which I now offer to you and to this House for appraisal.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Dalakouras.

**Mr Dalakouras.** — *(EL)* Mr President, it would be an exaggeration to say that yesterday's speech by Mr Thorn filled me with optimism for the future of Europe. The bad economic and social situation in our countries is no secret, nor is it, unfortunately, a purely

**Dalakouras**

European phenomenon. I should like to add, moreover, that neither the state of mind nor the morale of nations and individuals is good at the moment.

The European might be imagined as a man waiting to be shipwrecked. Faced with imminent disaster, he is either completely apathetic or completely hysterical, while the only way he could save himself is by being calm, methodical and cool. The problem of energy is the most typical feature of this picture. Mr Thorn reminded us yesterday of a number of well-known facts, such as that Europe, more than any other economic association, imports most of its energy and raw materials, that in 1980 the Community countries had an oil bill of 100 000 million and that, with the exception of the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, the Member States are the most dependent countries in the world on external supplies.

I should also like to add that Europe is at a greater disadvantage than America, which has untapped energy reserves, and than the Eastern bloc, whose regimes are able to put infinitely more pressure on the consumer than is the case in our countries and are certainly able to make better economic and political use of their energy resources even when they are dwindling.

But what is the Community doing about this programme? Mr Thorn said that we had learnt to live with the crisis but also that we must learn to tackle it. But has the Community got a real energy policy with which to tackle the crisis? In the short-term we must struggle to secure today's energy requirements, and here I think that a purely national policy predominates because each government, under the pressure of everyday needs, often in a state of panic and almost always hard pressed by public opinion, hastens to obtain petrol for its country by always giving something more and something else to the oil-producing countries, and there is no doubt that in doing so they are dancing to the tune of the producers at the expense of all of us.

The conclusion could thus be drawn that there is no short-term Community energy policy, since the special measures to which Mr Thorn referred certainly cannot be described as a systematic policy.

This idea also leads to the conclusion that the absence of any such policy has two disastrous consequences.

Firstly, it aggravates the economic situation in the Member States, since this blatant free-for-all can certainly never manage either to curb fuel prices or to improve the terms.

Secondly, and even worse, it undermines the Community's continuing and long-term energy policy which, quite rightly, must be geared to restricting energy consumption, lowering our dependence on oil and increasing our use of solid fuels, nuclear energy and new renewable sources of energy. The former Greek

Prime Minister and current President of the Republic, Mr Karamanlis, has repeatedly called for the setting up of a short-term and long-term Community energy policy, since it is a well-known and accepted economic rule that your only protection if you are faced with a monopoly is to unite consumers.

In connection with these ideas I shall turn, Mr President, to the famous story of Odysseus to say that it must be very small consolation when the producers say to a Western country 'Don't worry, I won't eat you till last'.

When the smaller countries begin to flag under the intense strain of procuring energy, it will only be a question of time before the same thing happens to the larger and stronger ones.

It is therefore time to join together with great discipline, determination and courage in readiness for the struggle now and tomorrow, since the day after tomorrow or next year we shall still be weaker and the other side will still be stronger. I therefore appeal to the Commission and Parliament to decide without delay on an immediate and sound common energy policy.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Kirk.

**Mr Kirk.** — *(DK)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak in this debate because I feel that many important matters have been raised by the various speakers. Amongst other things attention was drawn to many important points which were missing from the programme of activities presented by Mr Thorn yesterday. I must say that I found Mr Thorn's presentation and speech extremely brilliant, but like many of the other speakers before me I missed some practical initiatives on the part of the Commission which would enable the Community to really come to grips with the problems facing it.

However, I observed that Mr Thorn also devoted time to inter-institutional relations. I am pleased that the Commission intends to treat Parliament as a directly-elected Assembly but I ask myself whether we in the European Parliament behave as directly elected representatives in our relations with Commission, whether the manner in which we hold debates, the manner in which we actually participate in the Commission's programme of activities, would in reality give us the influence we wish to have on European development.

I noted also that Mr Thorn indicated that one obvious way of solving the problems facing the Community in the absence of decisions from the Council of Ministers, was to change the decision-making process and

**Kirk**

all in all, as Mr Thorn expressed it, to go over to the qualified majority vote to a greater extent in the Council. I must however say that I am not convinced that that would not be the right solution, because contrary to what Mr Thorn imagines, it is probably not true that the Member State governments really represent European interests. As far as I can see our experience has often been that what the governments represent in the Council is nothing other than the individual government's interest. For this reason I believe that it is tremendously important, instead of trying to strengthen the decision-making process in the Council, to ensure that the European Parliament, which is directly elected by the citizens of Europe, plays a greater role in the decision-making process.

I would like to ask Parliament and the Commission if it is in fact in the interest of the Community citizens that President Giscard d'Estaing be re-elected in France, Helmut Schmidt in Germany, and Anker Jørgensen in Denmark. It is perhaps in the interests of some of them but it is not certain that it is in the interests of the whole Community. The policy often pursued in the Council is very clearly revealed in its objective, which is that the governments should be re-elected. This is precisely the problem we are facing. This is the stumbling block we face in the Council, this is why decisions often cannot be taken.

However, we must come out of this crisis. This is why I missed a resolute policy in Mr Thorn's programme of activities, a policy to tackle, amongst other things, the problems which the previous speaker illustrated so excellently, namely energy problems which exist. In the interests of the Community we must do something about the very real energy problems. Each time that we are on the point of recovering from one more energy price increase the Community receives a further blow and we sink down again: the OPEC countries are allowing their prices to rise at the present time to ensure that we can never restore proper order in our economies. Here I believe we have an opportunity to introduce a policy which will make it clear to Community citizens that this is a Community task which extends beyond the more national interests which so often stand in our way.

I noted also in Mr Thorn's speech that he was somewhat doubtful about whether the Community will be able to admit the new applicant countries Spain and Portugal, whether we have the political and economic strength to carry them along. However, should we not instead of asking this question, instead of being doubtful, formulate a policy which could assist in developing these countries and which could at the same time help industry in the existing Community. All in all we should try to do what the USA did after the Second World War: we should draw up a Marshall Plan for Europe, develop the weak regions both in the existing Community and in the countries which are interested in becoming Community members.

Owing to pressure of time, I cannot go into these points in detail. But I should like to mention briefly one element of Mr Thorn's speech yesterday which pleased me: Mr Thorn clearly stressed that there is no question of reforming the common agricultural policy, that it must instead be adjusted. I would like to say to the Commission that it can count on our full support in this, because that is exactly what is needed. We do not need to change the principles of the common agricultural policy radically. However, I hope that the whole Commission will adopt this policy because unfortunately in the former Commission there were a few members who viewed the problems of the common agricultural policy from a purely budgetary point of view and not as problems of adjustment.

Finally, Mr President of the Commission, I wish to say that I found the section dealing with the common fisheries policy rather poorly thought out. I have read what the former Commission had proposed as solutions for a common fisheries policy even in the past four years, and that is, word for word, identical to what I read here now. I believe that this Commission really must make an effort. The Commission must take a stand against the big countries so that the national interests which these countries are trying to protect can be set aside thus enabling us to go ahead to solve the problems and to introduce the policy which we claim to have been striving after now for four years. We must not find ourselves in the situation, which unfortunately we experienced in previous years, where the Commission succumbs to pressure from the big countries.

Finally, I should like to say that yesterday a Danish representative in the Technical Coordination Group held a speech in which amongst other things, he entertained great doubts about the Danish people's contribution to solving Europe's problems. I am fully convinced that the Danish people want to help in solving the problems facing the Community, that is if we are all prepared to pull up our socks and make a determined effort to drag ourselves out of this *impasse*. Under no circumstances can I accept the manner in which Mr Skovmand of the Technical Group presented matters yesterday. That is nothing other than misrepresentation. That is not the position of the Danish people who are indeed prepared to help in solving the problems.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (*F*) Mr President, I shall not pretend that I am going to speak on Mr Thorn's report in the three short minutes allotted to me, because this would be both presumptuous and untrue. In any Parliament worthy of the name, real debates on basic issues, analyses of historical developments and the business of setting objectives cannot be conducted in the sort of conditions under which certain representatives of

**Pannella**

minority groups, such as myself, are obliged to work in this House. Such representatives are granted three or four minutes' speaking time, as indeed are a very large proportion of the Members, belonging to the majority groups, who are forced to keep their peace and consequently to lose all the political impact they might have had.

Mr Thorn, I have heard rumours that the major political groups may not be too happy with your statement, because they feel that you did not offer enough, and couched your report in terms which were too vague. This is as may be, but the large political groups are the faithful representatives of the Council of the Ten, of national governments and of the princes who reign over us. They are representatives of the political vacuum in Europe, in other words of the majority in this House. I think we have, at the outset, to go along with the petty squabbling in which this independent and sovereign House indulges with an executive which in some ways has other political interests. Mr President of the Commission, we are now continually subjected to an assault on the 'social and political lepers' which 90 % of Europeans feel us to be, in a Europe where people are disenfranchised and gagged. And should by chance, in spite of rigged elections and electoral laws which are loaded against us, one of these lepers be elected to this House, then the Rules of Procedure are altered and broken and that person is prevented from talking about those matters which it is our duty to discuss.

You have just indicated to me, Mr President of the Parliament, that my speaking time is up. So is it then that I have done my bit, or at least what was expected of me. This means, Mr Thorn, that the reply which one school of thought in Europe will give, not to you personally but to this Community, will have to be given from elsewhere. I only hope that it will not make itself heard through violence. However that may be, it is certainly not via this House that you will get the help and support of constructive criticism and of an alternative solution to our problems.

**President.** — I call Mrs De March.

**Mrs De March.** — (*F*) Mr President, Europe is going through a grave crisis which is hitting all sectors, and it is this very result which spells an indictment of the policies applied up to now by the Common Market and by the Commission of the European Communities. The people responsible for this state of affairs are the same people who are working together within the Commission, which is chosen by the national governments, and who cover a political spectrum for the various countries from Conservative to Social Democrat. We noted in passing that Mr Glinne, on behalf of the Socialist Group, did not omit to stress the fact that this consensus existed.

Yes, the situation has never been so clear as it is today. You expressed, Mr Thorn, the Commission's open intention to alter its status to that of a supranational body, and you appealed to the European Assembly to play its role as remover of national sovereignty and to continue to act as it does today as a democratic facade. You expressed your determination to broaden the scope and authority of the Commission by abolishing the unanimity rule and by supporting the principle of an increase in the Community's own resources. You yourself state that enlargement is one of the basic means of achieving all these aims. The French Members of the Communist and Allies Group vigorously oppose such intentions. We refuse the Commission the right to speak on behalf of France. We are here as the representatives of a country and we shall never accept seeing its interests, which are one and the same as those of the workers, trampled underfoot in order to provide huge profits exclusively for the multinationals.

My second point concerns economic and social policy. You dodged the issue by not mentioning the causes of this crisis. Similarly, your speech never once answers the question of who dominates Europe. You say you are concerned about unemployment, but in the same breath and in spite of the figure of 8 million unemployed, you decide to carry on along the same path, which is that of a policy of industrial reorganization.

You say you want to tackle the real issues in a new way, but you then aim your appeal at the workers and I noted several times the words 'sacrifice' and 'worker mobility' in your speech. These, then, are the solutions you propose to go with your noble intentions.

When you talk about the steel, shipbuilding and textile industries, it is merely in order to refer to the new reorganization plans, whose most striking result will be thousands of lay-offs in our various countries and — as I have had cause to note — in my region. In fact, far from being constructive the Common Market has become a firm of wreckers — witness the plan for shipbuilding. And now you are asking yourselves, why is Europe so little respected? How can you possibly expect to obtain support from the people in the regions of Europe which, if the democratic workers' movement in France and in all the European countries did not engage in a struggle and show its determination to oppose the dismantling of the economic infrastructure, would become wastelands and, for some amongst us, would become huge leisure areas for rich visitors, regions in which the right to live, work and participate in the decision-making processes of one's region are denied.

Lastly, how can one avoid noting the determination of the new Commission to reduce farm expenditure, which is thought to be increasing much too fast? This sentence makes perfectly clear the threats which exist for the fixing of farm prices, for farm incomes and for the continued existence of small and medium-sized

**De March**

family holdings, whose fate is linked to the inevitable and unmentionable outcome of enlargement. This policy was born of the way in which the crisis is managed by the Right and by the Social Democrats who govern Europe. And for their acceptance of the faithful management of the interests of the capitalistic forces, the social-democratic parties in the Community bear a heavy responsibility. There is no point in all talking together about an independent Europe. The fact is that you are cut off from the peoples you represent because they do not have any affinity with the Europe you are building. Your fear of the future is brought out by your frightening portrayal of a possible disintegration of the Community by 1985.

Yes, Mr Thorn, there is a fundamental difference of opinion between you and the Communists. This difference is based on the fact that you, together with the Commission, support a fully integrated Europe, in which the individual nations are brought to their knees. But what we want is cooperation between strong, sovereign and independent nations, since we consider the idea of national sovereignty as an idea which has historical roots and continues to have a dynamic and fruitful life of its own. As for the French Communists, they offer a new path towards a Europe which serves the interests of the workers, a path which is a truly national one. You talk about efficiency. I agree, efficiency can come from a new economic policy based on economic and social progress, and in order to achieve this we must oppose the power of the multinationals, which stifles both people and industries. Yes, efficiency means fair shares for all and a new type of growth in which men and women will have all the basic guarantees and all the rights they should have. You talk about solidarity. Yes, we want Europe to show solidarity towards the least well-off and we do not want to see any more use made of the food weapon against peoples who are fighting for freedom.

Yes, we must show solidarity towards developing countries, whose way of life is a glaring contrast to the best this age has to offer . . .

On this subject, I also noted that you were very reluctant to take into account a basic factor of this modern age, that is the new world economic order. For our part, we dare to say 'Away with selfishness!' It is the fact that we feel a real solidarity with the peoples of the Mediterranean regions which leads us to restate here and now our irreversible opposition to enlargement of any kind and to demand an immediate halt to negotiations.

Our aspirations towards social progress and peace lead us to raise for the second time — and in this we are the only French Members of this House so to do — the dangers inherent in pooling arms production. We denounce Viscount Davignon's note on a common defence strategy, which goes against the Treaties and the notion of national independence. We recommend

that a broad consensus be found in order to stop the arms race and to found a peaceful Europe. This should be one of the main objectives of the Commission, so that over and above speeches we can help millions of people in the world to live, and I mean those who have to endure the most humiliating thing of all: starvation because they do not have the right to eat.

These are objectives which would help us to attain freedoms befitting the age we live in. Security means that nations must be independent, it requires full sovereignty, presupposes the right to peace and a halt to such horrifying projects as the neutron bomb or a European defence force. We are striving towards these noble goals, since that is why we are elected. Luckily, millions of workers and their trade unions are taking action along the same lines all over Europe from France to Italy, from Belgium to Germany. This is what we were elected for, and it is with these people that we are building a new future for the peoples of Europe, one based on justice, human dignity, freedom and peace.

*(Applause from the extreme left)*

**President.** — I call Mr Cecovini.

**Mr Cecovini.** — *(I)* Mr President, first and foremost I wish to express my personal esteem for Mr Thorn, whom I regard not only as a brilliant politician and statesman but above all as a level-headed expert on the basic Community policies, and especially the agricultural and energy policies, the references to which in the report and memorandum I appreciated. With regard to energy, the old saying that the best medicine is to save it undoubtedly bears repeating. To achieve this result, however, a truly far-sighted Community regional and transport policy is also required. Let us be honest and admit that little has been done so far in these sectors. Among other things, it is necessary to eliminate the existing bottlenecks, to shorten and rationalize the so-called European routes which have already been mentioned by ex-Commissioner Burke, and to which I think the attention of the new Commission should be drawn.

The Channel Tunnel the port of Trieste, the Straits of Messina — these are a few typical bottlenecks in the North-South routes, which are, however, not even mentioned either in the report or in the memorandum. One is therefore justified in wondering if a policy exists on this matter. Among other things, the accession of Greece to the Community again raises the urgent need for homogeneity among the various European regions, to be pursued first and foremost through a policy of practical action instead of merely with fine words.

The memorandum stresses the importance that the Community Mediterranean policies will assume in

**Cecovini**

1981. The new agreement with Yugoslavia is rightly mentioned. But what does the Commission plan to do for the Adriatic route, which is the most direct, economic and independent route from Community Europe to Greece, the Middle East, Egypt and east of Suez?

It is clear that all the policies depend on the regional and transport policy, and that integrated measures must be strengthened, especially when an overwhelming Community interest can be perceived, not conflicting with, but in certain cases transcending, the more immediate national needs.

The Community must be made less abstract and more attentive to the real needs of local communities. Moreover, I think you were right to stress your declared intention, Mr Thorn, to carry out Commission planning in a constant dialogue and consensus with Parliament. This all ties in with Mr Spinelli's noble idea of a very necessary reform of Parliament, designed to increase its dignity and political weight.

After all, this is not a revolutionary proposal, given that Article 235 of the EEC Treaty also allows for measures not expressly mentioned in the Treaty, provided that they are needed to achieve its goals, and no-one could say that a European Parliament with increased powers would not satisfy that provision.

We therefore have the technical and legal means to carry out this reform and the political will to carry it out is now being expressed. You and we — to use your words, Mr Thorn — are empowered to make any proposal whatever. Let us therefore begin by proposing this reform. Let us start to talk more about Community and less about common market, mutton, butter and surpluses which profit the few at the expense of the many.

Europe — and this, too, is implied in your speech — is above all a political and cultural reality and cannot be reduced to merely mercantile terms — however important — not least because only a strong and aware political union will enable us to overcome this economic crisis and possible future crises, which seem to be the dominant theme of these last decades of the century.

*(Applause from the Liberal Group)*

**President.** — I call Mr Fanton.

**Mr Fanton.** — *(F)* Mr President, I should like to tell the President of the Commission that all of us in this House appreciated the high standard of his speech. I am not just saying this to flatter his pride but because it is true. Dare I say, however, that although we were satisfied with the overall standard of his speech, and my Group at least was well satisfied with it, when it

comes to the details we at times felt thwarted, especially where agricultural policy was concerned.

Mr Thorn, you referred to the 30 May deadline. We are all aware in this House that the coming year will be taken up by the difficulties of the common agricultural policy, not just because of this deadline, but also because of its budget repercussions. However, in your thirty-page long speech, less than one page is devoted to the common agricultural policy. It is true that you expressed a positive attitude on this matter, and that reassures us. You stated that Europe needs a strong agriculture and that there was no chance of the broad principles of the common agricultural policy being called into question. We thank you for this two-fold declaration of intent, because it echoes our concern and this is for us one of the prerequisites for continuing the agricultural policy.

But, almost in the same breath, you added a new principle. And might I venture to say that this new principle does not appear to us to meet in any way the requirement for breathing new life — as you put it — into the CAP. What you stated was in fact that the new Commission wished to rejuvenate the CAP by involving the farmers in seeing that it is well managed, in particular by applying the principle of co-responsibility. We were able to read in a report drawn up by Mr Gundelach during his time in office that co-responsibility was for the former Commission one of the ideas on which the whole reform was based. I am sorry to see — and I am being perfectly frank on this matter — that you felt that this could now be termed a new principle, because, let us be honest about it, this is not a principle but simply an expedient. The fact is that I did not quite understand how what you said marries up with what is stated in the report which we are now discussing in the Committee on Agriculture and which we will soon be debating in this House. You say that you wish to involve the farmers in the good management of this policy, but that is not at all what emerges from the way in which the co-responsibility levy is extended in the document before us today. The producers are in fact not involved in management at all. And it seemed to us that for the Commission the co-responsibility levy was more a supplementary means of income than a means of influencing farm policy. Once all types of produce are eligible for the co-responsibility levy, with no distinction being drawn between those which produce surpluses and those which do not, and with no breakdown within each type of produce, but simply imposed on everyone, then you should not call this a co-responsibility levy, but rather a levy on farm produce which will perhaps enable the Commission to undertake other policies. This is why we are more than a little reticent on this general motion. We would not like, Mr President, to see co-responsibility becoming, both in your mind and in that of the Commission, a fourth principle added to those which have existed since the inception of the CAP, because if this were the case, and contrary to what you would seem to be

Fanton

saying, we would be turning our backs on the basic principles of the CAP. Co-responsibility can in no way take the place of the other guiding principles of the CAP, and it cannot be added to them either. This is why I wish to stress this point. It is true that you spoke so little on agricultural policy that you did not perhaps have time to say everything. However, on this particular matter, you said a little too much, I can only hope that this was inadvertent.

There was another subject in your speech, Mr Thorn, which worried us, and that was the question of farm prices. You actually stated in the one sentence you devoted to this issue that proposals had already been drawn up and that we would be given more information in one week's time. I suppose we will glean this information from the press because in one week's time we will no longer be sitting and you will not be able to speak before us. But what really worries me, Mr Thorn, is the schedule. We have already stated here that things needed to progress faster than usual this year. I am well aware of the reasons, linked to the Commission's sad loss, which can explain the fact that we are already behind-hand, but I am afraid that this delay is not merely the outcome of that event and I am worried that farm prices may once more not be fixed by 1 April. We are being told now that the Commission will perhaps come up with some solutions on 18 February, and that then the Council will give its opinion on these proposals. I am afraid that on 1 April the measures will not be ready. Once more, Mr Thorn, the Community's farmers are going to wonder if the only outcome of the cumbersome mechanism which exists at present is not to place them in tighter and tighter situations, since it has often been said here, and I should have liked not to have to repeat it, that we cannot constantly put off the fixing of farm prices without jeopardizing the credibility of the CAP.

Mr President of the Commission, I thank you for your statement on the guiding principles of the common agricultural policy. I should merely like to add in conclusion that we shall be watchful as to their observance, that we do not under any circumstances wish to see them called into question and we should like the Commission to follow its views through to their logical conclusion. The common agricultural policy means Community preference. We should in particular, Mr President, like to see you preserve the single market system. We should like the Commission to insist that Community preference be observed to the hilt by everyone all the time. And on the subject of price unity, which is now under attack, we should also like the Commission to ensure that this is observed too, in particular by abolishing positive compensatory amounts. But above all, we want the common agricultural policy to be pursued with our support and we particularly want it to be pursued along the lines laid down by those who conceived it and, on this matter, we shall be totally unshakable.

(Applause)

President. — I call Mr Bøgh.

Mr Bøgh. — (DK) Mr President, as a representative of minority views in this House, both on national and EEC policy issues, I am allergic to any suggestion that the majority should vote down the minority. Indeed there have been many grounds for allergic reactions in this Parliament in the last twenty-four hours. There were grounds for such reactions in Mr Thorn's European visions, in the motion for a resolution put forward in connection with Mr Thorn's speech, and in the conduct of this Parliament's proceedings this very morning.

Mr President, a democracy is not, as you know characterized by the fact that the majority has its way but by the fact that the minority's view is heard. This morning this Parliament faced its democratic ordeal by fire when representatives of the weakest nation, Greenland, presented to us that country's dispute with the EEC's strongest nation. Mr President, Parliament did not pass this test. Firstly, the only really urgent item amongst a profusion of pseudo urgent items was not dealt with. Secondly, what occurred was far worse in that the small nation's cry for help was met with nonchalance by the majority of Parliament. When the President called Mr Lyngé it was the signal for a general exodus accompanied by loud talk and noise. And what was even worse, the President refused the speaker's request to restore order so that he could be heard.

Mr President, I believe that can guarantee this Parliament that the majority's behaviour this morning towards the small Greenland population and its representative has brought Greenland's withdrawal from the EEC in the forthcoming referendum a great deal closer. For this reason the Danish representatives will proclaim a resounding 'no' to the proposal, moved by Jonker and others in connection with Mr Thorn's report, to increase this Parliament's powers, which thank God are not especially great.

Mr President, those of us who represent minority views feel that there is a conspiracy under way against national influence and accordingly against minority rights in the EEC. On the one hand we have Mr Thorn's proposal to reduce the importance of the Council of Ministers, which is the only defence against being voted down by the majority, and his proposal to abolish the right of veto which is the small countries' last weapon. On the other hand we have the unflagging attempts by those for whom Europe is written in capital letters, to increase this Parliament's powers at the expense of the national parliaments. For this reason, Mr President, I should like to stress that only the national parliaments can change the balance of power, whether it be between the EEC's main institutions or between the EEC's national governments and parliaments. So one may as well refrain from fantasizing about such a change.

**President.** — I call Mr Gondicas.

**Mr Gondicas.** — (*EL*) Mr President, if one wanted to sum up Mr Thorn's speech yesterday in one sentence, one would say that the President of the Commission affirmed once again his deep faith in and his devotion to the fundamental principles of the Community. The way in which he pointed out the dangers surrounding us and his vivid comparison of Europe to a house which is in need of someone to look after it properly show that the President and his colleagues are aware of the problems and are working to solve them.

In his extremely comprehensive speech Mr Thorn avoided, however, any reference to the solutions he envisages and the measures he intends to take with regard to various problems, nor are they referred to in the report which, as he rightly said, had in fact been distributed to us beforehand. After what we heard yesterday I should like to think that we shall soon have the opportunity of finding out what the Commission's proposals are without being confronted, as has happened very often hitherto, with a set of *faits-accomplis*. The problems exist and solutions must be found. I am glad, Mr President, that Mr Thorn stressed that the solutions will be found objectively without any influence whatsoever from outside. Those who are trying to find solutions should bear in mind that all of us are waiting to see what will happen with regard to boosting economic activity in the Community, reviewing the Community's position on social questions, taking a decision on the creation of the new labour market policy and developments relating to the common agricultural policy.

I have deliberately left till last a point which, although touched on in Mr Thorn's report, in my view is not dealt with in sufficient detail, namely that the Community belongs to the generations yet to come. It is for them that we are working and hoping for the best. I would ask the Commission to pay more attention to the problems of young people and to find ways of convincing them that within the Community they will live in security and peace.

On the other hand, Mr President, I do not think it is a coincidence that the speech by the President of the Commission followed that of a great statesman. By his presence among us President Sadat stressed the enormous importance which the whole world attaches to the Europe of the Ten. But at the same time this also imposes on all of us the obligation to work together to consolidate Europe's role. In your speech, Mr Thorn, you asked Parliament to give you its political backing in your work. Permit me to say that it depends on you and your colleagues whether you retain until the end of your period of office the sincere support and goodwill of us all that you enjoy today.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — I call Mr Gautier.

**Mr Gautier.** — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to take the opportunity offered by this debate on the Commission's report to discuss a number of specific problems regarding the Community's fishery policy. It says on page 18 of its programme that the Commission will be giving priority to the introduction of a common fishery policy in 1981. Following the breakdown of negotiations in the Council of Ministers last night, though, I get the impression that, by the time we have such a policy, there will be either no more fish or no more fishermen. I should like to ask the Commission what steps it plans to take in the future now that deadlock has apparently been reached in the Council. It would appear that all hell has now broken loose in the European Community over this issue. British fishermen have gone on strike and intend to blockade the ports. German ports have already been blockaded and French trawlers have been turned back. Today we have seen the first lorryloads of fish from Denmark and the Netherlands sent back from Germany — not by the German Government, but by workers in the fish-processing industry.

The Council's role in all this is to go and destroy jobs. There are, of course, grounds for saying that some jobs here and there are in danger because — from a purely objective point of view — there is no alternative. It is the Community's job, though, to allocate the fish; the only problem is that we are not capable of reaching political agreement and of making the best use of the available fish stocks.

For instance, fishing rights around the Shetland Isles have been used to block an agreement with a third country, Canada. There was a debate this morning in this House on the claim that there was no relationship between fishing around Denmark and Greenland and that the catch quotas for the two countries — or rather the two parts of the same country — should be set separately. What, then, is there to stop the Commission denying that there is a tie-up between the Shetland Isles and Canada? Why is the Commission or the Council not capable of following Parliament's advice and, for instance, excluding the agreement with Canada from the general fisheries negotiations? I should like to ask the Commission whether it is prepared to go along with Parliament's decision and, for instance, forward the agreement with Canada to the Council of Foreign Ministers as an external trade agreement, whereupon it will be up to the Council to reach a majority decision.

It is quite incredible that no-one allegedly has anything against the quota allocation, the structural policy, the market organization or the agreement with Canada and other third countries, but that the European institutions are still incapable of putting a fisheries policy into effect. I can only say that, if the

**Gautier**

Council carries on as it has been doing and if the Commission likewise fails to make any progress, the upshot will be that, in my own country for instance, the entire deep-sea fishing industry will go to the wall and, in a very short space of time, thousands of people will lose their jobs, with all the attendant long-term repercussions in the processing industry.

I should like to remind the Commission that, when the compromise over the British contribution to the budget was reached in May last year, a political link was established between the fisheries policy and the budget repayments to the United Kingdom. What is the Commission's view of this situation now that the fisheries negotiations have broken down? Personally, I have every sympathy for the actions being taken now by fishermen throughout the Community. I simply cannot understand why our institutions are incapable of doing something in the fishermen's interests.

Nobody in the European Community understands the haggling in the Council, where the Ministers spent three days behind locked doors without achieving any result at all. We expect the Commission to persevere with its efforts to bring about structural changes in the Community institutions, so that the Council can at last take up agreed positions which are in the interests of the people of Europe, and not in the interests of those who think they can spend three nights haggling until, by the end, no one knows any more what they are haggling about.

*(Applause from the left)*

**President.** — I call Mr Fischbach.

**Mr Fischbach.** — *(F)* Mr President, yesterday the President of the Commission, in a serious but optimistic tone, outlined for us the key points of the Commission's work programme for the coming term of office. Whilst drawing a clear distinction between the work which needs to be carried out in 1981 and the broad lines of the Commission's work which will be spread over the next four years, no Member of this House who is truly in favour of a policy of European integration could possibly dispute that, over and above the alarming state of health of the Community as it was put before us by the President of the Commission, the programme drawn up by the new team can be viewed in its broad lines as an ambitious and perhaps even courageous one, if we judge from the clear-cut position adopted with regard to the consideration, or even reconsideration, of how to give the Community its own means of action, means which it can no longer do without in the future if it wishes to stride boldly forward.

My Group is especially pleased that the priorities which it had backed in its motion for a resolution on the mission and programme of the Commission, tabled

this January, have been incorporated more or less in their entirety into the Commission programme. This is true for a wide variety of subjects ranging from the need for the European Monetary System to develop towards a European Monetary Union to devising real Community policies in the energy, regional and industrial sectors, to adjusting or partially reorganizing the common agricultural policy, to stepping up the fight against unemployment or instituting a new social and employment policy or, as I have already mentioned, to achieving the absolutely essential increase in own resources. But in order to achieve such ambitious objectives, and since the need for action is so very important, we must finally bring ourselves to assess the Community's real potential for supplementing national measures in a number of areas. If the energy question or the battle against unemployment are problems which could better be solved at Community level, then it is time to draw our conclusions, and this means first and foremost to convince the Member States of this fact. It is from this standpoint that my Group expects the Commission to come up with its own appraisal of how to achieve a better balance between Community policies on expenditure and those of the various Member States. This is in our view the only way in which we can succeed in clearly defining the responsibilities of the Community and those of the Member States, and the only way in which we can avoid future duplication of work and even a complete absence of harmonization of the objectives sought by some of the Community's budget spending and the objectives sought by some of the budget spending of the Member States.

But the most important thing for my Group — this point having already been very clearly expressed by my colleagues Mr Junker and Mr Van Aerssen in their speeches — is how the Commission intends to cooperate with Parliament in order to fulfill its programme. The fact is, and I am sure that the President of the Commission would be the last to fault me on this point, that it is very difficult for Parliament to judge a new Commission of the European Communities solely on its programme as long as we have no clear idea of just how far the Commission is prepared to take account of the desires expressed by the majority of this House.

In line with the positions it has already adopted and with the contents of the Rey report, my Group is particularly in favour of seeing an inter-institutional agreement reached on future cooperation between the Commission and Parliament. The aim of an agreement of this type is fully justified since it would considerably enhance the mutual confidence which should reign between the Commission and Parliament and which would precisely have the effect of boosting Community action and would cut down on the hesitation displayed far too frequently by various Member States. Those who in spite of this continue to believe that an inter-institutional agreement of this type would inevitably lead to the Commission becoming subject to

## Fischbach

Parliament, have not understood what is intended, or at least they are pretending that they have not understood.

My Group naturally has some very clear ideas of what might be the contents of an inter-institutional agreement of this sort. Our suggestions and proposals range from the proposal that the Commission consult Parliament before forwarding proposals to the Council, to the strict observance by the Commission of amendments adopted by Parliament, and would in particular include recognition of Parliament's new moves in the field of legislation and support for Parliament in its efforts to have the conciliation procedure laid down in the declaration of 4 March 1975 extended to cover other legal acts, even those which have no bearing on the budget.

Given that the President of the Commission clearly stressed the need for a new dialogue and even for the setting up of a permanent dialogue between the Commission and Parliament to further their mutual relations, we have no real reason to be pessimistic as to the future. We do, however, feel that the Commission would be well advised not to take hasty action but to take all the time it needs to consider this question and to look very closely into the proposals we have submitted to it. Nonetheless, if the Commission were to delay too long in making its views known, then we would feel justified in coming back to this matter between now and 1 October, and at that time we should, if need be, display a much greater insistence.

*(Applause)*

IN THE CHAIR: MR KATZER

*Vice-President*

**President:** — I call Mr Curry.

**Mr Curry.** — Mr President, I am sorry to have interrupted the President of the Commission in such a brusque fashion but I hope to detain him only a very short time as I only have two minutes in which to do it. I wish to draw attention to a single remark he made in his address. That was when he referred to the agricultural policy as the only common policy we have. When he sets about his reassessment of that policy will he start from the point of departure that it is no longer a common policy? It is becoming less and less a common policy. It is becoming submerged in an avalanche of national aids uncoordinated, unorganized and in many cases unnotified.

*(Applause from the right)*

I put a question down on the latest instalment, not in a sense of hostility, to his Agricultural Commissioner, about the 4 000 million francs of French national aids, and I got the most appallingly vague and inadequate reply I have ever received. We want information; if they are legal, let us know about it. If they are not, what is he going to do about it?

There is an illusion, President Thorn, that the CAP can be reformed in Brussels. The answer is it can only be reformed in the national capitals, and until you either begin the process of bringing national aids into some sort of framework, regularized, authorized, understood as part of the mechanism of the CAP to be decided jointly by the Ministers or else try to get rid of them and restore the CAP to those three famous principles of which many of my colleagues frequently talk, except when they themselves are defending the national aids they have given, then you will simply be beating the air, as far as changes to the common agricultural policy are concerned. Some people believe that we should do very little to the policy and some believe that substantial things have got to be done. You owe it to both sides either to restore a genuine common agricultural policy or else to let us have a policy which is divided between Community and national responsibility but which is clear and transparent, so that we know where we are going and who is putting the signals on the road along which we are going. Unless you do that, unless we move either towards greater flexibility of control or else towards the elimination of national aids and the restoration of the original principles, all the talk about adjustments or changes or reform of the CAP is so much hot air.

You have to begin, Mr President, to tackle this basic problem, this basic contradiction, namely, that the common policy, acclaimed as the great triumph of this Community, is in wholesale retreat. Either we organize that retreat or we try to put an end to it.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Fernandez.

**Mr Fernandez.** — Mr Thorn, in your summing-up of 1980 you were forced to admit that your Commission had been unable to go as far as it would have liked. It is true that the growing opposition of the workers has meant a lot of spanners in the works of your austerity and reorganization policies in general, and of agriculture in particular.

Last year, your Commission, squeezed into the girdle of its budget, only put forward a ridiculously small rise in farm prices of 2.4 %, after even having thought of blocking them completely. However, the efforts made by farmers paid off, in France in particular, by producing a rise of approximately 10 %, which limited the drop in farmers' incomes. But by refusing to grant an increase which corresponds to the increase in produc-

**Fernandez**

tion costs, that is 13 % for France, the Commission, the Council and the Conservative and Social-Democratic majority in this House are directly responsible for the drop in farm incomes which occurred during the financial year 1980.

For 1981, you are on the brink of taking another step along the path to austerity and reorganization. What is more, you are making your objectives quite plain. You want to continue transferring expenditure which should go to agriculture to new common policies for reorganizing industry in the interest of multinational companies and to bring greater pressure to bear on farm incomes, firstly by extending co-responsibility levies to cover all types of producer and by carrying out distressing cuts in expenditure aimed at supporting the market, and secondly by preventing any fair increase in farm prices. The unofficial offers you have made up to now are far from being up to the mark, and well outside the type of increase which might normally be expected. We, like the farmers, are concerned that farm prices should be fixed and once again we can see that political manoeuvring is going on with the intention of delaying this until after 1 April. In 1980, the two-month delay hit farmers hard. In France, the price increase in real terms was less than 6 %, even though prices had been nominally increased by 10 %. You do not miss a chance of making petty savings at the expense of farmers, but what you really want is to try to save Giscard d'Estaing and his government from the backlash of farmers' anger. As early as last year, the *Lettre européenne* stated the following under the headline *250 million French francs to get Giscard re-elected*, and I quote:

For the time being the Nine appear to be prepared to ease the way for the re-election of Valéry Giscard d'Estaing by not sowing the seeds of discontent in the French countryside. Once the elections are over, it will then be possible to institute the reform of the common agricultural policy.

By deliberately delaying the fixing of farm prices, you are attempting to 'save the bacon' of the French Government and of Giscard d'Estaing by letting him play the role of d'Artagnan fighting off the villainous Brussels guard. In the interests of French farmers, we are determined to combat these moves and to put a stop to them. That is why I now demand that farm prices for 1981 to 1982, for which we propose an increase of 15 % together with the dismantling of positive monetary compensatory amounts, should be fixed by 1 April at the very latest. In order to meet this deadline, we now also demand that this House be convened, if necessary in an extraordinary session, in order to discuss farm prices before 1 April.

**President.** — I call Mr Delatte.

**Mr Delatte.** — (F) Mr President, Mr Thorn wanted in his speech to sum up the guiding thread of Commu-

nity policies in general, and I should like to stress that in many respects the directions he indicated denoted a courageous approach.

I noted one remark concerning the common agricultural policy, which was that priority was given to this policy because it is the focal point of the Commission's tasks. You stated, Mr Thorn, that 'Agriculture is by far the largest budget item'. With good reason, since it is the only all-embracing European policy. I should, however, like to insist that the myth that agriculture is too costly be dispelled once and for all. We will have opportunity to do this in any case during the debate on the adjustment of the common agricultural policy. What you said, Mr Thorn, was that we had to inject new life into the CAP.

Taking this view as my basis, and referring back also to the excellent report submitted by the Commission at the end of last year — and I should like in this connection, to pay tribute to the memory of the late Mr Gundelach — I should like you, Mr Thorn, to reaffirm one of the basic tenets of the report I have just mentioned, which was that we must stimulate the growth of a dynamic and productive agricultural sector. Let us not forget that natural resources are very scarce in Europe and that the food requirement here is enormous. We need a farming industry which is geared to productivity and to the export of certain types of produce. This can only be achieved by applying a determined policy and particularly by sound market organization.

I agree, therefore, that the three principles enshrined in the Treaty must be observed, but I refuse to have it tampered with or to let compromise after compromise go by. I agree that producers should make a financial contribution and be involved in policy management, provided that farm prices guarantee them a decent income and that the overall tax system applied to fats and oils results in fair competition. In a word, Mr Thorn, we have great expectations of the planned adjustment of the common agricultural policy, which ought to lead to an agricultural policy which is really and truly managed and not one to which we are subjected as we generally are at the moment. The fixing of farm prices which should take place in the coming weeks will be the first way of showing that this determination to progress exists, and I should like to stress on this subject that the budget which everyone is referring to, that is the 1981 budget, makes progress quite possible.

(Applause from the Liberal Group)

**President.** — I call Mr Fotilas.

**Mr Fotilas.** — (El) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in no way and by no criterion can Mr Thorn's presentation of the general report and

### Fotilas

programme of the Commission of the European Communities be considered satisfactory. First and foremost because it is not so much a programme as a pronouncement of general principles which are in any case already widely known and, moreover, debatable and disputed. What is more, despite the attempt by the President of the Commission to determine the reasons for the crisis, the real nature of the problems appears to escape him. The third reason why the report cannot be considered satisfactory is that it disregards the warnings and indications given by various sides of this House, as well as in plenary sittings, on many previous occasions. The main themes of the report are the common agricultural policy and the announcement of a new industrial policy. As far as the agricultural policy is concerned, the problem of the produce of the south is essentially ignored. It is common knowledge in Parliament and in all the Community institutions that the basic problem of the common agricultural policy is the unbalanced distribution of its resources between the produce of the north, which has been privileged up till now, and the produce of the south, which has so far been neglected. There can be no doubt that the common agricultural policy is the Community's greatest weakness. However, before the patient can be pronounced dead, it is only sensible to try to treat him, and in this case the logical treatment is the acceptance, introduction and establishment of a reasonable distribution of aid between the produce of the south and the north. The President of the Commission also announced a new industrial policy, a reorientation towards advanced technologies, and a new international division of labour. However, no such policy can be expected to succeed unless it takes account of the constantly increasing need of the countries of the south for full — and not just limited — industrial development. For us Socialists, and particularly those of PASOK, the new international division of labour must not simply mean a transfer of problematic — not to say bankrupt — industries to the peripheral countries, while the major role in the new and profitable sectors, such as the aerospace industry, telematics, electronics and the exploitation of the sea-bed, is retained exclusively by the advanced countries of the north.

However, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the problem is not only one of Community aims — it is principally one of tactical possibilities and of the distribution of roles within the Community. A few figures will make it clear to you what these roles are.

At present, according to Community statistics, industrial plant accounts for only 3.1 % of all Greek exports, whereas the figure for the Federal Republic is 44.8 %, for France 35.8 %, for Italy 30.8 %, for the United Kingdom 34.5 %, and even for Israel 16.1 %. For Portugal — a non-Community country — the corresponding figure is 13.6 %.

On the other hand, plant and equipment account for 42.7 % of Greek imports, which means that 97.5 %

of our industrial plant is imported. The corresponding figures are 19.3 % for the Federal Republic, 18.2 % for Italy and 22.4 % for the Netherlands. Even for countries outside the Community, the figures are 19.4 % for Spain and 28.7 % for Portugal. In all cases the figures are taken from Community statistics.

This is the reason for what Mr Thorn admitted was the poor image of Europe. Various speakers drew attention to this poor image, while others tried to establish the reason for it. The attempt to touch up this image by referring to imbalances within the countries of the Community cannot change the facts. There may well be differences in the level of development of various regions of a particular country, but they cannot be compared with the differences in level of development between the countries themselves. The experience of the peoples of Europe is that the differences are getting greater — this is something which is not mentioned by Mr Thorn, although it is pointed out in a surprisingly offhand manner in the report by Mr Giolitti, which is familiar to us all — and that, when it comes to laying down the economic and social objectives, or to selecting the means and methods to be used to achieve these, the national governments show absolutely no spirit of sacrifice and are interested only in jealously promoting their narrow national interests. Of course, it is only the countries with the greatest political influence which succeed in doing this, and this is understandable in the present political, social and economic structure of the countries of Europe.

Ladies and gentlemen, the seriousness and bitterness of the social and regional imbalances is essentially matched by an imbalance between countries in the level of development and by an imbalance in the distribution of income by class. Those who are in some way privileged, either as a country or as a class, are prepared to put up with this policy. The poor, on the other hand, see their total share getting smaller, and it is only natural that they should try to ensure that this reduction does not come from their own personal share. The richer accept the distribution, they accept the increase, even if it is disproportionate. However, the fact is that the lion's share will always fall to the lion. Mr Thorn made what might be considered an impressive statement:

The new Commission (under Mr Thorn's Presidency) will stop forwarding to the Council proposals aimed at conciliation and will follow a supranational policy for the whole Community

Ladies and gentlemen, we know what this amounts to. There can be no doubt that the conditions needed for genuine solidarity among workers do not exist in the Community. On the other hand, there do exist all the conditions for the establishment of a genuine 'international' of capital. This means that the policy of social, regional and national imbalances will be strengthened and intensified, while the interests of the people will be left unprotected even by the national governments, if

**Fotilas**

these latter are deprived of the right to insist on the unanimous adoption of decisions, at least at Council level.

Such is the nature and the essence of what Mr Thorn admitted was an international crisis. However, instead of learning to live with this crisis, instead of giving new hands in the international game of cards, as Mr Thorn said, we Socialists are trying to finally get out of the crisis by changing the rules of the game and by implementing radical structural and economic changes which are the essence of the international, European and national Socialism which I have the honour to serve.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Spinelli.

**Mr Spinelli.** — *(I)* Mr President, in his speech Mr Thorn informed us that the Commission over which he presides will no longer transmit to the Council — as happened too often in the past — proposals for compromises which have been toned down to meet the requirements of the national experts, and that in future it will only make proposals which take account solely of the Community interest. I take this to be a criticism of the previous Commission, among others.

But, Mr Thorn, you have been in political life too long to be unaware that it is very often difficult to match words with deeds, unless there is a modicum of political strength behind those words. You and I know very well to what enormous national and sectoral pressures the Commission is subjected when it is preparing, processing and defending its proposals.

The Commission therefore needs a strong ally, the strongest possible. There is only one candidate — Parliament, provided the Commission wants to make this institution its ally. Well, we were expecting — or at least I was expecting — that when you came to speak here you would deal not only with the need to cooperate and the need for institutional peace — even enriching the Community vocabulary with the new expression 'three-way conversation' — we were expecting you also to say 'Mr Jenkins promised here that when the Commission drew up its proposals would discuss them with Parliament and would not present them to the Council until they had been approved by Parliament'. That is to say that before any inter-institutional agreement, before any reform of the institutions, the Commission had committed itself to involving Parliament in the preparation of legislation. Unfortunately this promise was not kept. We would have wished that after this statement you had said 'Well, we shall do what the Jenkins Commission promised'. Instead the commitment has disappeared, and there is nothing left to give us hope of such an attitude — Mr Andriessen will merely keep us informed of what the Commission does.

Mr Thorn, I think that in this way you are enormously weakening the position of your Commission and that you will not succeed in maintaining that independence which, as far as I can tell, you would like to maintain. In your statements you tell us that this Community can no longer be a 'one per cent' Community, that it must have the opportunity to develop. Yet immediately after this fine statement you added that you would now content yourselves with remaining within the present ambit. The tension between Parliament and the Council has been increasing year by year for three years, because the budget fails to satisfy the Community, and you are unable to sketch out any perspective going beyond the present limits. Do you or do you not intend rapidly to present a plan which will indicate the how the Community can acquire new resources if it needs them? Will you or will you not present, together with measures, agricultural proposals which will ensure that these new resources are not swallowed up in price support but will be used for new policies? If you had told us that something would be presented in the next few months, you would have said all that was needed for this year — all the rest could then have developed gradually. Instead, you said no such thing.

Your statement speaks of the Third World and of the importance of aid to developing countries. We would like to know if the Commission intends to commit itself, after all the debates we have had, to making available a larger, more credible and more impressive sum than that which has so far been at our disposal.

This would also help to revive our own economies, which will benefit from increased demand from the developing countries. Or shall we go on counting out the centimes in the cheese-paring manner we have so far adopted? There is nothing in your statement to clarify this question.

I could go on to mention other points, but I simply say to you, Mr Thorn, that if the Commission continues with this approach, whereby the major objectives are well formulated and set out but there is no indication of a first step, it will be failing in its duty.

I have always been convinced of the aptness of one of Monnet's ideas — that when some great project was at stake, the thing on which he concentrated and which was fundamental for him was the nature and direction of the first step. In your report, Mr Thorn, there is no substantial indication of first steps in any direction. I therefore think we can only be disappointed with your statement.

**President.** — I call Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti.

**Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti.** — *(I)* Mr President, Mr Thorn, ladies and gentlemen, I must say first and foremost that my speech is linked to the speeches already made by Mr Tindemans, my friend Mr Jonker

**Cassanmagnago Cerretti**

on institutional matters, and all the other speakers for my Group. For that reason, the aspect allocated to me by my Group is that of social policy.

It is above all necessary to acknowledge an indubitable fact — that economic policy and social policy, which have hitherto been very different fields, are now closely connected. Decisions taken by national communities on social growth have considerable repercussions in the economic sphere, with which they are interwoven. Social peace is the main precondition for economic growth, and lack of growth is the determining factor in social crisis.

Social policy must no longer be surely a corrective for the dysfunctions caused by the economic system but should guide social growth and responsible participation. May I say that I greatly appreciated your approach to the problem expressed by your statement that the new generation demanded a new quality of life. A new quality of life requires decisions involving the coordination of policies, but above all the poorest countries must have the opportunity to participate on an equal footing. That is the significance of the North-South Dialogue, and of the policy which within the Committee on Development and Cooperation and together with Mr Cheysson we are trying to implement with regard to the problem of the developing countries.

May I say Mr President that the real problem is linked with the subject of employment, for young people and women should have a greater range of choice. Here again you emphasized many and diverse factors on which employment and unemployment depend — demographic factors, which you stressed, the dynamics of the relative prices of capital and labour, changes in international trade flows, and finally restrictive economic policies which seek to restrain inflation and restore the balance of payments.

Mr Thorn, it seems important to me — as you said in general terms — to stress that an expansionist policy cannot be carried out by individual countries but must be a common policy covering, in the case of the EEC, all the Community area. It is desirable to reaffirm the idea that an expansionist investment policy can be implemented only if it is planned for large economic areas and that to remove any employment imbalances an adequate regional policy is required.

Mr Thorn, we have had great difficulties over regional policy in the past. We have referred the budget back with our essential comments. Indeed, we think that imbalances can be eliminated only if precise decisions are taken in the context of the regional policy.

We must carry out a precise examination of the Social Fund. We sincerely hope that the debate on the institutions, which must take place as soon as possible here, will reflect the views of the millions of European citizens who sent us here to take decisions. For our

part in the Committee on Social Affairs, by means of the dialogue which we shall begin with the new Commissioner responsible, we hope to initiate a policy relating to the less well off and to development, a policy which in the final analysis will help citizens who may thus become leaders of society in our stand. What is really lacking is citizens — both men and women — who make up a group of leaders determined to base planning on the individual, the family and the community — in short a well-defined concept instead of something abstract and technocratic carried out at the expense of the less-developed regions.

**President.** — I call Mr Albers.

**Mr Albers.** — (NL) Mr President, I am very pleased to have the chance to make a few comments on Mr Thorn's speech. I very will remember the speech given by Mr Jenkins on a similar occasion. At the time, our expectations were probably set too high, and in such cases, one is bound to be in for a rude awakening. Mr Jenkins spoke about a Europe of the people, referring to the time when the people of the Member States would have a chance to exert a direct influence on the membership of the European Parliament by way of direct elections. Those elections have now taken place, and now we have the new President of the Commission speaking to an elected House. He made this point on a number of occasions in his speech, saying that the European Parliament should be held in higher esteem than used to be the case. But at the same time, of course, Mr President, this House also has a greater obligation to the people of the European Community, the voters who were prepared to place their trust in us and give us the opportunity in this House to work out a policy for the good of all the people of the Community.

Mr Thorn also referred to the need for consolidating and adapting — a cautious approach to 1985. He stressed the year 1985, but as far as this House is concerned, 1984 is of course of greater interest because we shall then have to go to the people of the Community and tell them what has been achieved during our period of office.

The main criticism my Group has to make of the Commission's programme is that it covers one year only, namely 1981. We had expected to hear a political policy statement for the whole of the new Commission's period of office, that is to say, up to 1985. The lack of any such statement raises a number of points which I should now like to go into in more detail.

Firstly, let us take a look at social affairs. I have taken part in four tripartite conferences. I know the expectations raised by these among workers in the Member States, and I also know what disappointments subsequently ensue. No reference is made any more to tripartite consultation, not even in the Commission's

## Albers

programme. Nonetheless, we must bring something of this kind into being over the coming years so that we can discuss together how we can stem the rising tide of unemployment. Mr Thorn did reply to the problem of democratic development and the danger of inertia setting in in the Community, but as regards employment, all he said was that, between now and 1985, we would have to reckon on a steadily rising number of people looking for jobs which are not there. There can be no doubt that the percentage of young people unemployed will continue to grow between now and 1985 unless we find ways of dealing with the problem. I believe that the Commission has indeed put forward a number of proposals on this point, but so far, it would seem that nothing has actually been done.

Secondly, I should like to comment on transport policy. I was a little disappointed not only in Mr Thorn's statement, but also in the approach adopted by the Dutch Presidency. Transport policy enjoys a special place in the Treaty, which is not surprising in view of the goods traffic, passenger traffic and the flow of goods through the countries of the European Community. The Community is growing all the time. Greece has now joined, and merchandise will have to be transported from Greece to the other Member States through countries like Austria and Yugoslavia.

This merchandise will be subject to transit levies and charges which will make it more expensive, and we must expect the Commission to do everything it can to help in this respect. For instance, we could help towards improving the infrastructure of these countries, and we could encourage the use of combined forms of transport. At any rate, though, we must keep the goods moving.

Mr President, we must ask ourselves in all this whether — as Mr Jonker said this morning — we should give the Commission the benefit of the doubt. There are such things as motions of no confidence. As far as I am concerned, though, it is much more important for the Commission to be given a mandate. I believe that Mr Thorn is very well aware that his Commission does have such a mandate as the guardian of the Treaties. Indeed, he said as much in his speech. But should the Commission discover in certain circumstances that it is unable to fulfil its role as guardian of the Treaties, what conclusions would it draw? Would the Commission be prepared to go to the very limit with the Council and say that, in these circumstances, it cannot possibly fulfil its mandate? Would it be prepared to say that, unless certain things happen, it is prepared to resign even in the absence of a motion of no confidence from this House? Perhaps that would be a good way for the Commission to achieve what Mr Thorn is aiming for: the pursuit of a Community policy in the interests of all people of the Community.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Blumenfeld.

**Mr Blumenfeld.** — *(D)* Mr President, I should like to say Mr Thorn that it is entirely coincidental that I should be speaking last. After all the critical comments we have heard — and to which I do not wish to add — I should like to say that my Group supports the programme and the policy guidelines he set out in his speech yesterday.

I should also like to say that my Group does not share the pessimistic views prevailing in the face of the critical developments now going on in Europe and the rest of the world. If the Commission and the European Parliament are prepared to tell the people of Europe quite unambiguously that we are facing a massive challenge, they will respond and appreciate that this crisis really is the major challenge facing Europe in the second half of the 20th century, and that we are not prepared to throw in the towel. But the work of the Commission must show a great sense of realism and practicality because, unfortunately, these virtues are not much in evidence from many national politicians in the Member States of the Community. I believe that the people of Europe want to be told the truth about our present situation and not have the wool pulled over their eyes. The Commission, as the powerhouse of European integration, has a very important role to play here, and the speech we heard from Mr Thorn shows that the Commission is prepared to accept the new sense of responsibility.

I think you will agree with me, Mr Thorn, that security in Europe is becoming increasingly central to all the decisions we have to take in the field of economic, social, foreign and external trade policy. I think the same goes for the energy problems which both you and other Members of this House referred to. If we are to solve the whole energy problem — and the Commission can make a major contribution here — we Europeans must see it in its true political context. How are we to free ourselves from the blackmailing policy of the OPEC cartel if we disregard the political element? If we seriously wish to get away from oil, if we want to develop alternative energies and if the Commission wants to make a show of courage, it should do what many national governments feel they cannot do in the field of nuclear energy because of their fear of vociferous minority opposition.

Let me tell you what we must do to give us more room for manoeuvre again in European economic, investment, foreign trade and, of course, foreign policy. Although certain political groupings may prefer to close their eyes to what is going on, the new US administration has just drafted a bill — the US Deregulation Bill — aimed at making the United States, within a relatively short space of time, independent of energy from oil — or at least very independent of OPEC. This move will of course have an effect on

**Blumenfeld**

Europe unless we adopt the appropriate measures. This must be one of Mr Thorn's main aims and responsibilities.

You neglected the USA/Europe theme in your policy guideline speech, Mr Thorn. We must realize here — and perhaps that is what you were getting at — that we must be prepared for much more cut-throat competition, if only because the American Government will be trying to persuade its European allies — at least most of them, and certainly the biggest of them — to make a much more substantial financial contribution to security and defence policy. That will have repercussions on our economies, and for that reason, the Commission and the European Parliament must pay special attention to fostering relations between Europe and the United States. We must also make sure that our justified pride in the amount of agricultural produce Europe has exported over recent years — we are now the second largest exporter of agricultural produce in the world — does not damage our industry and our investment potential.

This is something the Commission must pay special attention to. We should also realize that what the Commission referred to as recycling cannot be treated as a means of creating new debts to pay oil bills. The whole point of recycling must be to create new investment and new future-orientated technologies. That is the only way we shall be able to break out of this vicious circle.

We shall never have a common economic and monetary policy — and hence achieve the European Union that many of us are doubtless yearning for — unless we succeed in bringing about some convergence in administrative matters. That is why you must make that one of your main concerns.

Together with the Liberal and Democratic Group and the European Democratic Group, we have tabled a motion for a resolution in which — as I said earlier — we declare our support for the main policy guidelines sketched out by the Commission. After the long-winded statements we have heard from all sides over the last few years on the rights and duties of the institutions — in other words, the Commission, the European Parliament and the Council — we are now for the first time setting out to reach agreement between our institutions on future relations between the Commission and Parliament. If that is the line you are adopting, Mr Thorn, we shall have confidence in what you have set out to do over the next twelve months.

**President.** — The Commission has the floor.

**Mr Thorn, President of the Commission.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I hope you will forgive me for trying to reply to a large number of speakers in a short time, and I ask now for your

indulgence if I cannot reply to everyone and if my replies are not exhaustive.

Yesterday Mr Glinne was one of the first to wonder whether employment policy had been relegated to the background; he spoke of an 'emergency policy' on the part of the Community or the Commission, and even complained that economic policy was regarded as more important than social policy. I would say, very frankly, that we must realize that in this day and age we are not alone in the world, and that economic problems are created for us partly by the oil-producing countries and partly by our competitors in Asia or the United States. It is therefore not by trying to deal with the social consequences that we shall change the economic framework, and I think Mr Tindemans, along with many others, stressed this. We must therefore — as a world economic power, indeed the largest exporter in the world — find a new framework and a corresponding economic policy, precisely to avoid in future the social consequences which we now face and which the Commission, with your support, intends to tackle in the spirit of solidarity which I tried to define yesterday.

Mr Glinne also asked how the Commission's attitude towards advanced technology can be reconciled with the need to aid small and medium-sized undertakings. I would say to my former colleague Mr Glinne that in my view there is no contradiction between our desire to master advanced technology — i.e. our ability to produce instead of merely buying — and the development of the small and medium-sized undertakings. Indeed, the success of the small and medium-sized undertakings depends partly — and in future above all — on their access to information, i.e. to data processing and data banks, as well as on the availability of qualified manpower. Advanced technology is not the preserve of large undertakings alone, and cannot be their preserve in future. This myth must be exploded as soon as possible.

Mr Tindemans concentrated on foreign policy and political cooperation. I can only say that I entirely agree with the picture he painted, and I would like to draw the attention of Parliament to the fact that, speaking on behalf of the Commission, I expressed the wish that in future this Community will no longer be merely an economic one and that the principal Community institutions — Parliament and the Commission — will be the central pillars of a European Union which will concern itself as much with cooperation as with economics and the existing Treaties. I hope that this message has been understood by all.

(Applause)

Sir James Scott-Hopkins rightly — I now admit — criticized me on the time our programme took to reach you; I hope you will forgive me for this. It is extremely regrettable that such administrative failures

## Thorn

should lead to such serious misunderstandings. We will try to ensure that this does not occur again by providing you well in advance with the detailed — and perhaps rather too unadorned — text. But I am sure that you as Members of Parliament will also understand that the political commentary and introduction will then be submitted at the last moment, since it does not need to be transmitted too far in advance. Sir James also said that agricultural prices are not the whole of the common agricultural policy. Of course we agree with that, and we will have the opportunity in the coming weeks and months to consider the common agricultural policy in detail. It is a fact that agricultural prices constitute the first obstacle to be overcome, the first deadline facing us in the coming year, and, in this context, the proposals which the Commission will make for the coming year do not in any way pre-empt our mandate for a renewed discussion with you, in which you will be able to give your views on the common agricultural policy as a whole and the resources to be devoted to it in relation to other policies.

Mr Berlinguer, like many other Members, found my reply cautious on certain points. But let us be realistic, ladies and gentlemen! I sat for 11 years in this Parliament. Then I was for 12 years a member of government and hence a member of the Council, and I am now President of the Commission. You say that you often feel frustrated or duped by promises. What do we want now? Do we want to talk the language of honesty and realism, and say what is feasible, or are we going to pretend that we have ready-made solutions and that either you or I will impose them tomorrow, according to taste? The day after tomorrow, you would be the first to criticize me — and rightly so — for arousing hopes which I was not in a position to fulfil. If we really want a dialogue, if we really want Europe to get the message, through us and through this dialogue, and to have confidence in Parliament, the Commission and the relationship between them, let us talk a language of truth and realism. Many of the crucial problems facing us do not have a ready-made solution — at any rate, I have not got one up my sleeve — which could be implemented tomorrow by democratic means.

As to the need to introduce a regional dimension into Community policy, it goes without saying that we should attach more importance to it, and I agree with Mr Berlinguer on this. Then, speaking about the institutional question, Mr Berlinguer said that he did not entirely agree with me, and incidentally, in saying that he runs the risk of being contradicted by the non-Italian members of his Group. Mr Berlinguer says that there is a need for reform and change. I agree with him, and I hope the French members of his Group will not mind my saying so, since they told us through an authoritative spokesman just now that they thought everything should remain under the control of national authorities rather than being decided at the international level. We can see how many divergences

there are even within the so-called political families. For my part, I believe there is a real need for reform and change, but first we must improve the workings of our institutions. That is the reply I shall give in advance to Mr Spinelli and so many others — particularly to Mr Delors, who was wondering just now whether the institutional peace advocated by the President of the Commission did not carry the risk of somnolence on the part of the institutions and whether a certain productive tension between the institutions was not desirable. Of course I am in favour of this kind of tension, but we must first draw the maximum advantage from the possible operating conditions; we must take objectively into account firstly that the Council is not operating as envisaged by the Treaties — and a situation in accordance with the Treaty provisions must be restored — and secondly that the Commission is no longer operating as envisaged by the Treaties. The Commission's role provided by the Treaties must be restored to it — the Treaties must be complied with. Mr Spinelli, you were once a member of the Commission, and you know that since 1970 there has been a deterioration. Each of us has continued to occupy his place and carry out his mandate. Well, I shall carry out mine also, and I shall try to restore to the Commission — assuming that it has lost it — its proper role as a driving force. And Parliament, freshly elected, since its election took place only a year and half ago, and which has not got the powers it wanted — or that I wanted to give it when I was Prime Minister — must also play its particular role. Let each institution recover its true stature; let us restore confidence between us. That is what I call institutional peace — not a soporific peace. Then indeed each institution will play its role in relation to the other, and will try to achieve that new dimension which the Community will need in future. These replies are also addressed to some extent to Mr Bange-mann, who wondered — how shall I put it — about what he saw as the Commission's excessively polite and reserved attitude towards the Parliament. I shall return to this point at the end of my speech.

Mr de la Malène, speaking on behalf of his Group, was, I would say, much more restrained and realistic. You and I were expecting this. For once the difficulties do not arise from the Commission, nor from him, nor from his Group, since we both talk in realistic terms, albeit perhaps for different reasons. I thank Mr Pasmazoglou, Mr Romualdi and Mr De Goede for the confidence they have shown in me, and, believe, if criticism creates an obligation, explicit confidence creates an equal obligation. I assure you that the Commission will try to be worthy of the confidence which many Members of Parliament have shown in it, together with considerable understanding. Mr Hänsch expressed the hope that there would be a healthy rivalry between Parliament and the other institutions. I agree with him. I was convinced by the sincerity of his remarks and by his enthusiasm, and his convictions remind me of some speeches I made myself here a few years ago. To Mr Jonker I would reply that he should

### Thorn

not ask me to achieve in a few months what Mr Roy Jenkins promised, in unimpeachable good faith, at the beginning of his term of office, before coming up against a series of real obstacles which perhaps prevented him from achieving in full everything which he set out to do. The institutional framework created by the Treaties must be regarded as a whole. This framework is essentially based on a creative association among independent bodies which respect each other, and each of which has its own responsibilities. The Commission depends in its daily operation on the contribution of all the other institutions. I am grateful to you for the confidence you have shown in us, and I shall repay it by respecting the deadlines which you set for us on behalf of your Group.

Lady Elles, may I congratulate you on the quality of your speech and particularly on the profoundly European convictions underlying it. I wish to say that I agree with your suggestion about Parliamentary resolutions, and even if I cannot on behalf of the Commission assure you that this or that resolution will be implemented in full, I promise you that we shall remain in contact with Parliament each time, on each resolution, to inform Parliament to what extent account has been taken of it and to ensure that it is placed before the Council.

That was what you were realistically asking of me this morning. That is what I would like to prove in future, for the sake of inter-institutional clarity, transparency and confidence.

Mr Kappos, speaking on behalf of the Greek Communist Party, pointed out the patriotism of his Group and its part in the fight for independence. I would like to say to him that we also — believe me, gentlemen — who have been fighting for Europe in our various countries, in many cases for 30 years or more, have done so — and myself particularly — because in the last World War we had experience of prisons and torture and do not want those conditions to recur, because we do not want any of our countries to be enslaved in future, and because we want to defend all our countries against any external threat of subjection. That is why we are fighting today for the independence of Europe, which means the independence of all our countries.

*(Applause)*

Mr Galland, among others, raised the energy problem, and I acknowledge immediately on behalf of the Commission that this is one of the major problems we shall have to tackle in the years to come. Mr Galland will understand that in this field, as in many others, it was not possible for the Commission to submit a detailed programme in the last few weeks. I wanted to tell him that between the problem of agricultural prices — and here I am replying in advance to Mr Fanton — which will shortly be put before the Committee on Agriculture, between this first impor-

tant deadline in chronological terms and the great debate on the mandate of 30 May 1980 we shall have the opportunity, thanks to the practical proposals which the Committee on Agriculture will submit, to have a debate on the energy problem and the Commission proposals.

Mr Delors wondered, among other things, why the phrase 'Jumbo Council' was used. This phrase was created, I think, to indicate that it was a slightly larger Council — let us say a slightly more heavyweight one — because it comprised not just the ministers dealing with one area of responsibility but the Ministers of the Economy and Finance together with the Ministers of Social Affairs. In this context, I said in my speech yesterday that for the purposes of social policy we intended in future to start a dialogue with the social partners, not only on social matters — I was showing here that we wanted a real dialogue, for the social partners and particularly the trade unions, are very well aware that their problems will not be solved by our debating redundancy conditions or unemployment benefit — but also on economic matters. It is precisely by discussing with them the economic and financial policy to be adopted and the creation of new jobs that we can avoid regarding some sectors merely as deserving social cases which have to be subsidized as an act of charity or by special allowances.

Ladies and gentlemen, in view of the late hour I shall concentrate my replies on a few essential points. One of the major criticisms you have expressed to me — and I understand this — is that the programme should have been more detailed. You must have guessed what difficulties face the whole Commission, whoever the President may be. It is not like the national situation, in which an opposition has prepared itself over the years with a 'shadow cabinet' and an alternative programme which it has submitted to an electorate in the course of a long and often hard-fought electoral campaign and, when it wins the election, takes office with a fully defined programme.

For us it has been quite different, as you know. The Commission was nominated by national governments. The majority of the Commissioners belonged to the previous Commission, and now we have to try to amalgamate them with the new members and thus create a new team. Faced with the requirements — with the timetable which awaited us and which is dictated to us by you, by events and also by the national governments — we have to try to produce solutions. You will understand that in four weeks — of which the first was taken up with the allocation of responsibilities, and the second was marked by the stroke of fate which deprived us of one of our most valued colleagues, whom we have had to replace — this new Commission has not yet been able to work out priorities in detail. That is why we submitted to you a programme, a list of priorities, which cannot be revised until next month, but which Parliament and the Commission will have the opportunity to discuss in

### Thorn

the course of the coming months, beginning — some will say fortunately, others unfortunately — with agricultural problems. And then, do not forget what I told you in my speech yesterday — that by the middle of 1981 we must carry out the mandate which requires us to quantify the cost of our policies — the agricultural policy and all the others, old or new — taking into account their financing and the budgetary problems. Logically, you and we will then have to exchange opinions on nearly all Community policies around the middle of this year. I therefore think that in the meantime, taking account of all the other specialized debates, we shall not have any specific meeting, but towards the middle of the year — I am not speaking now of the institutional problem, to which I shall turn later — we shall have to decide on practical problems relating to our policies. As you must realize, we have matter for discussion which will last many months.

Some members have asked us to clarify the budgetary problem. But we have done so, ladies and gentlemen. Three countries have not yet paid. We have begun the procedure and we are prepared, if there is no settlement by the end of the procedure, to take the matter to the Court, as you wished, in accordance with the resolutions of Parliament. There can therefore be no doubt about it, but I think that no-one in this Parliament will criticize us if we do our duty and say that in parallel, in the interests of the Community and its proper functioning, we are establishing contact with the three governments concerned to try to ensure that this does not recur in future, and in order to arrive at proposals which we could put before you, so that towards the middle of this year we do not find ourselves in a similar situation — so that you and we, and Europe as a whole, do not waste most of our energy year after year in disputes over budgetary procedure. I think I can therefore say, without overstressing it for obvious reasons, that the Commission has faced up to its responsibilities and that Parliament has no reason to criticize it in this matter. The Commission will do its legal duty as guardian of the Treaties, and its political duty by facing up to its responsibilities and trying to foresee future contingencies.

Ladies and gentlemen, in your speeches and your motions for resolutions you are asking a great deal of us in the institutional sphere. but at the same time I am staggered to note that some, including my great Europeanist friend Spinelli, have not understood everything which the Commission asked me to offer Parliament yesterday in my speech. Perhaps it was rather too obscurely expressed.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Commission intends to face up to its responsibilities, and as guardian of the Treaties it does not intend to change its role — that would be to fail in its task. I assure you — as you have asked me to — that we shall never be a mere secretariat to the Council of Ministers. But you must understand that the corollary is that we shall never be the agent or

the secretariat of Parliament. The Commission is the Commission, and it must carry out its role fully, in total independence . . .

*(Applause)*

You must never forget that the number of our institutions cannot be regarded as only two. That is the great difference between the Community and the national situation — in the latter there is an executive and a parliament, and direct tension or possibly agreement between the two. The drafters of the Treaties wanted a different system. It was not I and my colleagues who invented it. Like us, you have had to live with this system in which a Parliament may censure the Commission, the Commission must make its proposals, but it is the Council which decides and which, through the national governments, has agreed that, on all essential questions, decisions may be taken only by unanimity. In many cases, therefore, you can say to the Commission ‘You have an obligation to provide the means, have you done your duty?’ However, it is difficult to turn that into an obligation to produce results, since unfortunately the results do not always depend on the Commission. May I, then, draw your attention to a contradiction which threatens to infiltrate our debates? On the one hand you rightly urge the Commission to grasp the nettle, to make proposals whenever it deems it necessary, and to do so taking account only of the Community interest. But when the Member States make their agreement conditional on too many amendments, I hear some say that the Commission should withdraw its proposals. Agreed, but only if the situation is really serious. Only yesterday, speakers representing the Groups said here that the worst thing was not to take a decision. May I take the most recent example: Mr Bangemann said yesterday evening that there could have been various solutions for regulating fisheries. One solution would have pleased some, another solution would have pleased others, but the worst thing is that in the absence of a fisheries policy nothing is done, the fishing fleets remain in the ports and everyone feels frustrated. So be careful not to ask the Commission to withdraw its proposal every time that the wishes of the maximalists are not entirely fulfilled. In that case nothing will be done. What I mean is that this argument must only be used when it is necessary and when something essential is at stake — when, as I said yesterday, the nature of the proposal is changed or it is emasculated to the point of no longer having any Community content. But one must not use this argument too glibly. I would say, therefore, that our institutions are aware of the seriousness of the economic and political situation, and, in reply to Mr Blumenfeld, who spoke just now and called for sobriety and realism on our part, I would say that it is an example of realism to admit that the economic situation is bad. In the last few years people have often tried to put a good face on things in the Member States. I would not go so far as to say that they tried a method of auto-suggestion, but they did not want to dramatize the

**Thorn**

situation. Well, events have proved some of our governments wrong. The economic situation is pretty serious. None of us would deny that détente has suffered a great setback and that the situation has consequently deteriorated politically, whether in Europe, Asia, the Middle East or Latin America. If we are to be realistic, therefore, I think we must regard the situation as a difficult one. We are aware of the state in which the Community finds itself in the institutional sphere owing to the budgetary dispute. I shall not mention the seat of Parliament, and other problems, for obvious reasons. We see that there is a certain crisis of confidence among the institutions or, at any rate, that it is difficult for us to find our proper roles. And we all know that all this must be changed. In this respect, as in many others, Mr Spinelli is right — all this must be changed in order to create what I called yesterday 'a second-generation Europe'. But we must first find our proper roles and restore a certain confidence and serenity. Clarity and transparency must be restored before tackling this second phase. That is why I called on you yesterday, on behalf of the Commission, to work with us not only in our ordinary Parliament-Commission relationship but going far beyond it, bearing in mind the Tindemans Report and the Report of the Three Wise Men. I repeat once more, I want to avoid a situation in two or three years time where three, four, five or six experts will be asked to draw up a plan and explain what Europe is suffering from, what it needs, or how the Treaties need to be changed.

Ladies and gentlemen, I hope you have understood my point. On behalf of the Commission, I wanted to urge you to turn Parliament and the Commission, from now on, into the experts who, by starting a dialogue which would go far beyond what you have asked me for today, would try to find solutions for the future, propose them to the Council and then, at the appropriate time, to the European Council and the Member States of the Community. This is a dialogue which must last a considerable time, but if you are in a hurry — and I understand that — if you want to have proof of the Commission's good will, I promise you that by October we shall produce a comprehensive document, while in the meantime keeping in contact with you and cooperating with you. Ladies and gentlemen, I urge you to have confidence in the men of goodwill who are assembled here around and behind me, and who have only one aim — with your help, to make the Community progress as much as possible in the best interests of the ten Member States. Judge us by results, give us the opportunity to work in cooperation with you, and do not make pointless criticisms of our intentions.

*(Loud applause)*

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

*Vice-President*

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

9. *Votes*

**President.** — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-877/80/rev. II) by Mr Fergusson on behalf of the European Democratic Group: Commission's programme of work.*

The Socialist Group and the Liberal and Democratic Group have withdrawn their names from this motion for a resolution.

I call Mr Christopher Jackson for an explanation of vote.

**Mr C. Jackson.** — President, my explanation of vote is directed equally at the Commission and at this House. I warmly welcomed President Thorn's declaration of intent and, like my colleagues, wish his Commission great success. Of course this debate took place in somewhat special circumstances. However, I hope this is the last year that our Parliament will attempt in such a weak way to debate a programme so lacking in the detail which is vital to us if we are to reach a judgment on its merits. I further hope, following the resolution which Mr Tyrrell and I tabled last October, that the European Parliament will during this year, during 1981, work out and express in a formal resolution Parliament's detailed view of the priorities for the European Community over the coming years. I hope we will then ask your Commission, President Thorn, to respond to our clear expression of policy priorities with your programme of action. In this way and through such a dialogue you will know our mind and we shall be able to use our right to express our confidence or otherwise in your proposals. It is with these hopes for the future that I shall vote in favour of the motion before us.

**President.** — I call Mr Fergusson.

**Mr Fergusson.** — Mr President, this motion of confidence, which is now standing only in the name of the European Democratic Group, was tabled before the Commission's programme was presented and debated in this House. No one, I want to make it plain, intended to adopt it as a matter of course. Other names have already been withdrawn from this motion, and my Group has now joined others in tabling another, more appropriate resolution to voice our

**Fergusson**

disappointment. Now it falls to us finally to withdraw this positive motion of confidence, regretting that we could not, after all, have supported it ourselves, believing that it would not find the support of this Parliament and aware that its defeat would have constitutional consequences which Parliament has not yet had time to consider. To withdraw this motion, as I now wish to do, intimates that Parliament reserves its judgment and its position.

**President.** — Are you maintaining your motion for a resolution, Mr Fergusson?

**Mr Fergusson.** — I am withdrawing it, Mr President.

**President.** — I call Mr Haagerup.

**Mr Haagerup.** — *(DK)* Mr President, I should like to point out the fact that the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-888/80 rev.) which Mr Fergusson just referred to and which is moved by the rapporteurs of three Groups, including myself on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, has not yet been circulated to all benches. I haven't received it in Danish, I haven't seen it in English and I don't know if it exists in all languages. However, since it is a motion for a resolution which was worked out in the course of today in cooperation with three Groups, namely the European People's Party, the European Democratic Group and the Liberal and Democratic Group, I will support it and I am sure the other rapporteurs will do likewise. However, we don't have the text because it hasn't been distributed yet.

**President.** — Mr Haagerup, let me say again that this motion for a resolution has been withdrawn by Mr Fergusson, since two of the Groups which signed it originally have changed their minds.

I call Mr Arndt.

**Mr Arndt.** — *(D)* Mr President, you should now be asking us to consider the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-888/80) by Mr Jonker and others. The motion has been revised in the meantime and two other Groups have now signed it. We have just heard something about this revised version. Not all the Members have a copy of it in their own language, however, and that includes most of my Group. In order to kill two birds with one stone, may I ask you to suspend the proceedings for quarter of an hour, so that firstly this motion can be distributed and secondly my Group has another chance to discuss it?

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — The proceedings will be suspended for quarter of an hour.

The House will rise.

The sitting is resumed.

Since the revised version of the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-888/80) by Mr Jonker and others has now been distributed everywhere, we can move on to the explanations of vote.

I call Mr Fanti on a point of order.

**Mr Fanti.** — *(I)* Mr President, I think we can be courteous enough to wait for a few minutes for a Group which has not yet returned to the Chamber or else inform the Group that the sitting has resumed. Apart from that, Mr President, I should like to point out that I was not first on the list of speakers.

**President.** — Mr Fanti, we have already lost a lot of time. I cannot suspend the sitting again. I would ask you to speak.

**Mr Fanti.** — *(I)* Mr President, I say again that I was not first on the list. I should like the order of speakers to be followed.

**President.** — On the list I have here you are first, but you can speak later if you want.

I call Mr Lalor.

**Mr Lalor.** — Mr President, I want to say that in accord with the stand taken by the chairman of my Group yesterday, following President Thorn's declaration, we of the European Progressive Democrats will not take part in this vote. We regard this vote as an acceptance of a totally irregular procedure that will only lead to further difficulties and complications at a later stage. This Assembly does not appoint the Commissioners, and so should not endeavour to create the false impression among our electors at home that it has the same authority over the European Commission as the national parliaments have over their own governments. If we continue to adopt procedures that are not provided for in the Treaties themselves, then we are paving the way for blocking the Community's

**Lalor**

entire decision-making process and upsetting the institutional balance that exists at the present time. Finally, those who vote in favour of this resolution today will be voting in favour of institutional anarchy and against the legitimate interests of the citizens of the Member States. It is still the case that those interests can only be guaranteed by the Governments of the Member States, and we are not voting for a transference of that responsibility to the Commission.

**President.** — I call Mr Forth on a point of order.

**Mr Forth.** — Mr President, did I hear you say that you were going to ask this House to vote on a motion which has not been distributed and the text of which Members have not seen? Did I understand you to say this? If so, I think this is quite out of order and should not be taken.

**President.** — I am sorry but what I said was the opposite, that the motion had been distributed. I am sure you can easily get your hands on a copy.

I call Mr Fich.

**Mr Fich.** — (DK) Mr President, I should like to say that I regard this whole procedure as being extremely dangerous. We entered upon this course because in the past we approved the Reay report, against which I protested at the time. There is no provision in the Treaties for us to appoint the Commission. In no way is the Commission our government and with this resolution one is trying to introduce a form of cabinet responsibility for which there is no provision in the Treaties. Of course provision is made in the Treaties for Parliament to express no confidence in the Commission, but that is something entirely different. I was of course prepared to discuss the Commission's programme and I will gladly participate in such a discussion because I feel that that would be sensible. But that we should now formally appoint the Commission is in my view contrary to the terms of the Treaties. For this reason I will not vote in favour of this resolution, I will not vote against it or return a blank. I will protest by abstaining.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — I call Mr Glinne.

**Mr Glinne.** — (F) Mr President, the Socialist Group has decided to leave it to its members to decide individually. It is a free vote, but I should like to point out here that one could of course have questioned the very principle of such a resolution at this time. Moreover, I would like to ask you to hold a roll-call vote which will avoid a long series of personal explanations of

vote, and also to hold a separate vote on the three essential elements of the resolution. Finally I would say that, for my part, and this applies to many other members of my group — I cannot agree with the proposed wording of paragraph 1. Indeed, I must express once more to Mr Thorn my regret that there are no women in the Commission.

Secondly, paragraph 2 is based on what are called the underlying principles of political philosophy. I have the English text before me. As I said in my speech, we cannot support the statement you made yesterday. We therefore ask, Mr President, for a roll-call vote and a separate vote on the three essential paragraphs of the motion.

**President.** — I call Mr Colla.

**Mr Colla.** — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to give an explanation of vote on behalf of the Flemish Socialists elected to this Parliament. We would like to take part in this vote as we regard a resolution as important. However, we regret that, whoever is responsible, it was not possible to achieve a greater convergence of views. We would also like to take part in the vote because we feel that this would be a logical thing to do after the adoption of the Rey report and that, both for the directly elected Parliament and for the relations between the various institutions, this is not only a matter of major innovation but also a necessity if Parliament wishes to take itself seriously and make a serious impression on others.

We cannot, however, vote for the resolution. We intend to abstain — not because we cannot go along with certain aspects of the resolution but, on the contrary, because, in our view, there are major gaps. Our main objection is that what we want to hear in a policy statement by the new Commission is not just general fine-sounding but sometimes nebulous principles. We expect the new Commission to put forward more specific plans regarding all the major fields in which this Community has problems to contend with, such as institutional matters common policy and the implementation of the 1981 budget and the supplementary budget for 1980. Thus we are giving the Commission the benefit of the doubt, but our vote of confidence will depend on the specific options we should like to see the Commission put forward as soon as possible.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Mr President, may I ask you when Mr Fanti is going to speak? Since I normally have to speak after him, I should like to observe the same custom this evening.

**President.** — I am giving you the floor because you are next in the list of speakers. I am sure you are not going to forego this opportunity to say something.

*(Laughter)*

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* I am simply asking for things to happen in the same order as they have always happened in this Parliament. My Group always speaks after the bigger Groups.

**President.** — I do not think there is anything in the Rules of Procedure about bigger Groups. Be that as it may, since you are surrendering your right to speak, I shall call Mr Welsh.

*(Laughter)*

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* I am not surrendering anything!

**Mr Welsh.** — Unlike our friend, Mr Lalor, Mr President, I did not come here to act as a rubber stamp for the Commission, nor did I come here to act as a figleaf for the Member States. The resolution we have before us now represents a political compromise and therefore is absolutely the lowest common denominator of political opinion. It says absolutely nothing. It is not even the beginning of a response to what Mr Thorn has had to say. It says nothing about what the programme of the Commission ought to be. Nor does it comment on the fact that the Commission apparently has very little of a programme at all. I personally cannot vote for this resolution, because, frankly, there is nothing worth voting for. Equally, I cannot vote against it, because there is nothing worth voting against. Therefore, because I believe in what this Parliament has to do and I believe in its role, I shall abstain, and I invite all those who really care about democracy in Europe and the power of the Parliament to join me in abstaining on this vote.

*(Applause from certain quarters of the European Democratic Group)*

**President.** — I call Mr Kirk.

**Mr Kirk.** — *(DK)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I will not abstain like the previous speakers from voting on this motion for a resolution, nor will I say, like some of the previous speakers, that we in Parliament have not had an opportunity to approve the appointment of the new Commission. The fact is, we have not had an opportunity to do the contrary, namely to reject its appointment. There is a substantial difference here.

The reason I want to vote in favour of this motion for a resolution is not that I am satisfied with the

programme of activities which Mr Thorn presented, I made that quite clear here during the discussions this afternoon. But in spite of all I see it as an opportunity when Point 2 of the motion for a resolution asks the Commission to appear before the relevant Parliamentary committees to discuss the programme in greater detail as soon as possible. I hope that the Commission will comply with this request, I hope also that the discussion which takes place in the committee will not be an interminable debate without definite content, but that it will lead to specific initiatives both on the part of the committee and on the part of the Commission so that we no longer have a programme of activities which formulates no definite policy. This is the reason why I will vote in favour of this motion for a resolution.

**President.** — I call Mr Fanti.

**Mr Fanti.** — *(I)* Mr President, the criticism of the Italian Members of the Communist and Allies Group with regard to the Commission programme presented by Mr Thorn was outlined in the speeches by Mr Berlinguer and Mr Spinelli, and there is no need for me to repeat what they said.

I just want to say to Mr Thorn that promises are not what we want. What we have asked for and what we are asking for now are definite undertakings which bridge the gap between the vague generalities — with which no one can disagree — and incomplete plans of work which ignore, among other things, all the suggestions, proposals and resolutions which this Parliament of ours has put forward over the last 18 months.

I want to say that the Italian Communists will be voting against the motion before the House. The point is we think it is a bit too fanciful. There are three parts to the motion. In the first part something is approved which it is not Parliament's job to approve: the investiture of the Commission is carried out by the governments, in accordance with the Treaties. The second part takes note of the Commission's programme but lacks the courage to say that Parliament approves the programme. As for the third part, there is reference to some dim date in the future, October 1981, when there is to be an agreement on inter-institutional relations, relations which develop day by day, our stock-in-trade, which have to be dealt with as they occur and which have to be dealt with from today in the way they occur, so that we can find some way out of the serious crisis which has arisen.

Consequently, we shall be voting against this motion for a resolution, and let me say again what we said originally when the Commission report was presented: we said then that we wanted frank and open relations with the Commission. We in Parliament shall be just as

**Fanti**

meticulous in demanding as we have been in carrying out our role and our function.

*(Applause from the extreme left)*

**President.** — I call Mr Radoux.

**Mr Radoux.** — *(F)* I was delighted a fortnight ago at a meeting of the Political Affairs Committee when the inauguration of a new Commission helped us to decide on the text of a motion for a resolution. Furthermore, I was also delighted when I heard the new President of the Commission lay greater stress than his predecessors on the institutional problems. But I am dismayed at the circumstances in which this House presents a motion. I trust that on future occasions we can come here and vote right away without having to discuss matters. Speaking personally, and for the reasons I have just outlined, I certainly intend to vote.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* Mr President, I am going to vote against this motion and I am going to do so for reasons which I think are quite straightforward. First of all, the motion says that Parliament declares itself in agreement with the political principles which have been outlined by the President of the Council. The fact is, Mr Thorn, that you had no option but to present a programme for the Commission which respected the views of the Council and of a majority here in Parliament. But we are dead against the views of the majority here and dead against Council policy. It is obvious that in the circumstances there is no way we can give our political support to your programme.

I am more than ready to say this, Mr Thorn, because you know that in spite of my criticism I have the highest regard for you, and not just because of your personal qualities. You quite rightly pointed out that the Commission has to adopt a collectively responsible attitude. Well, Mr Thorn, neither of us believes there is place for a kind of demi-urge in a democratic system. You are surrounded by the same people as your predecessor had, and without doubt the Commissioners are all honourable men. I am delighted that collective responsibility has induced the Commission to present just ten lines on the North-South Dialogue and I am over the moon at Mr Cheysson's contribution to your collective responsibility in this area. But it affects me in a rather negative way, you know, and I think it comes as a surprise.

Mr Thorn, I really wish you the best on behalf of us all. But I fear that the federalist you were, and the fearless European you are now, will not manage to carry through the appointed task. I am not saying that you will simply have to make up your mind whether to give in or give up, but what I am saying is that you

should watch those people who say they are with you today, and keep an eye on your friends. They are not federalists and they do not have the same ideas that I know you have. I was among those who put their names to the crocodile and I am glad I did. Just let me finish by saying that I am surprised Mr Fanti was prompted to say that it is not our job to appoint the Members of the Commission, and so on. This was not going far enough, Mr Fanti, but at least some progress has been made.

**President.** — I call Mr Romualdi.

**Mr Romualdi.** — *(I)* Ladies and gentlemen, in spite of what a number of esteemed colleagues have said, we find that the motion on the appointment of the Commission complies with the Treaties and especially with Article 144, and this is backed up by the interpretation given in the Rey report which we approved a few months ago. If the article in question contains the idea of censure, the idea of investiture must be there too. By this I mean a vote of confidence which renders the Commission more directly answerable to Parliament. This is what we want and what we have always said we wanted.

As a result, my colleagues and I shall be voting in favour of the motion ratifying the new Commission. Quite apart from our comments and our criticism, we shall thus be marking our appreciation for the political slant which Mr Thorn gave to his programme. We think he is on the right lines with his commitments outlined in the programme, especially as far as relations with Parliament go. Parliament thus lays claim to a position of authority and prestige which is a solid reflection of the will of the 180 million Europeans who elected this Assembly to defend their interests and to safeguard their future within a free community of nations.

**President.** — I call Mr Albers.

**Mr Albers.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I should be glad to take part in the pronouncement made by this Parliament following the detailed debate which has taken place. Unfortunately, I cannot do so on the basis of a decision by my Group, as I would have also wished in connection with the pronouncements which have already been made here today.

Unfortunately, I will not be able to vote in favour of paragraph 1, since this is a particularly feeble reflection of the actual situation in this Parliament. As things stand, we have had no hand in the nomination of the new Commission and, after the forceful statements which have been made it is a little feeble to say that in future we would like to be involved in nominations of this kind.

**Albers**

Nor, unfortunately, can I support paragraph 2 of this resolution since this too states somewhat feebly that Parliament has taken note of the programme.

As I said before in my speech, what we would have liked was a policy programme for the next four years which we could have discussed with the Commission.

In Paragraph 3 it is stated that Parliament notes with satisfaction that the President of the Commission has agreed to submit a document by 1 October 1981. I can wholeheartedly share this satisfaction since I expect the principles on which the Commission intends to conduct its policy will be made more clear in this document. After what I have said regarding Paragraphs 1 and 2, you will understand that I will abstain from the final vote on the motion for a resolution as a whole.

**President.** — I call Mrs Van den Heuvel.

**Mrs Van den Heuvel.** — (NL) Mr President, the Rey report, which was adopted by a great majority in this Parliament, had and continues to have my wholehearted support. In the Political Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, I gave my firm support to the Hänsch proposal to conclude the debate on the Commission's programme with a vote, since I take the view that this Parliament has the right to do so and must lay claim to this right. However, the programme which the Commission presented to us yesterday is, in my view, so vague that I cannot declare my confidence in the Commission on this basis. For this reason, I intend to vote against Paragraph 2 of the motion for a resolution.

As for Paragraph 1, the approval of the nomination of the Commission, I should like to say that, obviously, I deeply regret that this Commission includes no women members. Everyone knows my views on this subject after the amendment I tabled on the occasion of the debate on the Rey report in which I called for the appointing of at least three women to the Commission. If however, a programme had been submitted to which I could have given my support, I would have been in favour of a vote of confidence. I think, therefore, that it would only be reasonable to do that under these circumstances too. I will therefore vote in favour of Paragraph 1, but against Paragraph 2 and abstain from the final vote.

**President.** — I call Mr Hänsch.

**Mr Hänsch.** — (D) Ladies and gentlemen, in recent weeks I have endeavoured, together with a number of colleagues, to bring about a clear decision following the debate on the Commission programme. For various reasons, unfortunately, this will not be possible today and I will admit quite frankly that my own

Group also unfortunately shares the responsibility for this. I was concerned that we in this Parliament should not only manage to see eye to eye in the negative votes we can take by virtue of the Treaty, but also in a positive vote of confidence regarding the Commission so that we can explore all the possibilities which the Treaty does not explicitly prohibit.

If we have certain reservations and doubts regarding the motion for a resolution this is because my Group itself has decided not to play any further part in the formulation of the resolution. Naturally, we cannot unreservedly support it if the appointment of the Commission is approved in Paragraph 1, since we would have wished this Commission to include a number of women members too. Obviously, we cannot give our full support to Paragraph 2 either, since the programme which has been presented to us is not unfortunately, Mr Thorn, what we had been looking forward to. However, it should have been possible jointly to arrive at wordings which would have permitted the majority of this Parliament to vote in unison.

*(Scattered applause from the left)*

Be that as it may, we are still interested in efficient cooperation with you, i.e. the Commission, and we intend to reflect this interest in our voting.

Thus we as German Social Democratic members of the Socialist Group intend to take part in the voting since we are convinced that this vote will help to strengthen the position and influence of the European Parliament, and what we need is a more *pro-European* Parliament . . .

*(Applause from various quarters)*

. . . We intend to take part in the vote since it is our wish that Parliament should make use of all the possibilities which are not explicitly prohibited by the Treaty, with a view to increasing its influence.

We also intend to take part in the vote since it is not, I think, fitting for a Member of Parliament to abstain from voting. Finally, we intend to vote because we feel that this vote must take place after the Rey report, which calls for a vote of confidence of this kind, was adopted with a large majority by this Parliament in April of last year. If, ladies and gentlemen, a Parliament demands that the Commission and the Council take its decisions seriously and act on them, it must first of all take its own decision seriously and act on them.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Sarre.

**Mr Sarre.** — (F) Ladies and gentlemen, the French Members of the Socialist Group will not be voting. We

## Sarre

want to have nothing to do with the vote, for two reasons.

Firstly, and quite simply, Parliament has the possibility of criticizing the Commission and sending it packing. Parliament is not obliged to approve the appointment of Commissioners. That is my first point.

The second point I want to make is much more political in nature. When you listen to Mr Thorn, in fact, you cannot see how he relates the economic crisis to social and political matters. He talks of the crisis as though it were like an earthquake or a flood. To us, in fact, the crisis is political. And since we feel that the policy about to be followed is simply the approval of unbridled free trade, we refuse for these reasons to take part in this ballot and this vote. In this way we are respecting the rules of the Treaties and at the same time our own political beliefs.

**President.** — I call Mr Arndt.

**Mr Arndt.** — (*D*) Mr President, I am about to do something which hardly ever happens in this House, but I must make a statement on behalf of my friends in the German Social-Democratic Party.

In their campaign for the direct elections the German Social Democrats made the explicit promise that all those elected would endeavour in this Parliament not only to safeguard but also to develop a representative democratic constitution reflecting the rights of this Parliament, as is essential in a constitutional parliamentary democracy. This means that when a new Commission is appointed, a Parliament has not only the right but also the duty to express its views and vote on the matter.

This is a basic principle which we proclaimed to our electors and which we must also abide by. It therefore essential that we vote on this motion for a resolution following the statement of the President of the Commission. In itself, this seemed to present no problem, even for my entire Group. Unfortunately — and I should like to invite the Commission, the President and this House as a whole to give this matter some thought — when our colleague Mr Hänsch was given the task of producing an appropriate motion, we thought it would be possible for us to give a motion for a resolution of this kind our wholehearted support here today since we had expected the Commission to submit an acceptable programme. However, what the Commission submitted to us yesterday is unfortunately not the sort of programme which the voters and this Parliament had in mind, which is why we have run into difficulties with this motion for a resolution. I should like to be quite clear on this point. For this reason, my colleagues in the German Social Democratic Party for the most part find themselves unable to vote in favour of Paragraph 2. We will oppose this

paragraph because we take the view that no real programme has in fact been submitted. The fact that it will not enter into force until 1 October is some consolation but does not change the situation in any way. I should therefore like to make it quite clear that I intend to take part in the final vote but to vote against Paragraph 2 in order to make a quite unambiguous protest against the way affairs are being conducted. In future, we will make our confidence or lack of it dependent on the practicability of the Commission's programme. Otherwise I think it is the duty of this Parliament — if it wants to be a real Parliament — to give a yes or no answer to this question.

**President.** — I call Mr Van Minnen.

**Mr Van Minnen.** — (*NL*) Mr President, one thing is, I think, clear in spite of the strange mess we appear to have got into. None of us is satisfied with the political platitudes of which this Commission statement consisted. It is regrettable that the consultation process has not led to an expression of this rejection of the policies — and you must understand, Mr Thorn, that this has nothing to do with a rejection of the person. I should like, in this connection, to draw your attention to a suggestion from a very different political corner than my own, i.e. the suggestion contained in Amendment No 4, which has in the meantime been revised four times. This amendment was tabled by Mr Price and Mr Purvis, who are by no means Socialists, and states that Parliament shares many of the President's general aspirations but notes with disappointment that few concrete proposals have been put forward. It also calls on the Commission to put this to Parliament at its March part-session a detailed programme and that Parliament reserves its opinion as to whether it has confidence in the new Commission and that it has considered such a programme.

If the motion for a resolution before us had consisted of this simple text, I think it would have been possible for the critical members of this Parliament to come to some agreement. However, since this is not the case, since the resolution before us even goes one better than the Commissions's statement as regards its non-committal attitude to the content and timing of the programme, since this is the resolution we are to vote on, I am sure you will not be surprised if I must vote against it.

**President.** — I call Mr Schmid.

**Mr Schmid.** — (*D*) Mr President, I should like to make a request for two separate votes to be held on Paragraph 1, since this contains two points which have nothing to do with each other. Firstly, it states that Parliament approves the appointment of the Commission. This is one thing and many previous speakers

Schmid

have already made quite clear why my Group cannot go along with this. Secondly, it states that Parliament 'reiterates its request to participate in future in that appointment'. I could very well give my support to the second part of this paragraph but not to the first — indeed I feel that I *must* support the second part. It is, in my view, impossible for this House to invite the Egyptian President and call itself the elected representation of the people of Europe and then to back out when nothing more or less is at issue than the appointment of the body in charge of the 8 000 officials in Brussels who are running the whole show. This is preposterous.

And now a few words to my French colleagues. The French Revolution did not take place because the people of France in 1789 acted on the authority of the existing inflexible social arrangements of the monarchy, but because there were people who were prepared to transcend these agreements. We are not going to make any progress in Europe if we slavishly cling to the Treaties of 1957.

(Laughter)

President. — I call Mr Ferri.

Mr Ferri. — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Italian Social Democrats I want to say that we shall be voting since we feel that it is only right for Parliament to make its views known with a resolution after the speech we have heard by the President of the Commission, Mr Thorn. We shall abstain from voting on Paragraph 1, because we feel it is a risky and ambitious venture, and one which at any rate is not going to help increase as we should like the political powers of Parliament, if we go ahead and approve something which has been carried out in accordance with the Treaties by the Council of Ministers and which, if we were to reject it, would simply provoke a political crisis which no one can want. I mentioned the reservations I have on this matter when we discussed and adopted the Rey report.

As for Paragraph 2, while appreciating Mr Thorn's efforts, I must say that as Socialist Members of the European Parliament we cannot give our support, or at least our full support, to the political principles underlying the Commission's programme. If there can be a separate vote on the two parts of Paragraph 1 — which is what Mr Schmid asked for just now — we shall vote against the first part but in favour of the rest of the paragraph. If this cannot be done, we shall abstain. We shall be voting in favour of Paragraph 3 and abstaining on the motion for a resolution as a whole.

President. — I call Mrs Scrivener.

Mrs Scrivener. — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like everything to be quite clear. There can be no question of Parliament's ratifying the Commission with this motion for the simple reason that Parliament has no power to do so. However, together with several other Members who like me have one or two doubts, I shall be voting in favour of the motion as a display of our confidence, our unreserved confidence, in the Commission and in Mr Thorn in particular.

(Applause from various quarters)

In short, our vote will represent neither a lack of confidence nor a ratification.

President. — I call Mr Haralampopoulos.

Mr Haralampopoulos. — (EL) The motion for a resolution does not reflect either the spirit or the letter of the Treaties. We are therefore forced to conclude that this is an attempt to bring about an institutional change which is not provided for in the Treaties. On behalf of the Panhellenic Socialist Movement of Greece, I declare that we shall abstain from voting, for the simple reason that we do not wish to legitimize by our participation a procedure which is not provided for in the Treaties and which seeks to establish a new institutional order.

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

Mr Tyrrell. — Actually, Mr President, my point is under Rule 32 (1) (d) and I wish to move the adjournment of this debate. The reason I wish to move it is this: it is quite clear that there is a wide divergence of view in this Chamber on how this motion should be dealt with. It is a motion of great constitutional importance in the Parliament because it is the first time this directly-elected Parliament has had to consider what to do about the appointment of a new Commission and the presentation of its programme. The motion on which we are about to vote, unless my point of order is passed, is one which we have had no opportunity to put down amendments to. I firmly believe that if we have the opportunity to put down amendments and to vote on them, we shall find a motion which has the support of the majority of this House. At the moment this motion runs the risk of being defeated because people will vote against it for entirely different reasons, some because it is not strong enough; some because it is too strong; some because we have no constitutional power; some because we have. And accordingly, Mr President, I ask under Rule 32 (1) (d) that this vote be adjourned and that it take place on the first day of the next Strasbourg part-session, by which time amendments may have been put

Tyrrell

down which will enable this House to express its majority view.

*(Applause from certain quarters of the European Democratic Group)*

**President.** — I call Mr Bangemann to speak on the proposal which has just been made.

**Mr Bangemann.** — *(D)* Mr President, I fully realize that opinions differ in this House. This is true of every Parliament and always has been.

For the rest, I feel that the motion before us is perfectly clear and speaks for itself.

I hope that all the Members whose views are not reflected in specific phrases will nevertheless bear in mind the point which was made yesterday or the day before yesterday on the vote on the Maij-Weggen report when we come to the final vote, i.e. that one may well be defeated on a detail, but one should not for this reason lose sight of the main aim of a resolution of this kind. One must therefore consider the question of whether or not one intends to vote for or against it very carefully. This situation will be no different at the next part-session, and for this reason, Mr President, I oppose this request for adjournment.

*(Parliament rejected the request)*

**President.** — I call Mr Ryan on a point of order.

**Mr Ryan.** — Mr Glinne has asked for a roll-call vote. Before that request is acceded to and the electronic equipment is used I think the House should bear in mind that that equipment is known to be defective following a number of serious faults recorded yesterday, which could not have arisen, as has sometimes been alleged, by some Members voting for another. Therefore, before the vote is taken I, as a Member of this Parliament and in conformity with my responsibilities as a Quaestor, must warn the House that the validity of the vote may be open to question. I am saying that, Mr President, for this reason: when this morning I pointed out that there were mistakes I was accused of rising on the matter simply because the results did not please me. We are using a toy which we cannot rely on when making a serious and an historical decision, as some people have said, in relation to the future of the Parliament. Therefore it seems to me that notwithstanding the inconvenience and the bellows from the Communist bench we should vote in a responsible way and not use the electronic equipment.

*(Mixed reactions)*

**President.** — Mr Ryan, I have been assured that the electronic system was checked today and that it was working properly. We shall therefore use the system for the roll-call votes.

*(Applause — Parliament adopted successively the first, second and third indents of the preamble, the first<sup>1</sup> and second<sup>1</sup> parts of paragraph 1, paragraph 2<sup>1</sup>, paragraph 3,<sup>1</sup> paragraph 4 and the motion for a resolution as a whole)<sup>2</sup>*

#### 10. Agenda

**President.** — In accordance with the decision taken earlier today, we shall now vote on the request for deferral to the next part-session of the Lalor report (Doc. 1-532/80) on the Western Sahara.

*(Parliament rejected the request)<sup>2</sup>*

Mrs Castellina has asked for her report (Doc. 1-698/80) on STABEX to be deferred to the next part-session.

*(Parliament agreed to the request)*

I call Mr Prag, who also wishes to make a request.

**Mr Prag.** — Mr President, after consulting the Chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, I repeat to you, who were also in fact in the chair when I last made the same request at the January part-session, the request that, under Rule 32 (1) (d), the debate on my report on the linking of work and training for young people should be adjourned.

I made my protest this morning against the gross abuse of urgency procedures and the disruption of the agenda and work of this Parliament by an absolute rash of urgent motions. It is with the greatest regret that I ask for the adjournment. It is an own-initiative report, Mr President, the task of which is to draw attention to a very serious matter, namely the state of training for 3½ million young people who are unemployed. There would be no point in discussing it at midnight tonight in a virtually empty Chamber. That is why, under Rule 32 (1) (d), I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

*(Parliament agreed to the request)*

<sup>1</sup> By roll-call vote: see minutes of proceedings, OJ No C 50 of 9. 3. 1981.

<sup>2</sup> By roll-call vote requested by Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group: see minutes of proceedings, OJ No C 50 of 9. 3. 1981.

11. *Regulation on the common organization of the market in sugar — Sugar quotas of the French overseas departments*

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on two reports drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture:

- Bocklet report (Doc. 1-839/80) on the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-471/80) for a regulation on the common organization of the market in sugar;
- Curry report (Doc. 1-748/80) on the sugar quota for the French overseas departments.

I call Mr Bocklet.

**Mr Bocklet, rapporteur.** — (*D*) Mr President, in view of the importance of the organization of the market in sugar and the fact that we were supposed to vote tomorrow, at a time when there is bound to be a very poor attendance in the House, and in view of the fact also that 55 amendments have been tabled, I hereby request that the report and the amendments be referred to committee, in accordance with Rule 29 (6) of the Rules of Procedure.

**President.** — As this request has been made by the rapporteur, reference to committee is automatic.

I call Mr Rogers on a point of order.

**Mr Rogers.** — Mr President, I understand that although this is, generally done, we have now had two instances of items being withdrawn from the agenda. I certainly do not need advice from anyone in the hall. I am addressing my remarks to you as President, Mr Pflimlin. If this is to be the case, and if people are simply to wait for a full Chamber in order to present reports we are really going to wind up with a ridiculous nonsense!

(*Applause from certain quarters of the European Democratic Group*)

At 3 o'clock this afternoon, when I declared the sitting resumed, there was a debate on the report by Mr Thorn. There was a great deal of enjoyment from the other side of the House when the vote was carried. In the House I went through three speakers before I could find someone who was available to speak! We cannot carry out our business like this. It is not always possible to put every item on the agenda at a time when there is full attendance in the House. Quite frankly, you as President ought to rule that what is on the order paper and was adopted this morning should stay on the order paper. A Friday is just the same as a

Thursday or a Wednesday. If people wish to leave, that is none of our business, but I really do think it is ridiculous!

(*Applause from certain quarters of the European Democratic Group*)

**President.** — I understand your feelings, Mr Rogers, but as one who has often chaired the proceedings you know the Rules of Procedure as well as I do:

Reference to committee may be requested at any time. Such a request shall always be granted if it is made in person by the chairman or rapporteur of the committee responsible.

You may not like it, but that is what the Rules say.

**Mr Rogers.** — I am perfectly aware of that, Mr President. It does not add to the dignity of the House to have two of its Vice-Presidents arguing over procedure. But, as I understand it, the purpose of the rule which is now being invoked was simply to enable a report to be referred back to the committee if there were factual or textual errors in the text before the House. This is the reason for enabling it to be withdrawn. Previous interpretations of this rule gave the right of withdrawal to the rapporteur if there were textual errors. I am sorry and apologize for raising this, Mr President, because I could well be in your position.

**President.** — There is nothing in the Rules of Procedure which says that the rapporteur must give reasons for his request.

What does Mr Curry want to do with his report, which was supposed to be considered jointly with the Bocklet report?

**Mr Curry.** — Mr President, I do not see any reason why my report cannot make precedent and set a remarkable example in this Chamber and go ahead.

(*Applause from various quarters*)

Mr President, I can be very precise and brief on this report because it was voted unanimously in the Committee on Agriculture. It is based on a resolution that asked that in any production quota cuts which the Commission was at that time proposing, there should be exemption for the French overseas departments, whose economies were very dependent upon the growing of cane sugar and for whose development an expansion of cane sugar production was envisaged.

The conditions have, of course, changed completely now because those proposals are no longer on the table and the Commission has in fact substituted different proposals which do not involve a cut in the crucial aid quotas.

## Curry

There were, I think, two fears that inspired the resolution: first of all, that the development of the French territories ought to be protected, dependent as they were on cane, and secondly that French sugarbeet producers in Metropolitan France were out to get their hands on the unused portion of the quota which was allocated to the overseas departments.

The Committee on Agriculture agreed that while we were willing to envisage some sort of special conditions for the overseas territories we would not be willing to see any global increase in the French quota — that is the French quota defined as the sum of the quota allocated to Metropolitan France and to its overseas territories, that we would be perfectly happy if France wished to redistribute the quota between the metropolitan and the overseas territories on condition that this did not increase the beet production quota in France, and that we would be equally willing to see France organize some form of redistribution within the overseas territories. What we would not be prepared to accept is any special conditions for the overseas territories which had the effect of increasing the net global production quotas of France.

On that basis, and in full recognition of the importance of this sector to those territories, we were able to unanimously agree the report in the committee. I hope that this House will be able to follow that unanimity.

**President.** — The Commission has the floor.

**Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission.** — (DK) Mr President, first of all I would like to voice my regret at the fact that the Bocklet report has been deferred with the result that it will not be dealt with today. I know that the Council of Agricultural Ministers intends to deal with the whole question of the new regulation on sugar at its next meeting and for this reason it will be inconvenient for it not to have Parliament's opinion. However this is of course something which Parliament itself must decide.

I should like to thank Mr Curry for his report, and to emphasize the point which Mr Curry himself touched on, namely that to a large extent his report is based on the Commission proposal of November 1979 on the future organization of the market in sugar and that for this reason in fact it is to a large extent out of date. As you know our new proposal has already been accepted by the Committee on Agriculture and in this we propose maintaining all the A-quotas including also those for the overseas departments. As regards the B-quotas for the overseas departments, the Committee on Agriculture has raised no objections to our proposal to fix them at 5 % of the A-quotas.

Nevertheless, in reply to the two most important preoccupations expressed in the report, I think it only fair to say that, as was previously the case, the

Commission still has reservations about transferring quotas for the manufacture of raw sugar from sugar producers in the French overseas departments to be used by sugar producers in metropolitan France. On the other hand, the Commission has, as previously, no objection to a transfer of sugar quotas, under certain conditions, from one sugar producer in the French overseas territories to another so as to take account of the production quotas set for the coming years under the development plans now in operation in these departments.

**President.** — The Communist and Allies Group has the floor.

**Mr Vergès.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by clarifying a point: Mr Curry's report on the motions for resolutions tabled by Mr Debré and myself has been appended to the report by Mr Bocklet, but it is clear — as Mr Curry pointed out — that the problem raised in our motions for resolutions and in this report is no longer relevant, because they referred to a proposal on sugar which has now been withdrawn. Accordingly, there is no further reason for us to discuss it now as it has been incorporated in the new draft regulation and in Mr Bocklet's report. However, since Mr Curry was prepared to defend his position, I think it only right that I should say that we are in perfect agreement with the conclusions of his motion for a resolution as set out in paragraphs 6, 7, 8 and 9. It is right to emphasize the specific problems of sugar producers in the French overseas departments, precisely because they are sugarcane producers and precisely because these are single-crop countries where sugar plays a decisive role in the overall economy. The specific nature of the problem was also stressed by the ACP-EEC Joint Committee which met in Arusha. It is the reason why the quotas granted to the overseas departments, because of the specific and basic nature of the sugar economy, should not in our opinion be transferred elsewhere.

To our mind, this is fundamentally important and it is a condition for maintaining a relatively high quota for our countries, given that they have difficulty in reaching these quotas because of cyclones and their own particular structural problems. This is why, while we are all for the transfer of quotas from one cane-sugar producing overseas department to another, we are totally opposed to the transfer of any cane sugar quota to the quota for beet sugars.

To take up a point made by the rapporteur, I feel I must add that the overseas departments should not benefit from any preferential treatment, as they are countries which are part of the Community. What is more, we shall have an opportunity to discuss this matter and it may not be necessary to take a vote on this subject in Parliament. The Commission could take the initiative just as easily as the Council. But since we

## Vergès

are members of the Community, why is it that the intervention price for sugarbeet is paid when the product leaves the processor, whereas, in our countries, the intervention price is only applied at the port of embarkation, not on leaving the refinery, expenditure incurred between the refinery and the port of embarkation being the responsibility of the planters and sugar producers on the island of Réunion? It seems to us — if the rapporteur agrees — that this would be a good opportunity to eliminate unfair discrimination and to put us on an equal footing by eradicating this injustice. The intervention price for Réunion cane sugar should be paid when it leaves the refinery, as in the ten Member States, and not at the port of embarkation, whereby the transport costs are borne by the producers. Those are the points that we wanted to make. We feel that the debate will really get under way when we discuss Mr Bocklet's report.

**President.** — The Group of European Progressive Democrats has the floor.

**Mr Vié.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to begin by echoing Mr Vergès' remarks: it is not really logical to continue discussing this report, as it has been superseded by another report which the author has requested to have referred to committee. I just wanted to make the following points: pursuant to Article 227 of the Treaty and the judgment of the Court of Justice in Luxembourg, the French overseas departments are entitled to both Community patrimony and preference and to a specific economic development policy.

This House must make its deeds match its words. Where the common organization of markets in the sugar sector is concerned, it ought to take due account of Commission proposals voted on previously. For example, some months ago, on 17 October 1980, the European Parliament was almost unanimous in approving a plan for the development of agriculture in the French overseas departments, which had been proposed by the Commission. One of the main features of this plan was the renewed encouragement of sugar cane growing in soils and in climates which were naturally suited to this purpose.

The Commission now states — and this is consistent with previous statements it has made — that one of the objectives of the scheme which it is proposing is to guarantee sugar-cane producers a fair income. The methods of the scheme must be geared to meet the objective thus defined. Now, although the Commission — quite right — is rectifying a previous mistake by maintaining the A-quotas of the overseas departments at 466 000 tonnes, it is nevertheless not pursuing the argument to its logical conclusion, which is that these quotas should be made sufficiently profitable so that the overseas departments — which are the underprivileged regions of Europe — are encouraged to

produce them. In other words, it is only right and fair that the price paid should be an ex-factory price and not a fob price, and that the costs of transporting sugar to continental Europe should be reimbursed in accordance with actual costs and not on a flat-rate basis. In addition, national aid, as in Italy's case, should not only be maintained, but no phased reduction should take place either because this would result in its total disappearance at the end of five years. It has to be recognized that the combined effects of climate, geography, geology, economic and technical environment are such that sugar-cane factories in overseas departments are just not able to compete at the same level with European firms which produce sugar from beet. For this very reason, it is both right and essential that national aid should be maintained in its entirety until sugar-cane production in the overseas departments has reached the level where it can fairly compete with sugarbeet production in continental Europe. Similarly, the 2.5 % levy on the A-sugar price should not be applied to areas such as the overseas departments; on the contrary, they must be encouraged to produce more in order to create more jobs locally. In view of their economic situation, it is not right that they should have to finance the B and C quotas of European beet sugar producers.

**President.** — The Commission has the floor.

**Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission.** — (*DK*) Mr President, I would simply like to point out that the proposal which you have now decided not to deal with in this part-session takes account of requests for an exemption from transport costs for producers in the overseas territories. The provisions of the proposal have been changed with the result that it now complies with the requests expressed by the two honourable Members.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

#### 12. Regulation on the common organization of the market in fishery products

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-841/80), drawn up by Mr Gautier on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-635/80) for a regulation on the common organization of the market in fishery products.

I call Mr Gautier.

Mr Gautier, *rapporteur*. — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I see that we in the Committee on Agriculture are more or less on our own, so I can keep my introduction relatively brief. The Committee on Agriculture has devoted many hours to this somewhat knotty problem on various occasions and also discussed a large number of proposed amendments. The outcome has fortunately been such that we can submit a text to this House which has the unanimous support of all the members of the Committee.

Firstly, I should like to stress that we in the Committee are very pleased that the Commission has taken the trouble of revising the old organization of the markets in fisheries products and including a number of new proposals. We also know that it is extremely difficult to strike a balance between the extremely wide range of conflicting interests which an organization of the market in fisheries products affects. In addition I should like to stress that what we are concerned with here is an arrangement concerning the markets for fish and fish products in which account must be taken, not only of the producers, i.e. the fishermen, who form one of the elements in this sector, but also of a wide range of other elements including trade, the processing industry and the consumers.

I should like first of all to draw attention to the question of marketing standards. The Committee on Agriculture would advocate even more stringent marketing standards with a view to ensuring that only such fish is landed in the Community as can be sold under reasonable conditions and provide the processing industry with adequate supplies. I regard marketing standards as one of the basic elements in the whole organization of the market in fishery products. The importance of this aspect, particularly in the light of the extensive intervention in a large number of Member States, is frequently overlooked. In many cases, the fish does not always meet the standards one would expect.

Secondly, I should like to say that we in the Committee on Agriculture are particularly pleased that the central position of producers' organizations within the context of the organization of the market in fishery products has been maintained and that their influence is even to be extended. We think it is a good thing that producers should join together and attempt to arrange the marketing situation in such a way as to be able to obtain the highest possible price for the fish they have caught.

We also particularly welcome the fact that under the new arrangement, the producers' organizations will enjoy greater flexibility in price fixing, which was one of the concerns which had been brought to our notice. The idea was not to have such strict unit prices in every case, but that the producers' organizations should be enabled by virtue of the withdrawal price to make the entire system more flexible.

Under the new arrangements for compensation for withdrawal, our Committee unanimously approves the attempt by the Commission in its proposal to oblige the producers actually to sell the fish landed by means of a degressive compensation system. Thus, the more the producers land or the more landed fish goes into intervention, the lower the compensation received by the producers from the European Community. This is a good start as I think that marketing and not intervention should be in the forefront.

A criticism which has been voiced in the Committee on Agriculture concerns the arrangement on the destruction of fish withdrawn from the market, which in our view, is still unsatisfactory. In connection with the Clinton report we requested that fish withdrawn from the market should also be used in some form for human consumption without this causing serious market disturbances. We expect the Commission to make clearer arrangements in this area too so that the products withdrawn from the market can in fact be used for human consumption and do not automatically go for use in fish meal production. It is a downright scandal for the people of Europe if 20 000 tonnes of red mullet which could be used for human consumption go into intervention. We would like to see a change or systems which could alleviate this situation.

I should now like to say a few words on the somewhat delicate subject of imports from third countries. This has naturally been one of the major issues in the Committee on Agriculture and we have agreed on a text which is perhaps a little vague. The Committee on Agriculture recognizes the fact that we as a Community are obliged to import large amounts of fish. There is no getting away from this fact and we feel that it should not be allowed to disrupt the common market. This is the only specific comment the Committee on Agriculture has to make on this point.

Personally, as *rapporteur*, I take the view that the regulations as proposed by the Commission would provide adequate protection for producers within the Community and I should therefore like to take this opportunity of commenting briefly on the two amendments tabled by Mr Provan and others in which they call for a system of variable levies on all fish products on a weekly basis in the light of the market situation. I should to make two or three comments on this proposal. Firstly, everyone who is familiar with the GATT arrangements will realize that this would be in conflict with the GATT provisions. If we as Parliament call for something of this kind, we must realize that it is at variance with the GATT arrangements. A second, substantive question is, I think, whether we can really achieve what we hope to achieve by means of a variable import levy, i.e. to protect the common market from disturbances.

I do not think this would be the right way of going about it. I have referred once more to the figures and can tell you that we import approximately 500 000 t

Gautier

of fish per year of which perhaps 10 000 t are a source of market disturbances in some part of the Community. Mr Provan and others are now suggesting that variable levies should be imposed on the remaining 490 000 t. This would, however, automatically lead to an increase in the price of fish, which is often already expensive enough. If we really want to avoid market disturbances, we should, I think, accept the really sensible instruments proposed by the Commission and not introduce a general system of import levies which would only increase the price of fish unnecessarily — even if areas which are not subject to market disturbances, which, fortunately, continue to represent the larger proportion of the European market.

I should like to mention two further points which we could easily go on discussing for another hour. We in the Committee on Agriculture welcome the fact that the Commission has proposed making the granting of financial aid conditional on compliance with catch quotas. Thus, if a Community Member State has reached its quota, there is no question of compensation from the European Community for additional quantities. This too, I think, is a step towards greater discipline as regards compliance with catch quotas.

The final point is a somewhat general one and I think this is the first time it has been included in a Parliamentary report. The fact is that the Council seems recently to have got into a nice habit of dealing with practically everything as a matter of urgency. Since last December or thereabouts, we in the Committee on Agriculture and Parliament have had nothing else to do except vote on matters of urgency before the Council and we are rushing about frantically from one part-session to another in order to deal with requests for urgency from the Council. We in the Agricultural Committee have now come upon the idea that we can all play at the Council's game. We in turn have set the Council a deadline, i.e. the end of March, for a decision on the entire question of the organization of the market in fishery products. We in the Committee on Agriculture reserve the right — and Parliament will perhaps adopt this same attitude tomorrow — to initiate a conciliation procedure at the beginning of April or, if this should not be possible, to withdraw our opinion and subsequently adopt a new opinion in the light of events. We as Parliament, must, I think, make it clear for once that we cannot allow the Council to do exactly as it feels on this matter but that we too need time to discuss the matter thoroughly — and the question of the organization of the market in fishery products is one where this would have been perfectly possible. It is clear from Council documents of September that the Commission had already discussed the draft arrangement with the Council. The Commission and Council had got together and outlined the basic principles for the new arrangement and then at the end of December they suddenly spring these documents on us, which they have already agreed on, and say, 'Come on now, Parliament, we would like your opinion within two days — in fact we

would have preferred it in November!' And this is on documents which we do not see until December. We must finally put a stop to this and I am therefore pleased that the Committee on Agriculture has also taken over this suggestion of mine.

**President.** — The proceedings will now be suspended until 9 p.m.

The House will rise.

*(The sitting was suspended at 8.05 p.m. and resumed at 9 p.m.)*

IN THE CHAIR: MR BRUNO FRIEDRICH

*(Vice-President)*

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

### 13. Urgent procedure

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

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-916/80) by Mr Rogers and others on behalf of the Socialist Group: Activities of South African troops in southern Angola;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-921/80) by Mrs Vayssade and others: Dismissal of judge Bidalou by the Supreme Council of the French Magistrature.

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

Parliament will be consulted on these requests at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

### 14. Regulation on the common organization of the market in fishery products (continuation)

**President.** — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the Gautier report (Doc. 1-841/80) on the common organization of the market in fishery products.

I call Mr Hord on a point of order.

**Mr Hord.** — Mr President, before you recommence the debate I would draw your attention to the fact that

**Hord**

some copies of Doc. 908/80 were very badly printed. Would it be possible for the administration to have more English copies of that document made available for those people who have a defaced copy of the original?

**President.** — Thank you. I shall ask the administration to check whether there are still copies available.

The Commission has the floor.

**Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission.** — (EL) Mr President, I should like to start by thanking Parliament, and in particular the Committee on Agriculture and its rapporteur Mr Gautier, for having agreed to the request for urgent procedure on the Commission proposal for the revision of the common organization of the markets in fisheries products, which was set up in 1970, since this revision has become vital in view of market developments since 1970 and the changes in fishing conditions which have taken place in recent years as a result of the general introduction of 200-mile fishing limits.

The changes to the provisions currently in force proposed by the Commission will make it possible in future to ensure the effective functioning of the common organization of the market. The changes proposed concern mainly the provisions regarding producers' organizations, the price and intervention system and the trade arrangements with third countries. These provisions are closely interrelated, and any changes made to one of them inevitably involve changes to the others. That is why we are calling for greater restraint on the part of our fishermen as regards production and marketing. Consequently, as regards trading arrangements with third countries, we must ensure that imports do not take place under conditions which might upset the market balance established through the efforts of the producers' organizations.

I should now like to deal more specifically with the points made in the motion for a resolution tabled by the Committee on Agriculture.

Firstly, I am very pleased to note that the Committee on Agriculture generally welcomes the proposed modifications and agrees that there is a pressing need for a revision of the organization of the markets in the fisheries sector. The motion for a resolution stresses the need to ensure that the provisions for the organization of the market are correctly applied. I can solemnly assure Parliament that the Commission will continue to keep a close watch on the application of Community regulations in the various Member States with a view to avoiding, as far as possible, any abuses.

As regards the producers' organizations, the Committee on Agriculture supports the proposal that

launching aids should be increased for a transitional period of five years, which should help to strengthen the structure of the producers' organizations, particularly in certain regions of the Community where this structure leaves something to be desired. The Commission agrees with the opinion expressed in the motion for a resolution to the effect that these aids should be used exclusively to support the officially recognized activities of these organizations. Experience has shown that the activities of producers' organizations are frequently hampered by non-members. The proposed changes to the existing rules will make it easier and more practicable for the Member States to extend the marketing rules of the producers' organizations to non-members. In the Commission's view, this possibility of extending to non-members of a producers' organization the production and marketing constraints which the majority of the producers in a particular region has voluntarily agreed to could play a major role in attempts to establish optimum functioning of the market.

The Commission is pleased to have received the support of the European Parliament in this respect, as reflected in the motion.

The Commission has proposed certain measures designed to further encourage the producers' organizations to adapt the supply to the demand. In particular, the possibility of applying variable withdrawal prices within a certain bracket, as well as the phased reduction of financial compensation as function of the volume of withdrawals from the market, should help to achieve this objective. I was pleased to note that the Committee on Agriculture goes along with these proposals. We are also in agreement regarding the system of aids for processing and storage, which should take adequate account of the difficulties facing, in particular, certain Mediterranean products. These measures should, as far as possible, make considerable quantities, which would otherwise have to have been destroyed, available for sale for human consumption. Parliament has repeatedly stressed the need to tackle this problem which is a matter of great public concern.

The Committee on Agriculture has stressed that Community production does not completely cover market demand, so that it is necessary to import certain quantities of fisheries products. The changes in fishing conditions since the introduction of 200-mile zones have resulted in a substantial increase in the amounts which must be imported. Mr Gautier this evening mentioned the figure of 500 000 tonnes. However, we must see to it that the import conditions are not such as to disturb the balance on the Community market established through the efforts of Community producers.

I am convinced that Parliament will be able to support the appropriate measures which the Commission has proposed with this aim in view. This is an essential element in the revision of the common organization of

**Contogeorgis**

the market in fisheries products. However, I would add that the Commission cannot accept one proposal which has been made, namely that the reference prices should be automatically adjusted. The fact is that these prices are established in accordance with market conditions for a period of a year, with a view to achieving a stabilization of the market. The situation is similar in the case of agricultural products, for which there is a system of reference prices. Furthermore, the suggestion that a system of automatic equalization levies be introduced, with the levies changing each week according to market conditions, is unacceptable, since such a system would be against the GATT rules, which lay down binding duties on fisheries products.

With a view to protecting producers, and precisely because it is impossible to introduce a system of equalization levies, the proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation on the organization of the market in fisheries products provides for a system of reference prices, as well as for the possibility of forbidding imports at prices less than the reference price. Mr President, the European fisheries sector has been going through a difficult and sometimes distressing period of adaptation, and not all the problems have yet been solved. An effective common organization of the market could, together with other elements of the fisheries policy, help to solve these problems. The motion for a resolution calls upon the Council to take the necessary decisions by the end of March this year. I can assure you that the Commission, for its part, will do all it can to make it possible for the proposal for a regulation on the organization of the market in fisheries products to be adopted by then.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The Socialist Group has the floor.

**Miss Quin.** — Mr President, it is a great disappointment to me and, I think, to all of us here that we should be having this debate on 12 February, a good while after what was supposedly the last of the final deadlines for agreeing on a common fishing policy, with still no fishing policy in sight and the recent breakdown of negotiations. In the meantime, of course, fishermen throughout the EEC continue to be haunted by great insecurity and must be very very disappointed indeed.

This is an important report, and I would like to begin by paying tribute to my colleague, Fritz Gautier, for the very hard work that he has put into it and the mastery of detail that he has shown in the course of its passage both through the Fisheries Working Group and through the Committee on Agriculture. I think that the way we have worked in the Fisheries Working Group does reflect credit upon the members, who have worked hard to try to find a compromise, even in a situation where there are many factors that are difficult to reconcile.

The pricing policy and the marketing of fish is, of course, vital to fishermen. I think nearly all of us would agree that the present situation in these matters is unsatisfactory, and that is why this review is so badly needed. I know that in my own country at the present time, indeed in my own region and my own local port of North Shields, there has been tremendous unrest in the last two weeks. We have had ports being blockaded, demonstrations, strikes and tremendous hardship being suffered by fishermen who, in the UK anyway, are complaining about dumping of cheap imports, and imports in large quantities, which are undermining their livelihood.

There are many good things in the report, and I shall mention some of them just briefly. Paragraph 2 mentions the need to take into account the interests of all those involved, all those in the fishing industry and also the consumers of fish. The report mentions the role of the producer organizations, and I am one of those who feel that the producer organizations ought to play an increasingly important role and be taken very much into account both in the marketing of fish and in fishing policy in general. The report also emphasizes and need to avoid waste of fish resources and to safeguard in particular fish destined for human consumption.

There are indeed, as I have said, many good things in the report. But there are, of course, as Mr Gautier pointed out, conflicting needs which are very difficult to reconcile. We do need imports, it is true, and I think myself that imports will tend to increase as countries with 200-mile limits find that they are harvesting the resources of their fishing grounds and seek new markets for their fish. We need imports at not too high a price, so that consumers are not put off from buying fish. At the same time we do not need imports at such a low price that local fishermen and fishing communities are put out of business and have to suffer considerable economic hardship.

Because of these conflicting needs we need a policy which is both flexible and imaginative. It needs to be a policy that takes into account the different types of consumption in the various parts of the EEC and the difficulties of particular fishing regions. I think that we do need some regional pricing, but we need prices that will not cause speculation throughout the EEC, with fishermen from one country landing their fish elsewhere in order to profit from high prices, perhaps boosted by a high pound, as is the case in the UK, which again is causing very severe problems.

The regional effects, then, are vital, and I would like to say to the Commissioner, whom I am very pleased to see here tonight, that as far as the disturbance of the market is concerned, I hope that he will think small as well as thinking big. What may seem a mere ripple on the surface of the EEC situation can at the same time include very severe disturbances in small local communities. The Commission needs to take this fully into

### Quin

account and, I believe, act much more speedily and efficiently than has been the case in the past. I think, too, that if we are going to keep imports at a reasonable price then social measures may very well need to be envisaged, particularly in areas with a lower-than-average *per capita* income and a low level of GDP. All of these measures need to be taken in order to safeguard the industry and provide for a changed and modernized industry in the EEC.

I shall conclude where I began, Mr President, by saying that prices, of course, are only part of the package. The Council must ensure that the rest of the package is forthcoming. The fishermen of Europe are feeling betrayed. Let Europe do something for them before it is too late!

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Helms to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

**Mr Helms.** — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we cannot, unfortunately, hold a real debate on this matter in view of today's very full agenda, the fact that all the Group spokesmen are to state their positions on the individual points and the speaking time available to me. As you know, we have all agreed to restrict ourselves to two to three minutes and for this reason, I shall content myself with making a few essential points.

First of all, however, I should like to congratulate the rapporteur, Mr Gautier, on the excellent work he has done in producing this important report on the organization of the market in fishery products and on the succinct account he gave of it in the short time available. After all, it is not so easy — and it would undoubtedly have been in the interests of the matter in hand, i.e. the fishing sector — to discuss these essential points here in detail. This report deals with the problem of adapting the existing organization of the market in fishery products in the light of the new circumstances arising from the reduced stocks and the introduction of the 200-mile fishing limits in 1974. The aim is to modify and adapt the organization of the market in the interests of all the parties involved, i.e. the producers, the workers, the seamen, the processing industry, trade and, last but not least, the consumers. The rapporteur particularly stressed this point and I too should like to lay particular emphasis on it in these brief remarks. In the technical committee, we discussed in great detail all the problems involved in this difficult matter and I should also like to express particular thanks to those colleagues who supported the proposals I tabled on behalf of my Group and which have been reflected to a considerable extent in this motion for a resolution. On behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, therefore, I should

like to state that I wholeheartedly go along with this report and that we in the Technical Committee have for this reason tabled no further amendments to this resolution which was agreed upon unanimously.

The proposed adaptation of the organization of the market in fishery products particularly concerns — as the Commissioner and the rapporteur have already mentioned, the producers' organizations, price and intervention arrangements and import arrangements. In my view, the important thing was and remains the planning of fishing activities in the light of market requirements and ensuring that all catches are used for human consumption, as is also specifically mentioned in the motion for a resolution. An additional aim of the organization of the market is to increase protection by means of flexible import regulations. I should also like to draw particular attention once more to another point on behalf of my Group. The European People's Party urges the Commission — and I would ask the Commissioner to give particular consideration to this in his proposals which are to be amplified and examined once more — to state clearly the conditions under which measures for the protection of the market would be introduced or discontinued. In the opinion of the EPP, regulations must be introduced to rule out the possibility of abuse of the protective measures. We expect the Commission to provide regulations which will guarantee that advantages of long-term trade agreements are not destroyed by, in this case, inappropriate protective measures. Thus we also expect that the long-term trade agreements should not undermine the arrangements for protection of the Community market. This, in a word, is the position we would like to affirm here in the interests of all the partners involved in the market. In addition, however, we should like to uphold the interests of the seamen and the workers in the fishing industry who at this very time are, in some countries, suffering from the consequences of the fact that the Council has put off making a decision on the fishery arrangements once more.

We support, I repeat, the Gautier report, the motion for a resolution it contains and the proposals. The European Parliament has adopted the Clinton report, the report on catch quotas and a common structural policy, i.e. Community-oriented proposals for a common fishery policy. This report on a common organization of the market in fishery products forms part of this complex and completes the basic attitude of this Parliament. I urge the Council to take this democratic decision by the directly-elected Parliament as the basis for its own agreement, which is a vitally necessary. At the January part-session in Strasbourg we unanimously adopted a resolution on this point and I should like to urge the Council and the Commission to do all they can to put an end to the unfortunate situation in which fishing in the Community currently finds itself.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The European Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mr Battersby.** — Mr President, I too would like to congratulate Mr Gautier on his excellent report and to commend it on behalf of the European Democratic Group to the Parliament. I would also like to thank Mr Contogeorgis for his detailed and most professional statement, which we do appreciate. He has not been very long working in fisheries, and it was a most excellent statement for us.

We in the Fisheries Working Group and the Committee on Agriculture have always had the closest and most constructive cooperation with the Commission on matters of fisheries, and I look forward to an even closer cooperation in the future with Mr Contogeorgis and his staff.

I would also like to thank Mr Gautier for the speed and the efficiency with which he has prepared this essential report. This was urged upon us by the Council, who should, in my estimation, be with us tonight to listen to this debate.

The report also gives me the opportunity to refer to the common fisheries policy and to the state at this moment of the long and difficult negotiations towards a policy. I gather that at 2 o'clock this morning in Brussels it was still possible by one final and sensible compromise, by one final *beau geste* on the part of one State, to achieve success, but at 3 o'clock this morning the *beau geste* proved impossible for that one State to make and the Ministers decided to reconsider their position and to meet again on 9 and 10 March.

Over the past six years I have seen this situation in various forms recur time and time again, but this time we were closer to agreement than ever before. Tremendous concessions were made and remarkable progress achieved towards agreement. Only one thing was lacking: it is still lacking, and that is the united, unanimous political will of the Council. This is the weak link. It is not the Commission, who do a very good job in this sphere. It is not the Parliament. The final responsibility for success or failure in the fisheries policy rests with the Council. The buck stops there. A solution is essential and possible, and it is more possible today than ever before. Therefore I call on the Council, although they are not here, on 9 and 10 March to concentrate on solving the remaining main problem and on 10 March to give our fishermen the policy they need to ensure that this vital European industry survives and develops. If they do not do this, then, as Mr Gautier said, we have reserved the right to initiate a conciliation procedure. Make no mistake: we will carry through this procedure, because enough procrastination is enough and it is time that we looked after our fishermen and not after these long evenings in the Council.

(Applause)

**President.** — The Communist and Allies Group has the floor.

**Mr Papapietro.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we approve of the innovations contained in this new Commission proposal for a regulation for the common organization of the market in fishery products. We do not, however, believe that these measures mark the conclusion of the review stage of the Community fisheries policy, which began with the new directive on structural policy and with the fixing of total allowable catches.

We feel that there is another issue which needs careful consideration, namely, a social policy in the fisheries sector. The Council has raised many obstacles here, but we nevertheless believe that Parliament and the Commission must tackle it promptly and decisively.

Attention has already been drawn to the most significant innovations, both in Mr Gautier's report — which we approve — and in the speech by Mr Contogeorgis this evening. I shall not list these again; I shall just emphasize the greater attention paid to the setting up of producers' organizations — as other Members of this House have pointed out — and to the rules governing relations between such associations and non-members so that the associations do not upset the process of market stability. We concur with this proposal, and in particular with paragraph 5 of the motion accompanying the Gautier report, which states that caution is required when following this line, so as to avoid any risk of corporate monopoly of the market by such organizations. We support the introduction of flexible criteria when fixing the guide prices and the withdrawal prices which have just been mentioned for by Mr Contogeorgis.

We do, however, have some criticisms to make, particularly where Mediterranean fishing is concerned. Firstly, we feel that there is a need to strengthen the certainly welcome provisions of in Article 14 and other articles of the new regulations in respect of support for blue-fish. These fish constitute a large part of the total Mediterranean catch and a particularly large part of the Italian catch. We should therefore like better protection from imports from third countries so that a higher percentage of this type of fish can be caught by the organizations in the Mediterranean countries, as this higher figure is necessary in order to obtain the processing premium.

The Italian Government proposes — as do we — that this percentage should be raised from 15 to 25 %. These proposals — as I said earlier — are of particular concern to the Mediterranean countries; to our mind, they were not given sufficient consideration in Mr Gautier's report and we shall stress this in Brussels next week when the fishermen's representatives meet the Committee on Agriculture and the Fisheries Working Group.

## Papapietro

Whether these measures are effective will depend both on the existence of other measures, such as those with which we have concerned ourselves in the last few months, e.g. on structures and market regulations, and on the speed with which they can be put into effect. Tension in this sector is building up, not just in a few areas, but throughout the Community from the Atlantic to the Mediterranean. The dithering and indecision of the Council, which have once again been denounced in this House, are certainly not helping to allay the anxiety of fishermen, anxiety which has already been translated into active protests in some areas.

We therefore take this opportunity to appeal once again to both the Council and the Commission. We feel bound to say that we were not satisfied by Mr Thorn's replies to the questions raised by Mr Gautier this evening. We call upon the Council and the Commission to come to swift and effective decisions. Mr Thorn said that we cannot turn back now. Naturally, we must not turn back; on the contrary, we must see to it that the measures which the Commission itself and the European Parliament have repeatedly advocated in the last few months are put into effect.

(Applause)

**President.** — The Group of European Progressive Democrats Group has the floor.

**Mr Vié.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I was born and live in a *département* in the south of Brittany and I am sure all of you are aware of this province's involvement with fishing. Of course, it is not my intention to put forward special claims for my own particular region, but only to remind those present that France's interest in this question is capital, as I am sure you all realize, given its extensive coastline.

In view of the discussions held by the Commission in recent months, I think that we were entitled to expect proposals inspired by a sincere desire for change which would result in progress. The plain truth, however, is that we have been disappointed, because the schemes which have been proposed — for both internal and external organization — barely take account of the troubles we have had in the past. The fact is that the inadequacies of the present system are becoming more and more apparent. First of all, the guide prices need to be brought up to date as they no longer reflect the actual situation. The price for the majority of species must be made compatible with a profit for the fishing fleets.

With regard to the points discussed by the Committee on Agriculture, the rapporteur said that the guide price should be fixed on the basis of objective criteria. But we feel that there will be little change from past practice if these so-called objective criteria are used as

a basis, because they would entail the formulation of a mathematical equation which would be practically impossible to devise. Levels will continue to be chosen according to circumstances, such as changing climatic conditions, and to take account of inflation and the cost of living. In short, there are too many unknowns for the equation and more serious attention should be given to the various parameters. The same is true of the withdrawal prices. They are not high enough to encourage fishermen to join producers' organizations, yet we cannot afford to ignore the great merit of such organizations in their role of regulating the market. In our view, the problem is not so much one of fixing compensation on the basis of a standard withdrawal price, but of making sure that the price really is fixed and is applied throughout the Community. At any rate, we regard the maintenance of regional prices as quite unacceptable as it upsets the markets.

What is more, as it is applied at the moment, the reference price has shown itself to be purely nominal. It should be raised a substantial amount in order to penalize low-cost imports entering the Community. Such imports represent unfair competition to our producers while at the same time they greatly benefit certain industrial processors in northern Europe. Nor in the light of our present commitments, is it acceptable to advocate a more flexible trade policy.

Up to now, the Commission always had the possibility of closing frontiers in some cases and we regret that it never took this action. Where fishing is concerned, we believe that the Common Customs Tariff and Community safeguards are inadequate. Even the Commission acknowledges this in its policy document for a review of market organization, dated 25 September of last year. This is why we consider that it is not acceptable, either, to propose that preferential agreements are not subject to the common market safeguards arrangements. From our point of view, the regulations proposed by the Commission for external market organization are unacceptable as they now stand. As some members of the Committee on Agriculture have already emphasized, any further relaxation of controls would herald the doom of fishing and fishermen in the Community. It would also have the effect of making consumers totally dependent on producers in third countries, which must be avoided at all costs.

**President.** — I call Mr Provan.

**Mr Provan.** — Mr President, it is a pleasure for me to rise and address a new Commissioner tonight and we welcome him here to this very important debate on the new organization of the market in fishery products. I say that quite openly and quite blatantly because unless a fisherman gets proper return for his day's work in the fish price there is no sense in his going out to fish in the first place and that is what the market organization is attempting to do. The rappor-

**Provan**

teur has come forward with a report that we can welcome, although there are one or two aspects of it that we feel could be improved upon and we also feel, therefore, that there are one or two aspects of the Commission's proposals that could be improved upon.

What we are really talking about in this report is how we are to organize the marketing of fish — what is wrong at present, of course, with the marketing of fish is that really we have got no marketing organization to take care of the situation that has been developing, namely, a flood of imports coming into the Community at subsidized rates.

Now, I am sorry to have to say this to a new Commissioner, and I hope he will not take it personally therefore, but I am aware of the fact that there have been 22 occasions on which the British Government has reported imports of fish coming into the United Kingdom at below reference prices. On some occasions these imports have been coming in at 45 % below the reference price. Now when these have been pointed out to the Commission we have had no action — nothing has been done, and I would like to ask the Commissioner if he can inform us what he is intending to do about it; what the Commission is intending to do about it, because unless we get this put right we are going to get nowhere.

We have got practically all the fishing boats in the United Kingdom tied up at the moment because it is not worth their while going out to fish. It is not economic for them to go out and fish and why has this arisen? I will tell you why it has arisen; I will tell you why I believe the new proposals will not cover it. We were told by Mr Contogeorgis when he spoke to us that they will stop imports coming in below the reference price, that that will be prohibited, but how can we make an agreement with Canada, for example, which we state quite openly will have a preferential tariff rate of 8 % for all their fish and fish products that will come into the Community. The Canadians know that they have just got to add another 8 % subsidy and they can bring it in and it will make no difference.

What we require, and I must drive this home, is a variable levy so that if the price of fish on the quayhead falls dramatically, we automatically get an increase in the levy to protect our own catching industry.

The other problem, of course, at the moment is that the Commission say that they have covered this, because the Council can meet and if they all agree that this has happened they can take measures to stop the fish coming into the Community at all. But we all know how long it takes to get the Council together; we all know how long it takes to get a decision out of the Council, and by that time, of course, the imports have probably dried up in any case. It is not good enough. We must get some automatic arrangement

whereby we can get the levies adjusted according to the market requirements.

Mr President, this is a good report on the whole and I thank the rapporteur for all the work that he has done on it. I believe that we will get a fishing policy. I believe that we have got to get it very soon as everybody in this Chamber also believes. But we must get a policy that will put the Community fishermen right for the next generation and the next generation after that. If we adopt the proposals that are before us tonight and if we adopt the amendments that I have got before the House I believe we can do that.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Turner.

**Mr Turner.** — Mr President, I came here tonight to speak about sugar, but I am speaking on fish and I am equally good at both. I very much regret that the Bocklet sugar report was withdrawn on the grounds that Parliament is less a parliament on Thursday nights and Friday mornings. That attitude is a very serious one and it must be stopped in its tracks. It is a new danger, and the chairmen of all the committees must use their disciplinary power to make sure that this does not happen again. I may say as a member of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions that new rules have already been put into process which I think will put a stop to this business.

Anyway, we are talking about fish at ten o'clock at night as we usually do in this Parliament. As far as I am concerned we have good debates on fish and they are always late at night and it is to the advantage of fishermen. I can only say that sugar growers are coming out the worse because their report was withdrawn.

Mr President, I believe that the Gautier report on the proposals of the Commission is very good. I think it could and should be the start of a new life for many fishing ports. My particular fishing port is Lowestoft, and it is in a terribly bad way, and I do believe that marketing is the only thing that can save it. I believe that this kind of proposal can save the fishermen of Lowestoft. It could give fishermen more real control over the fate of their catch; right downstream to the housewife's price. The fishermen at present complain that the housewife pays a great deal and the fishermen get very little.

Now, Mr President, once we have a common fishing policy, local market organizations run by local fishermen can look after the local fishermen's affairs. They will have common and fair conditions for the local fishermen and also for other ships landing fish in their ports who will be subjected to the same common and fair conditions and sharing of costs and responsi-

Turner

bilities. I believe myself that that is the only salvation for the fishermen, at any rate of East Anglia, because it is in this sphere of marketing that they have failed most. They can fish, but they cannot sell.

**President.** — The Commission has the floor.

**Mr Contogeorgis, Member of the Commission.** — (*EL*) Mr President, I have listened very closely to the honourable Members who have spoken and have noted all the points they made. The Commission will take their remarks into account in its future talks on the establishment of a common fisheries policy for the Community. As you know, the Council has been in continuous session over the last three days — up till three o'clock this morning in fact — in an attempt to reach a decision on a package of measures proposed by the Commission. These measures, as you know, have many objectives, all of them intended to protect the producer, the fisheries and the marine resources of the Community. The measures are aimed at maintaining and replenishing the Community's stocks of fish, at establishing total quantities of fish by sea area and by species, and at distributing these quantities between the Member States. However, the main feature consists of proposals intended to strengthen the present market mechanisms, with a view to protecting not only producers and prices, but also consumers, within the framework of Community preference. There are also proposals for a structural policy, for organizing the fishing infrastructure, and for increasing productivity and for a lasting and steady increase in producer's incomes. Other measures concern the supervision of the correct application of all these measures under the common fisheries policy. Finally, the proposals concern the Community's relations with foreign countries. This is a difficult, complicated and delicate subject involving questions of principle, and it has many legal and political aspects which cannot be ignored. Unfortunately the latest Council was unable to reach a decision on all these measures, despite the fact that some progress was made.

It was therefore decided that the Council would meet again on 9 and 10 March in an attempt to reach decisions. It requires political courage, realism and a major effort on the part of all of us — Parliament, the Commission and the Council — if a solution is to be found. The Commission believes that a solution can and must be found. Let us all work together until the day of the next Council meeting, so that a decision can be reached then. There is one particular point I should like to take up — the low prices for fish imported into the United Kingdom.

This matter was brought to the attention of the Council officially for the first time yesterday by the British delegation. Up till now, the Commission has not received any official request. The matter was raised here as well this evening. Yesterday I gave an

assurance to the Council that the Commission would look into this request to see whether the present mechanisms for protecting and organizing the market offered any possibility of tackling this truly delicate and difficult situation. The draft regulation which has been submitted for approval by the Council provides for stronger measures to protect Community production against low-priced imports, and I have already said that the principle measure provided for is the prohibition of imports if their price is below the reference price. We shall look into the matter in the light of existing regulations to see as soon as possible what can be done, or whether anything can be done under existing regulations to tackle this situation.

**President.** — I call Mrs Ewing.

**Mrs Ewing.** — I rise very quickly to support the Provan amendments. Mr Provan is my neighbouring Member of Parliament and has the bigger markets. I perhaps have the bigger area. But the markets are very important and are the subject of this report, which I support too. Mr Provan's amendments do not need any more clarification from myself. I would just like to say to Mr Contogeorgis that his name is known already in the 80 islands, and many scores of fishing communities in my constituency look to him. They got to know Mr Gundelach's name, and I believe the first invitation on Mr Contogeorgis' desk is from the Shetland Islands. I hope he accepts it.

Mr Gundelach's last words to me shortly before his death were 'Mr Contogeorgis, when he succeeds me, will have no North Sea interest and therefore even you will not be able to accuse him of bias of any kind'. I should like to say that I wish him well in what must be one of the most interesting but onerous tasks. I should like to say this to him: the inshore fishermen of Scotland and of England and Wales and all the other places are not men who go on strike. They are not striking men. That is not their normal sort of behaviour. All they want to do is embrace this dangerous way of life and go to sea and catch fish, but if they cannot, it they are going to be in debt by going to sea, they will not go. So, I really do support the Provan amendments and I would advise and ask and urge the Parliament to do so tomorrow.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

#### 15. Regulation on hormones

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-840/80), drawn up by Mr Brøndlund Nielsen on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the

**President**

proposals from the Commission to the Council for:

- I — a regulation concerning the use of substances with a hormonal action and those having a thyrostatic action in domestic animals (Doc. 1-580/80);
- II — a regulation concerning the control and examination of animals and meat in the Community for the presence of residues of substances with oestrogenic, androgenic, gestagenic and thyrostatic effect;
- III — a regulation laying down conditions for controlling the possession, distribution and administration to animals of certain substances with a hormonal action (Doc. 1-843/80).

I call Mr Brøndlund Nielsen.

**Mr Brøndlund Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) I shall be very brief. I understand that there is not very much time for the rapporteurs and I might take the liberty of saying that earlier today one might have been tempted to think that if a hormone was discovered which stimulated the flow of speech in people, this would perhaps be a particular candidate for prohibition.

However, I should like very briefly to introduce my report and point out that it supports the Commission proposal — indeed it is in favour of intensifying and clarifying the proposals made. Fortunately, major progress is being made in technical aids in various areas, including agriculture, and these aids include chemical aids regarding which, however, there is considerable scepticism since, in many cases, people are not entirely certain of the consequences they will have. We must remember that the reason this matter has come up was that it was the subject of perhaps the most violent reaction on the part of the consumers we have ever witnessed in the field of foodstuffs. There was a very substantial sharp fall in the sale of veal last year when it was announced that it might contain residues of certain hormonal substances.

Mr President, in the Community, our production is, I think, so efficient and plentiful — as was explained last night by Mr Dalsager in answer to a question — and the capacity is such that we would be advised to play safe in situations where there might possibly be health risks and where there may be good reason to think that using aids of this kind may be detrimental to the quality of the products. We should, at least, maintain a prohibition in areas where there is a demonstrable risk or uncertainty.

It is vital, in this respect, that we should have standard rules throughout the Community, and that these rules should be such that it is possible both to observe them and to check that they are observed throughout the Community. The introduction of standard provisions everywhere and guaranteeing that they are fully applied form, I think, the crux of the matter. If there is

room for doubt regarding certain additives, the general rule should be that the consumer, i.e. all of us, should be given the benefit of this doubt.

Naturally, it could be argued that agricultural incomes are so bad that all possible steps should be taken with a view to increasing them. This is a viewpoint which I can understand, since we must all admit that the situation as regards agricultural incomes is in fact very bad everywhere in the Community. However, we are looking forward to the price proposals which are to be made in the near future and I hope that Parliament will adopt a realistic attitude so that it will really be possible for farmers to cover their costs and for their incomes to keep pace with those of the rest of society.

I do not, however, think that one can reasonably argue in favour of allowing farmers to cut corners by using the substances under discussion here today. This would be harmful to us all and should not be used as the basis for an attempt to improve agricultural incomes. I do not think we in the Community are so badly off that we must sacrifice quality in order to provide farmers with a reasonable income, but we should obviously bear this in mind not only when we consider the question of quality but also, as I said, when we come to consider the question of incomes.

We can be glad that the common agricultural policy has resulted in stable supplies of foodstuffs of a very high quality. The Commission is, I think, going all out here to continue in this way, to increase free internal trade and to safeguard us against the products being imported which do not meet the quality requirements, and I should like, by means of my report, to give it my support in this respect.

One final remark. I listened to the exceptions as one of the few Members who did not speak in the debate on the Commission's statement. I should like to point out that I do not go along with the many fine words which have been said to the effect that the whole of Europe is now to be reformed over the next six months. I am glad to see practical work being done and I was pleased to see that the memorandum issued in connection with the statement states that one of the main issues in 1981 will be further harmonization of veterinary legislation within the Community. This is a practical, tangible, meaningful and valuable statement. In my view, the best way of developing European cooperation is by means of practical steps such as this rather than big gestures. The proposals before us are, I think a step in this direction, and I would like to recommend my report to Parliament.

**President.** — The Commission has the floor.

**Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission.** — (DK) Mr President, by way of introduction, I should like to say how much I appreciate the fact that

### Dalsager

the European Parliament has managed to deal with this difficult question of hormones so swiftly. I am very pleased that we can discuss this matter at today's meeting.

As Mr Brøndlund Nielsen also pointed out, this is a matter which has created a considerable stir among the public and it is vital that we do all we can to regain the confidence of the consumers in the products produced by Community farmers. The Commission has submitted a proposal to the Council advocating a total ban since we think this is the best way of protecting the consumers. I might add that this will call for particularly strict surveillance, but there is no point in having good rules if people do not observe them.

The proposals before you consist of a basic act and two implementing acts concerning control measures. Obviously, the proposed control regulations may have economic consequences. The Commission has proposed that the expense of carrying out checks on the presence of residues in animals and meat should be defrayed via the product. I think this is reasonable and it is vital that the checks should be carried out in the same way in all the Member States. In most Member States the costs of veterinary controls of this kind are reflected in the price of the product. If we stipulate that these costs should be borne by the national budgets, this would, I fear, make these controls very difficult to finance in certain Member States at the present moment. Nor is this budgetary problem one which affects only the Member States, it is also a Community problem. I think, therefore, that a system involving economic aid to the Member States for these controls is hardly a viable proposition. With this reservation, I should like to voice my appreciation of the report submitted by Mr Brøndlund Nielsen on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture.

At the same time, I should like to stress that as regards the vital primary controls on the production, distribution and use of these substances, it was a different type of control we had in mind, which should form an integral part of the general control measures already financed by the Member States. We regard it as self-evident that distribution for therapeutic purposes must take place on the responsibility of a veterinary surgeon. I agree that we need a Community system of control, as already exists in the case of other veterinary activities. However, in the present case, the budgetary requirements mean that it is difficult to fulfil all the existing obligations and no proposals for a system of this kind have been made at this stage, but the Commission certainly intends to take up this problem.

I might add that I share Mr Ceravolo's view regarding the need to ensure health protection. I fully agree that only such chemical substances as can be regarded as absolutely safe should be approved. However, if we are to build up a system of effective and practicable legislation, we must solve the problems step by step. As regards the immediate introduction of legislation with

respect to other chemical substances, I would admit that Community regulations are necessary, but it is only possible to introduce regulations of this kind by considering the situation as a whole and provided provision is made for control measures.

I can inform the European Parliament that the Commission is approaching the conclusion of its work on drawing up a proposal on antibiotics residues and this will be submitted to Parliament in the near future. I should like to stress that we must guarantee healthy foodstuffs for Community consumers and re-establish confidence in Community products as soon as possible. These are the main objectives which our proposals hope to help achieve as soon as possible. Thus, in my view, it is not only a question of protecting the consumers, but also of protecting the producers who earn their livings from producing the meat under discussion here today, i.e., in particular, veal.

I should like to say, Mr President, that in the many amendments which have been tabled, I have noticed that three wishes have been expressed by various people. Firstly, there is the wish that certain substances may be approved for use in promoting growth, i.e. a special positive list. Secondly, there is the wish that in principle, a ban should be introduced on the use of a certain series of substances to stimulate growth, whilst permitting others, i.e. a negative list. Finally, there is a wish to the effect that a list of substances which may not be used in the treatment of sick animals or the regulation of sexual activity, should be made up instead of the positive list as proposed by the Commission.

I should like to say regarding these numerous amendments, that they provide food for further thought as part of an objective analysis of the problems involved in the introduction of new legislation in this sector. I should also like to stress that, whatever happens, the consumers must, in my view, be protected and we must re-establish confidence in Community-produced veal. These proposals aim to protect the interests of industry, trade and the producers.

**President.** — The Socialist Group has the floor.

**Mr Seeler.** — (D) Mr President, I am speaking on behalf of my colleague, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, who is unfortunately no longer present owing to a sudden indisposition. My group welcomes the proposals and the excellent report drawn up by Mr Nielsen. We regard these proposals as a substantial improvement in Community law in this sector although the harmonization of the legislation in the individual Member States, which is so urgently necessary, is still lacking. Only when we have both can we speak of a really good solution in this field.

We in the Socialist Group are also pleased at the attempt which has been made to fill the gaps in the

## Seeler

control system. We acknowledge the fact that in his report Mr Nielsen has very clearly pinpointed all possible ways of evading this regulation and opposed them. However, a problem will arise if the amendment on this point tabled by the Committee on the Environment is not adopted, i.e. that products which are prohibited in the Community may not be produced in the Community for subsequent export either, since this would involve a risk of reimport and a grey re-purchase market. We must prevent this if the regulations are to be really effective. In addition, ladies and gentlemen, we need a uniform system of checks on transport between the Member States and within the individual Member States. This is a prerequisite for really effective consumer protection. For this reason, my group firmly advocates standardizing the regulations governing slaughterhouses in the individual Member States.

Furthermore, when this regulation comes into force, it should not be possible under any circumstances to evade it as a result, of, if I may say, national negligence. The practice of customs checks at the external borders of the Community is very important in this respect. No gaps in the fence, as it were, should be allowed to come into being, since news of such gaps tends to spread very quickly, which in practical terms means that the customs controls are ineffective. I might remind you of the case of imports from Argentina in this connection and those of you who are familiar with such matters know what problems this gave rise to. These regulations take account of the urgent wish that the costs for the necessary controls should not be passed on to the consumer, as the Commissioner has mentioned. It would be unfortunate if control were to prove impossible or be less effective because of this problem.

Ladies and gentlemen, in our view, any use or administration of thyrostatic substances for purposes of promoting growth, must be quite unambiguously prohibited in the future. Substances which are permitted for use in veterinary medicine — which are necessary — must be clearly specified in a positive list so that the situation is quite unambiguous. For this reason, our group intends to oppose all those amendments which call for a relaxing of this principle. Finally, we particularly welcome paragraph 12 of the report since we support the encouragement of natural methods for stock farming, which is so vital in our Community and indeed everywhere.

Ladies and gentlemen, as would appear to be characteristic of this Parliament when urgent problems are involved, we are discussing at a very late hour a matter which is extremely important, proposals for regulations which are vitally necessary, not to say overdue, for the European consumers. I think, however, that what we are dealing with tonight is nevertheless only the tip of the iceberg. The larger problem is still hidden and is

yet to be discussed and tackled by us in the coming months and years.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) has the floor.

**Mr Helms.** — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to point out that we spent an hour discussing the previous report and we have already spent twenty minutes discussing this one. When we consider that there are still a number of very important reports on the agenda and — let me be quite frank on this point, if we go on talking at great length, it will not be possible tomorrow to vote on these urgent resolutions, which I could list, but that in turn would take time. I should therefore like to urge you to keep this debate brief. The subject currently before us is one which gives rise to particularly lengthy discussions, as was the case in the technical committee and Mr Nielsen took up the points raised. Under the circumstances, in view of the points expounded by Mr Nielsen and in view of the clarity with which Parliament has stated its views regarding the Commission proposals, we can, I think, be brief.

I should like to say on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, that we firmly support and welcome this report by Mr Nielsen. I should like to thank Mr Nielsen, our colleague from the Liberal Group, particularly warmly for his cooperation. He accepted the amendments tabled by myself and my colleague Mr Diana which were aimed at making this report more precise and forceful. What we must do is make it quite clear in this resolution by the European Parliament that an improvement in the quality of all agricultural products is called for and that the consumers and honest producers are in the same boat in this respect. I should therefore like particularly to stress the requests we have drawn up and which have been adopted by Mr Nielsen. Firstly, the controls and surveillance of the production, distribution and import of hormonal substances. We regard this as a very important point. Secondly, the establishment of controlling authorities at European level. This has already been mentioned by the Commissioner and we should like to stress it once more in this resolution. Then there is the introduction of a uniform control system as mentioned in the report, which must apply in all the Member States.

It strikes me, however, as vital — and I should like to draw particular attention to this point on behalf of my group — that all the import regulations and relevant trade agreements should be adapted and frontier checks intensified so as to prevent the importing of any meat which does not fulfil Community provisions for consumer protection and I should like to point out to the Commission in this connection that we adopted

## Helms

the Combé report in Strasbourg last month and on this occasion too, my group made this request and it was included by Mr Combé in his report. The Commission has not clearly stated its opinion on this report and has seen too many sources of difficulty for trade agreements and negotiations with third countries. I will leave it at that.

In our view, it would be dishonest *vis-à-vis* the consumers if we were to introduce stringent and appropriate provisions within the Community but left loopholes which could enable these provisions to be evaded by imports from third countries. This would mean that our regulations and decisions would lose credibility in the eyes of the consumers.

I should like you to give some thought to the amendments tabled by my colleague, Mrs Schleicher, i.e. Nos 33 and 35, which we would be pleased if you supported. We urge the Commission and the Council to take this resolution by Parliament as soon as possible as its basis for proposals and decisions. It is vital that we do not just talk about these matters but take some real action — I am thinking here of the situation in the fisheries sector. We must not allow matters to stagnate as long as in that case and must avoid the institutions of the Community laying themselves open for criticism in this field too. They should certainly not do that.

(Applause)

**President.** — The European Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mr Hord.** — Mr President, on behalf of my group, I wish first of all to voice strong reservations about the pressure that has been applied to the Parliament by the Council and the Commission on this very important and complicated subject. You will have heard in other debates how the Committee on Agriculture is under very serious pressure of work: urgent action on isoglucose, the sugar regulation and so on; the committee has had only one hour to discuss Commission Document No 614, and there has been no time for the weightier documents dealing with control — four times as many pages in the control measures under Documents 920 and 922. So I would very much like the Commission to recognize the pressures that they have put upon us, although as has been said already in this Chamber, there is no intention of stopping this process, since we do appreciate the seriousness of the situation prevailing in parts of the Community in the veal market. Members should understand that many of the problems in the veal market are due to over-control and to the excessive legislation, which has brought forward a black market: hence the situation with which we are confronted today. So Mr President, I believe that we should not allow the Commission to push us into over-reacting.

It is fair to say that the proposals before us represent a virtual total ban on substances with hormonal and thyrostatic action, and if we are not careful the good intentions may come to nothing and we may have a worse situation with an even bigger black market. For these reasons, my group believes it would be more practicable if we had a negative list: this would be a guide to those who are directly concerned. In the desire to make these proposals more realistic and more workable, my group has therefore submitted ten amendments, which mainly relate to the promotion of a negative list of substances, while other amendments will, we believe, be seen by the trade and by the consumer to be realistic.

In conclusion, my group believes there might well be very much merit in submitting these proposals in the form of a directive. If this can be done and if our amendments are approved by the House tomorrow, I am confident that my group will be prepared to support the Nielsen report, because they really do appreciate the seriousness of the situation in the veal market.

(Applause from the right)

## IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

### Vice-President

**President.** — The Communist and Allies Group has the floor.

**Mr Ceravolo, draftsman of an opinion.** — (I) Mr President, I should like to commend Mr Nielsen for his admirable attempts to impose a coherent pattern on these proposals. There are still many hurdles to surmount, and we are well aware that there was a great deal of resistance within the Committee on Agriculture to the proposed measures and that much pressure was exerted to prevent the work from going forward. The fact of the matter is that the proposals should have been referred to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, because they are all directly concerned with safeguarding the health of consumers. Nevertheless, now that we have reached this stage, I feel that we must support the proposed measures and make sure that any remaining doubts or hesitations are removed. In connection with this, we would like the Commissioner to confirm that proposals for a regulation on antibiotics will be produced within a month, as we feel that this is another topic.

If we want to be quite clear, in the interests of both producers and consumers, then we must opt for the

## Ceravolo

positive list in its entirety. The Member who spoke just now was in favour of the negative list, but the difference between the two is this: the negative list outlaws a substance when there is overwhelming proof, following experiments on humans, that it is harmful to human beings; we, however, feel that it is imperative to introduce the principle that use should be made only of those substances which have been proved to be totally harmless. This principle has come to be regarded as scientifically and morally sound by people everywhere. The Committee on the Environment only agreed not to insist on the inclusion of a reference to antibiotics because the Commission representative undertook to propose measures within a month, and as I said before, we would like confirmation that such proposals will be forthcoming.

Another topic to which we would like to draw the Commission's attention, and have some answers about, is this: we suggested that the term 'domestic animals' should be replaced by the more comprehensive term 'animals used for human nutrition' in order to take account of such activities as fish breeding, which involves the use of chemicals, and the breeding of creatures such as rabbits, which are quite commonly eaten by humans. Another point we wish to raise with the Commissioner is this: will the regulations apply to frozen meat as well as to fresh meat? This point is crucial because, if no reference is made to frozen meat it is highly likely that use will be made of it to bypass the rules, both where the daily sale of meat within the Community and where that destined for export is concerned.

We should also like to raise the question of industrial feedingstuffs. Article 6 (2) of Regulation No III states that there is a need to ensure that the prohibited substances — even those destined for veterinary medicine purposes — are marketed only in a form which precludes oral administration. Well, it seems obvious to me that controls need to be extended to include the manufacture of industrial feedingstuffs, because it would be quite possible for such feedingstuffs to contain precisely those chemical substances which are being banned.

I should now like to talk about two amendments which I have submitted and which express the opinion of the Committee on the Environment as well as my own. The first concerns the need to inform third countries which are sent shipments of meat contaminated by the substances we are about to ban. I think that we have a moral obligation to give them such information so that we can say we have been above board where our trade relations are concerned and so that the Community can face the world with an unblemished reputation. The second amendment is in a way connected to the first. Article 6 of the proposed regulation provides for the authorization of the manufacture of prohibited medicinal products if they are for export. We find this quite ridiculous. To take just one example, DES, or diethylstilboestrol, is a chemical

substance which has been acknowledged everywhere — both in America and now here in Europe — as a carcinogen. We cannot prohibit it on our own account and at the same time allow it to be produced for export to the third world, where it will be used as an anabolic substance by livestock-breeders. This is both absurd and morally wrong. In my opinion, it is quite inadmissible. If we have managed to prove — and it *has* been proved, as I say — that DES can cause vaginal cancers even in the daughters of women who have been treated with this synthetic chemical substance, then we must acknowledge that it is our duty to ban it, not only on our own behalf, but to benefit people everywhere, including in those countries where the discovery has not yet been made. Those, then, were the two amendments which we still felt the need to emphasize, as all the other proposals put forward by the Committee on the Environment have met with at least partial approval, credit for which must go to Mr Nielsen.

I am happy that this proposal is being welcomed, even though it is not yet complete — as I have already said, there is no reference to antibiotics — and it has not yet been made clear that only natural substances should be used for therapeutic purposes. But we must press on with this, because there is nothing worse, nothing more likely to upset both production and consumer interests, than allowing uncertainty to obscure the principles which should govern these affairs. One of these principles is a guarantee to people everywhere that only substances which are definitely known to be harmless should be used. This is for the sake of the consumer and for the sake of giving precise guidelines to manufacturers as well.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The Liberal and Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mrs Scrivener.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I think that we can only congratulate ourselves on the three Commission proposals which aim at prohibiting the use of both natural and artificial hormones unless they are being used for therapeutic reasons. In the last analysis, this is also a victory for consumers who are thereby given a guarantee that they will be better protected. We should not however overlook the fact that it was a public outcry which prompted the decision to no longer use natural or artificial hormones. This point needs to be emphasized. I dare say that we would have had to wait a great deal longer for these measures — whether one agrees with them or not — if there had been no boycott on the part of consumers. So any improvements are really due to the pressure of public opinion.

Several points need to be brought out. It is of course vital to ban all hormones, including natural ones.

**Scrivener**

Although synthetic hormones may be the most dangerous, natural hormones also constitute a toxic hazard in some cases. We are grateful to our colleague Mr Nielsen for his excellent report, which was both well-balanced and cogent, for revealing these facts. I must say we agree entirely with this report. We also approve the fact that regulations rather than directives are to be the instruments of choice, as this means that every part of the provisions will be compulsory and directly applicable in all the Member States.

At first, we wondered whether substances other than those with a thyrostatic action should be considered, by which I mean antibiotics, but we decided it would be more prudent to consider only hormonal substances in order to have a regulation as soon as possible. But let us not forget that antibiotics can be just as harmful, and that the Commission has undertaken to submit a regulation to us within a very short time.

There is still the problem of cost to consider, over which we may have quite different views. We believe that the cost of implementing controls and carrying out examinations should ultimately be borne by the consumer. I am aware that some of you have expressed your opposition to this Commission proposal, but I believe that there are certain facts which must be faced. It is only right that the consumer should be made aware of the fact that a higher price has to be paid for the improved quality of products. Equally, we should not dupe consumers by offering them harmful products at relatively low prices. It is much better to accept the financial implications of improvement. Finally, the notion of therapeutic treatment has been defined in a restrictive way by the Commission. We are quite glad about this for we are well aware that if the situation had been otherwise there would have been great scope for abuse.

In conclusion, we should like to point out the urgent need for the proposed directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to veterinary medicines to come into force, because this directive is an indispensable adjunct to the present regulation, as it will also be to the regulation on antibiotics. If the Community wishes to be consistent and effective in the area under discussion today, it is essential that measures should be adopted as quickly as possible, not only where hormones but also where antibiotics are concerned. For the fact of the matter is — and these are my last words — you cannot put a value on the health of consumers.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The Group of European Progressive Democrats has the floor.

**Mr Davern.** — Mr President, first of all I welcome the new Commissioner and wish him every success in

his job. He has got a difficult task in front of him, and I hope that he will be as successful as his late lamented fellow-countryman was in that office.

Mr President, I will be brief tonight. I have never heard such scaremongering going on and I think the Council and the Commission are both guilty of this. Both of them were panicked into giving a popular political reaction to something, but I think that they are regretting that decision now. There have been a number of inklings from the Commission and from the Council that they are thinking of changing their first position and then their second position. I think they are sensibly coming round now to looking at a positive list of these substances.

Let us not forget that essentially there is nothing wrong with the vast majority of growth-promoters, a fact that has not been mentioned in this House tonight. However, there is a tendency to give the impression that if a growth-promoter is used, then the animal is diseased. In fact, I was surprised to hear Mr Nielsen say tonight that growth-promoters should not be used to make a 'fast buck' from cattle or have a fast turnover in animals, because there was sufficient animal growth. I come from a country where animal growth is down by over 40-50 % at the present moment. I don't consider our position at all satisfactory. Like myself, Mr Nielsen comes from a country where the farmer's income is drastically low at the present moment. I understand that in Denmark it can be as much as 60 % down at the present moment, with a loss in milk production of 10 %. I am very glad to hear that Mr Nielsen thinks this is a happy situation.

I am surprised at the general tone here tonight. Everyone is out to destroy the hormone industry. There is nothing wrong with hormones; they are good if they are used properly. I think the Commission rushed into this, and so did the Council. They should aim at a positive list of these substances.

I would like to see the Commission produce a positive minimum permissible list first. When they have thoroughly checked the others they can then leave them through, but they should not condemn all growth-promoters now. It is the one way we have of ensuring a short-term immediate supply in the present situation. I have many amendments down to this, Mr President, and I intend to leave it at that. I think we have discussed it often enough in committee. However, we must stop this panic. There is nothing to panic about. Let us look at it coolly and rationally and decide properly what the position should be.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Castle.

**Mrs Castle.** — Mr President, I cannot support the Commission's proposals, for one simple reason: they

## Castle

will not protect the consumer as effectively as my Amendment No 9. No-one is more concerned than I am to protect the innocent shopper from the machinations of profit-makers; I do not think anybody in this room can accuse me of being an uncritical supporter of the farming community at every turn; but what I do like to do is to base my decisions upon objective facts, wherever they may lead me, and I am afraid it is a constant characteristic of this Community that it relapses into emotional spasms every time it is faced with an emotional claim. No wonder the Community is in such a mess! It is so hard to get people to stand back from either their vested or their national interests or from emotional pressures and really try and establish the truth and do honestly what should be done to achieve the aims we seek!

May I remind this House of what was the origin of this outcry over hormones in veal and baby food? It was because in Italy certain tins of baby food made from veal were discovered in which there was a dangerously high level of residues that could be damaging. The DES had left those residues. But where had the food come from? It had come from Belgium, where there operates that total ban which the Commission in its recklessness is trying to impose across a whole Community, when it could not even be enforced in one Member State. And you know, the key to effectiveness in protecting the consumer lies in enforcement. Anybody who wants protective legislation should first stand up and explain how they intend to see it carried out: otherwise it is just hot air to try and give people a false sense of security. And that is what these Commission proposals do; because the evidence has shown that where you have a total ban on these growth-promoters, with no safe or approved alternative available, all you get is black marketeering, as you did in Belgium. That is how the DES got into the Belgian baby food and, via Italy, into the testing stations of the United Kingdom, which exposed the dangerous levels within that food. If you say, we ban everything, we ban all hormones, you really are flying in the face of nature. Nature uses growth-promoters all the time. There are growth-promoters in the bodies of everybody in this room. Of course there are! If you want to say, hormones are terrible, we had all better rush and de-sex ourselves. We are talking absolute nonsense. What we have to do is to analyse and establish what are the dangerous elements and ban them. But to ban them is not enough, unless you have also identified, and made legitimate, safe alternatives. That is the way to protect the consumer. And there *are* safe alternatives: they have been proved safe by the most rigorous testing. Some of the products produced in my own country, whether the synthetic hormones or the synthetic replicas of natural hormones — by the very use of these words we realize the sort of complicated situation we get into, it is not as simple as some people would try to make out — have been tested and approved, they have passed the most rigorous tests of the United States Food and Drug Administration.

So there are available alternative products which are, much easier to control because their presence is much easier to establish. In the United Kingdom, DES is not banned, but in cattle it is not used at all. Why? Because there are legitimate alternatives. The great danger of DES, as we all know, is that it can be injected, and it is injected in those countries operating with a total ban: they use the DES, which is injected, rather than the safer product, which is implanted in the ear, because it is more difficult to detect. Let us grow up, please! Let us try and have legislation that produces results!

And so what I say is this: of course, DES and its derivatives and thyrostatic compounds should be banned, but what we need is not just a negative list. Here I part company completely with some of the European Democrats who have spoken in this debate. A negative list is not good enough, and one of the speakers earlier has made it clear why. If you have a negative list, what happens? You wait for products already on the market to be shown to do damage before you ban them. The damage to the consumer, the human being, has already taken place. You are using the human being as a guinea-pig. And then you say, well, that caused damaging results, so we will now ban it. No, what you need to do is to go out and look for and test and select growth-promoters which are at any rate as safe as those that nature provides and then say, right, we will have them as the approved positive list. That is what I propose in my Amendment No 9. I will vote against amendments calling for a negative list; I will certainly vote against a total ban; but I will vote for a positive list, rigorously selected, rigorously tested, rigorously monitored. I will vote for the toughest enforcement procedures anybody likes to mention, because I do want to protect the consumer, not just make a few noises that will make us all feel better. And I am confident that my Amendment No 9 is the way forward for an intelligent Community trying to achieve the best possible

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Clinton.

**Mr Clinton.** — Mr President, I too would like to add my tribute to Mr Nielsen for the work he has put into this report and for his very sensible approach to it. If I heard him correctly, he showed as much concern for the farmers in his area as he did for consumers generally. Let me say straight away that we are all consumers. There is no one sector that is not concerned about unsafe food. I think that that should be emphasized.

Before Mrs Castle started to speak I thought I had something to say, but now there is nothing left to be said. She has really said it all in the most sensible way and in one of the best speeches I have heard in this House for a long time. I was very pleased that we had

**Clinton**

with us Mr Dalsager, the new Commissioner on Agriculture, and that he intervened early in this debate. I too am very happy to see him here. I was glad to hear him say that, as a result of this report and of his looking through the various amendments, he was prepared to go back and take another serious look at the whole situation.

There is no doubt that there has been an immense amount of concern and apprehension all over Europe arising from the discovery of this unsafe residue in babyfood and indeed, I think, of something similar found in veal in another part of the Community. I think that this is quite justifiable, and if there are harmful substances being used, as we know there are, for growth promotion in cattle, then they should be hit on the head, and hit very hard.

But I think there is a lot of education and a lot of publicity needed in relation to all this, that is, sensible publicity, because the media love a scare and they love somebody doing somebody else down and going them down deliberately. They go to town on this. That is the aspect of publicity that has been highlighted.

There is very little normal, rational realization that there are quite a list of safe products that are advantageous and that give an extra profit to the producer, and God knows the producer wants an extra profit, now particularly. But indeed he wanted it always in beef production because beef production has always left a small margin for the producer and we should all be concerned to allow that advantage to continue while reassuring and being able to reassure the consumer that there are safe products. And indeed there are quite a number of safe products.

What we want is, of course, a positive list and positive control and I think we must make it easy for producers of these products, these valuable and safe products, to get them tested quickly and to get them to be allowed to be used quickly. I think that that is a comparatively easy matter. A lot of people who are concerned, and seriously concerned, about unsafe meat arising from the use of these growth-promoters are not aware that already a very considerable amount of scientific research has gone into this — and long before the scare. The knowledge was there.

Now it is no wonder that people are confused. They talk about androgens; they talk about oestrogens; they talk about growth-promoters; they talk about hormones. The people do not know really what they are talking about. They do not know that all these products result from the knowledge that the sex status of animals increases growth rate — that is that bulls grow faster than steers and heifers grow faster than other heifers from which the ovaries have been removed. That is what it is all based on. That is how it started. That is how these other products that have a similar effect were produced by people of knowledge and used for these purposes. It is quite right to say that

there are synthetic products on the market that are quite unsafe and should not be used. But there are also synthetic products that are safe and can be used, and this has been proved up to the hilt. It is control that is needed.

Mrs Castle knows all about this. I began to think she was a veterinary surgeon when she said this could only safely be done by an implant rather than in any other way. She knows, obviously, quite well also that the effect of these things lasts for two or perhaps three months and that it is a well known period. There must of course be control — mind you I do not think that the control of this should be taken away from farmers and exclusively put into the hands of veterinary surgeons, who are regarded as honest people while farmers are not — farmers' products must be identified as belonging to a certain farmer and they must be subject to tests, subject to monitoring. In this way I think we will have sensible decision and a sensible decision is overdue. I do not agree with those who say that the Commission is rushing us into this and rushing us into that. This concern has been with us for too long already and it should have been settled before now. Of course, I know there is a difficulty about time, we could go on talking about this for a long time, but Mrs Castle has said it all.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Sherlock.

**Mr Sherlock.** — Mr President, I am delighted to be filling a double bill yet again with you tonight.

*(Laughter)*

I shall not begin by expressing my intention of being brief. I have very little intention to be brief because there are several points that have got to be made despite the brilliant speech by Mrs Castle who has made a great many of them already. I endorse her amendment and I endorse virtually everything she has said. But I am, Mr President, going to endorse the point that was made earlier this evening namely that we have been rushed into this with, not unseemingly, but indecent haste by a Commission and a Council conspiring to such an extent that even in the introductory document they put the date of 1 January for its implementation. They have rushed into it without consultation, and the best professional advice in every one of the Community languages is almost totally against them with only one exception. The advice is that we must rid all foodstuffs within this Community of this menace. For menace it is if it is allowed to continue. We are all united in our endeavour. It is when we come to look at the ways of implementation that our ways part.

I have heard Mrs Castle who always reads her brief very thoroughly; I have heard our new Agriculture

**Sherlock**

Commissioner talk, for example, about safe substances. There is no such thing as a safe substance in this field: it is dose-related. And if you fill up your baby son with oestrogens of the most natural type, you will wind up buying him a brassiere. And if you fill up Mrs Castle with testosterone of the most natural type she will grow hair on her chest.

*(Laughter)*

Make no mistake about this! There is no distinction between the natural and the synthetic. And my colleague here has even gone so far as to say that by modifying certain branches of the structure of these most intriguing molecularly formed hormones you can make a synthetic which is safer than that which God has implanted in all our bodies. This is the way it goes but it can be done, Sir! It can be done and it has been done already. It is this sort of nonsense which makes those of us who can recognize the shape of a 17 steroid whenever we see its molecular diagram, positively puke when we see some of the nonsense that is put forward before us.

*(Applause)*

To address again at this time of night a small audience, select and intelligent though it may be, on a subject of such vital importance to every one of us as health and environment who daily by the look of some of us, thrice daily, takes a knife and a fork into his hands and eats the food that is produced has now become the regular procedure in this Parliament. Few people will hear; no one will have the chance of reading it before they come in tomorrow morning, once again with their portfolio of prejudices, to vote upon this matter. It is a saddening fact, but it is becoming a part of our way of life.

I wish to commend to you one particular attitude and that is that the list when it is constructed should be a combination of a positive list of permitted substances allied with a very definite negative list of those substances which we know already. We are not venturing into experiments, because these substances are already known to be too dangerous. Add, Mr Commissioner, a negative list to your positive list and you will have the support of myself and my colleagues.

But one thing I would say: go back, think about it again, come to us for an order for a directive and you will achieve, I think, a unanimity of opinion in this House which, as opposed to the pious platitudinous welcomes that have been extended to certain other proposals today, might overwhelm you by its spirit, its genuineness and its generosity.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Maher.

**Mr Maher.** — I can be extremely brief because most of what I had to say, has already been said. I did want to comment nevertheless on one point. There are many people here tonight who are leaders of consumer organizations and who influence consumers in their attitudes to the food they buy and the prices they pay. I think it is worth reminding them that those who produce food are constantly under pressure to try to produce that food at the lowest possible price for the consumer so that they will be left with a reasonable market and also a reasonable profit.

So very often they are under pressure to make use of aids in that production in order to try to increase their incomes. And every time the consumers — and I am talking of the consumers who are not also producers — pressurize the farmers to take less for their food.

The farmer is pushed in the direction of listening more and more to the powerful commercial interests. They are very powerful, using a lot of money — many of them are multinational organizations making use of the most sophisticated methods of publicity — the media — to convince the farmer that by using x, y, z he will get higher output and therefore more profit. Take up any newspaper, look at any television screen, and that is what you find.

So the farmer is under this pressure and very often in fact he is in a situation where he does not know what he is buying. He is pressurized on one side to keep his prices down and on the other he is pressurized by the commercial interests to buy the products so that he can increase his profits. Many of these commercial interests can operate in such a way that they can sell products which in fact are not safe and not well tested.

What about that aspect of it? Are we satisfied in fact that all these preparations that are being sold are in fact well tested before they are sold? I think it is extremely important that we look at this aspect of it because otherwise I think there is a danger that we will continue to use products that perhaps are a certain threat to the health of consumers.

But let the consumer be aware of this: if he wants food that has no risk at all attached to it we may have to get rid of artificial fertilizers, for instance. Many people would argue that they are a certain threat. And all the pesticides — they are a certain threat. If we get rid of all these things the consumer must be prepared to pay four times the price for his food. I would remind Mrs Castle of that when she tries to argue against increasing farm prices. She is pushing the farmer towards desperately trying to make use of these artificial aids in order to keep his income up.

Now that might be far removed from hormones but hormones are one of those areas where it has been shown to the farmer that by using them he can get better growth in his animals and so increase his profits.

**Maher**

So I want to give this message to the consumer leaders tonight: let them remember that if we are to avoid these substances that might be harmful then you cannot have it both ways. Pay us enough for the food and we will give it to you absolutely clear and natural with no artificial additives whatever.

**President.** — I call Mr Brøndlund Nielsen.

**Mr Brøndlund Nielsen, rapporteur** — (DK) Mr President, I should like to express my thanks for the support I have received from what I take to be a majority in this House. In particular, I should like to thank the spokesman of the Socialist Group and the Group of the European People's Party.

Mr Dalsager spoke on the point in my report dealing with the way in which these things are to be financed. I am assuming that what the Commissioner had reservations about was paragraph 10 and in particular the second half of this paragraph. I should like to explain that this was a paragraph which was the subject of considerable interest in the Committee on Agriculture and which, for this reason, can be regarded as having to a great extent the support of the Committee which is naturally due to the fact that it reflects something which both I myself and many other speakers have discussed, namely the fact that meat production and agricultural production as a whole are such risky and unprofitable businesses from the economic point of view that producers are out to find any way they can of increasing their production. This merely underlines what I said about the need for realistic price increases. However, it is also true to say, as the Commissioner pointed out, that the farmers must live from selling their products and for this reason, it is in our interests that the market should not be allowed to collapse, as was in fact happening. It could of course be said that people were over-reacting somewhat, but nevertheless this means that there was a reaction and that people understandably view some of these products with a certain amount of suspicion.

As regards Mr Hord's remarks concerning the work in the Committee, I should like to say that in many respects we were perhaps placed under considerable pressure and had some very difficult deadlines to meet, but I think that we in the Committee on Agriculture had the opportunity to conduct a very good and thorough debate on this subject.

For the rest, as regards agricultural incomes, which were mentioned in particular by Mr Davern, in my view, Mr Davern did not completely understand what I had to say. I had the pleasure recently of supporting a proposal put forward by Mr Davern regarding the difficult situation as regards income in his country and I do not think basically that we fail to understand the other's point of view regarding the problems facing the farmers in this respect.

The question of whether a negative or positive list should be drawn up was also discussed. I have advocated a positive list since I think this would be the safest solution. I realize that this might involve certain problems, but I think this is what we should fundamentally be aiming at. If I understood him correctly, Mr Sherlock was advocating both a positive and a negative list. I wonder about the logic of this, but we may learn later how we are to understand this proposal.

Thus I was pleased at the support I have received from this House and I might perhaps be permitted to say that even though it is late and many of us are perhaps tired, this has in fact been a very stimulating debate. According to the newspapers there are many new things happening in British politics at the time being. It is, I think, very interesting that Mrs Barbara Castle should have made a speech which received tumultuous applause from the conservatives which then encouraged her to make an extremely impassioned speech. This was extremely interesting and quite novel.

However, the document I submitted has, I think, received considerable support and I should like to thank you for this just as I thank my colleagues in the Committee on Agriculture for their valuable cooperation on this report.

*(Applause from the left)*

**President.** — The Commission has the floor.

**Mr Dalsager, Member of the Commission.** — (DK) Mr President, one of my main reasons for asking to speak is to answer a number of direct questions which I have been asked.

It was particularly Mr Ceravolo who asked me to give an assurance that a proposal regarding antibiotics would be forthcoming within a month. I might perhaps say that one should not perhaps take the expression 'a month' entirely literally — it may well be five weeks. However, I can at any rate vouch for the fact that these proposals are being drawn up. There are two proposals, one regarding the mixing of antibiotics with foodstuffs and one concerning the administration of antibiotics to animals. The chief aim of the proposals is to prevent the presence of residues in meat.

Mr Ceravolo had a question regarding an amendment in the case of animals for human nutrition. I am fully prepared to consider the wording proposed, i.e. to replace 'domestic animals' with 'animals for human nutrition' and I fully agree with the remarks which have been made concerning, for example, fish and rabbits. I can assure Mr Ceravolo that frozen meat is included, since the checks will apply to all meat without exception.

**Dalsager**

Various questions have been raised regarding exports to third countries of substances banned in the Community. I must admit that I myself have considered this question but I should nevertheless like to ask Parliament to be so kind as to bear in mind that I took over responsibility for these matters only about a fortnight ago. However, I have been informed by officials that, at least at present, there is no legal basis which would enable us to forbid factories to produce these substances and export them to third countries, which, quite simply, is why this figures in the proposed regulation.

Mrs Scrivener made a comment to the effect that there is no regulation regarding substances used for therapeutic purposes in veterinary medicine, and this is perfectly correct. A proposal on this subject has been before the Council since 1976 and we hope it may be adopted in the near future.

The question of a negative list or a positive list etc. has been raised by many speakers, and, in addition, the question has been raised as to whether there should perhaps be a directive rather than a regulation in this case. I should like to say that, in the Commission's view, a regulation is the best way of guaranteeing uniform application of the rules as swiftly as possible. However, if it should become apparent that a directive would be a more practical way of going about things, the Commission is prepared to reconsider its position.

I should, however, like to say that we must also consider whether this in fact meets the consumers' wishes. Is it an appropriate reaction to the campaign which has been launched against baby food and veal that we here in Parliament — and perhaps in the Council too, I have no way of knowing — should be trying to cause a delay? It is not only a question of the Commission or the Members of Parliament or others being quite certain that these things must not be allowed to hamper production of meat for various purposes. There is also the question of whether the consumers and consumers' organizations will believe us if we say that these substances are not dangerous. If they do not believe us, whatever we say, the effect on consumer prices will be such that it will be impossible to market the products at reasonable prices. Thus, certain vital interests of the producers are also at stake here.

There has been a sort of inter-party campaign for a positive list of hormones permitted for use in promoting growth. It was, I think, Mrs Castle who said that a total ban would result in a black market. I have discussed these problems before when I was a member of the Council, and I know that there is one country at least where there is a total ban, and there has been for decades, and where there has been no signs of a black market in these substances. However, I fully realize that in places where these substances have traditionally been used, this would naturally constitute a break with the traditional way of life, an intervention which the

consumers and producers might find difficult to understand. It is obvious, therefore, that the rules and regulations we introduced must preferably be such that they will be acceptable to both the producers and the consumers. The consumers are afraid of children and adults absorbing these substances via foodstuffs. We are under a major obligation to ensure that they will not be consuming undesirable substances by eating foodstuffs produced by European agriculture.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

**16. Membership of Parliament**

**President.** — I have been informed by the Belgian Government that Mr Jacques Vandenmeulebroucke has been appointed Member of Parliament to replace Mr Coppieters. I welcome the new Member, while pointing out that any Member whose credentials have not been verified provisionally takes his seat in Parliament and on its committees with the same rights as other Members.

**17. Convergence and budgetary questions**

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-136/80/rev.), drawn up by Mr Balfour on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the communication from the Commission to the Council concerning convergence and budgetary questions.

I call Mr Balfour.

**Mr Balfour, rapporteur.** — Mr President, I am conscious of the fact that my committee is introducing its report on convergence and budgetary questions, heavily pregnant after a nine-month delay. This postponement was not our doing; the delay was brought about by events. As the European Summit, or whatever we should call that supra-Community institution, made its painful and grudging progress towards a solution, the Parliament's business managers felt it unwise to introduce the will of Parliament, which is embodied in this report, as a factor in the summit discussions. We thus failed to debate and adopt this report in time to be able to influence events in April and May of last year, and I regretted this decision. Having thus stood aside to await the results of the eyeball-to-eyeball negotiations between Heads of Governments last May, there was felt to be little urgency in this report. Today, then, is as good a time as any since last May to consider the question of

**Balfour**

convergence and its budgetary implications, and I am glad of the opportunity which this gives us to highlight the problem so early on in the life of the new Commission.

The discussions in committee to which the resolution contained in my report gives expression took place against a background of disagreement and unparalleled resentment at Member State level which should not have been necessary; which was to put it mildly, unedifying; but which at least brought results.

Let me remind the House that we were asked to draft this report in response to a Commission initiative designed to find at least a temporary solution to the British budget problem. It was certainly felt in the committee that there was something deeply unhealthy about a Community which in net terms taxed one of its poorest members considerably more heavily than the richest. Thus the committee appreciated the reasons for the United Kingdom's insistence that an equitable solution be found, and we approved the Commission's proposals for mitigating the UK's budgetary imbalance under Article 235 of the Treaty. In truth, it could be said that we were profoundly relieved to see that a Community mechanism indeed existed for putting right this glaring abuse. However, though we were glad that legitimate means existed for the UK to obtain some immediate relief, our committee was fundamentally critical of the efforts, or rather the lack of effort, at Member State level to achieve the Community's overriding objective of economic convergence. Our motion for a resolution thus reaffirms certain basic principles essential to the development of a balanced and just Community in Europe and calls upon the Member States for once to live up to them.

I might at this stage add that, although our criticisms and exhortations are primarily directed at the Council of Ministers, we are deeply conscious of the fact that it is up to the Commission to remind the Council and individual Member States of their obligations and duties under the Treaties. It is up to the Commission — and they can expect the overwhelming support of Parliament in such a task — to oblige the all-powerful Council to look beyond the limits of immediate domestic financial or political advantage. Though appointed individually by their respective Member States, Commissioners owe their first and only loyalty to the European Community, and I cannot help feeling that they could afford to be more daring in their efforts to draw a more enthusiastic European response from individual Member State governments.

The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs therefore notes with a heavy heart the almost total absence over the last few years of progress towards the important objective of economic convergence. We believe the main reason for this to be the lack of political will at Council level. We recognize with dissatisfaction that too many people, including people who

should know better, regard the Community as a kind of begging bowl or eldorado. No Member State, not even the UK at the time of its worst budget deficit, should be so myopic as to evaluate the benefits of membership on a purely cash basis. There may be periods when membership will require one country or another to contribute more than the next to a particular policy. It will take an act of considerable political courage for a domestic politician to put wider strategic interests of Europe above that of the immediate political or financial advantage at home. Yet no amount of dipping one's hand into the begging bowl, even if it were large enough to make a real difference, will ever bring about convergence. For this can only be possible if individual Member States work hard to improve their own economic performance and if they can learn to coordinate such work with their Community partners on a medium and long-term basis.

The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs of course recognizes that the concept of convergence is distinct from and wider than the issue of budgetary balance. Nevertheless, we point out that, because the budget is so inadequate in size and because its commitment to agriculture expenditure is so overriding, it is probably now hindering progress towards convergence.

We approve the Commission's efforts to develop general investment policies and we see the indispensable role of an eventual European monetary union in preparing the conditions of progress towards convergence.

We note with frustration that the reasons advanced by succeeding United Kingdom administrations for standing back from full EMS membership have been turned literally upside down by subsequent events. We look forward to the United Kingdom establishing a proper basis for full participation in this crucially important development.

In specific terms our committee re-emphasizes for the umpteenth time that the resources which we expend on energy, transport, technology, industrial development, agricultural structural measures and regional investment should have a faster rate of growth than the resources which the Community spends each year in financing the buildup and subsequent selldown of surplus agricultural stocks. We want in a word to reverse the ratchet of constantly increasing agricultural expenditure, and we believe that this reversal will now at last be possible. It will be possible because it is now perceived by everyone in Europe to be necessary. This then is what we believe will be necessary for economic growth in Europe to be more harmonious: that we devote greater resources to the non-agricultural sectors of the Community budget, that we develop a better balance between Community policies, that the distributive effects of Community policy between sectors, regions and even countries be the essential criterion for the establishment of new policies

**Balfour**

and the re-evaluation of the old; that we change the Community budget from an annual and therefore static mechanism into a more dynamic instrument linked to advanced long-term multiannual planning and lastly, and most importantly, that we give urgent consideration to the ways in which the Community's own resources are to be increased.

I am delighted to say that although a lot has happened since our committee accepted this resolution by 14 votes to nil, with one bloody-minded abstention, nothing except the grammatical tense of certain verbs required up-dating, and I do not propose to waste Parliament's time by up-dating tenses by amendment, so though our resolution comes to this House late, it comes intact and with even greater relevance.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The Socialist Group has the floor.

**Mr Orlandi.** — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, discussion of the communication from the Commission to the Council concerning convergence and budgetary questions has once again ended up by being dominated by a debate on the motion for a resolution with regard to the Community's own resources.

Referral to committee, which was requested by the rapporteur himself, has turned out to be not very helpful and, to a certain extent, inconclusive. It was all the more unnecessary as the link between the two themes and the two motions for resolutions is inescapably clear: convergence will not be achieved unless the Community's own resources are increased; in view of the budgetary situation, an increase in own resources is a prerequisite for a policy of convergence.

It is emphasized in the motion for a resolution that convergence is one of the fundamental objectives of the Community, but the explanatory statement ends up by acknowledging that the term 'convergence', is rather vague and has been used in a number of general contexts. It is indeed difficult to get to grips with such an abstract concept as convergence. It is not just that the word lends itself to different interpretations; the object or the aim, whatever it is we are to converge on, is also shrouded in obscurity.

In order to define more clearly the methods and instruments to be used and the directions to be followed, it would be helpful if the misleading term 'convergence' could be replaced by the more transparent expression 'medium-term Community programme'.

Like all programmes, the medium-term Community programme should comprise:

- a defined purpose, namely the abolition of territorial imbalances, whether they be national, regional

or sectoral, and hence a reduction in disparities between areas;

- identification of the instruments to be used to achieve this purpose, or, in other words, a definition of the economic policies needed to attain the objectives defined.

We cannot ignore the fact that disparities in income between the strong and weak areas of the Community have grown wider in recent years.

This was only to be expected. A customs union and a free market for industrial products, although useful elements in themselves, help to create distortions, unless firm measures are taken to counterweigh them. What happens is that all the wealth is concentrated in the prosperous areas, where new jobs are created, and this acts as a magnet to workers from the poorer areas, the end result being that the latter become even more impoverished.

It is therefore evident that specific Community action aimed at reducing existing and foreseeable imbalances would not just be helpful but is in fact vital to every one's interest. President Thorn indicated that the need to overcome disparities between the regions of Europe was a basic objective in the wider task of achieving greater convergence.

This question is so vital that Community policies and the budget itself should be completely reformed and agreed upon mutually so as to restore balance between the regions, which is essential for a more durable and smooth pattern of common development.

Paragraph 16 of the motion for a resolution makes a very timely reference to the enlargement of the Community. Unless plans are laid and steps are taken to restore balance, enlargement as such will have serious adverse effects on the proclaimed objective of convergence.

The Community of the twelve will have to face the prospect of differences which are not only bigger, but which are likely to carry on growing within its boundaries. Tomorrow's reality everyone's detriment — will not be a set of industrial economies with a few backward areas here and there. Instead, we are going to be faced with a two-tier economy: on the one hand, there will be the North with its advanced industries, and on the other, there will be the South, the Community's poor relation, and destined to become even poorer.

We shall never achieve a politically unified Europe if we are moving at two different speeds. Economic integration will collapse if the process of unification is left to its own devices and not coordinated with suitable corrective measures, and if existing disparities are allowed to increase.

### Orlandi

The Community must reorganize the current regional development policies as these often amount to little more than unsystematic attempts at patching up and are often confined to the repayment of national aids.

The Socialist Group is currently examining the desirability of setting up a European development agency. Its tasks would be to draw up specific programmes, to give technical assistance and to promote business. Such an agency could be along lines similar to those of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I should like to sum up with three basic points:

- the Community budget is the basic tool for implementing a policy aimed at restoring balance and promoting effective economic convergence;
- the discussion on convergence happened to become merged with that on the proposals to achieve financial equilibrium for the United Kingdom, with unfortunate consequences. The need to come to grips with the incidental problem of the so-called *juste retour* is not so great as the much more far-reaching need to restore general balance, which affects the entire Community;
- it is not, however, fortuitous that the debate on convergence has coincided with that on an increase of own resources. We cannot get away from the need to increase our own resources, but Europe would be squandering a historical opportunity if, having obtained an increased budget, it failed to reorientate its expenditure and give it a definitive aim, namely, the abolition of imbalances which are an affront to the Community as well as a block to its progress.

**President.** — The Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) has the floor.

**Mr Herman.** — (*F*) Mr President, we sit here complaining all day long that the Council takes no notice of us. Well, this time *we* are to blame. In many cases we are quite justified in complaining, but this time it is all our own fault. The Commission delivered a communication to the Council on 5 February. We received the document in March and the Commission managed to finish its report in April. It should have been dealt with at a plenary sitting if it was to have any influence on the decisions of the Council which was itself meeting in May. But we have only got round to talking about it now. If our views are disregarded, this is due to the fact that we are unable to prepare ourselves, that we cannot organize our work, and that the Bureau, which urged our Committee to make a report in good time, is not capable of arranging for its inclusion at a plenary sitting. We have no right to spend our time poking our noses into all sorts of questions over which we have no influence, while neglecting the specific tasks which we have been given by the Treaties. I hardly think that Parliament will gain credibility in this way.

The second point I should like to make, Mr President, concerns the word convergence. The extraordinary way in which this word has been misused and misinterpreted will no doubt be a source of great interest one day to historians and etymologists. The term convergence has a very precise meaning, in fact, and those who first employed it knew what they meant. But nowadays, the word is used to convey an exactly opposite meaning, or to throw a smoke screen over a sorry state of affairs which is just the opposite of convergence. I mean this idea of the *juste retour*, which is leading some of us astray, ladies and gentlemen. We must get back on the right road and remind ourselves that convergence is something quite different from budgetary problems.

My last words are to do with the restoration of balance within the budget. It is quite true that we need to reduce spending on agriculture but we must take care not to throw the baby out with the bathwater. European agriculture has an enormous capacity of production which is unique in the world, and it is possible to make changes in what it produces. At the moment we are still importing some products from the outside world, but if a long-term structural policy were implemented, we would be able to produce the goods which the European market demands under the same conditions as those which prevail on the world market. We can do it. All it takes is organization and planning. In this way we will one day reabsorb agricultural surpluses and reduce expenditure in this sector. Rather than making drastic cuts, we ought to follow this course of action, which will enable us to overcome all our problems.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — The European Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mrs Kellett-Bowman.** — Mr President, convergence is undoubtedly crucial to the Community. It is a tribute to the rapporteur and to the Commission that, although much of what they said has been overtaken by events, nevertheless the ground they broke then is still useful to us.

Paragraph 18 stresses the need to consider all policies in the light of their effect on the regions. It is ironic that the Community's agricultural policy actually has a regressive effect on disadvantaged regions in that it gives far more money to rich than to poor regions, thus to a large extent nullifying the effect of the Regional and Social Funds and being positively anti-convergent. Moreover, there are other very serious anomalies between the operation of the regional and the agricultural policies. In some countries, the dividing line between areas which qualify for regional aid and those which need it and yet do not qualify for it are far too arbitrary. It is absurd that there should be

**Kellett-Bowman**

parts of the Community which actually qualify for aid under the least-favoured-areas directives and yet do not qualify for regional aid or Investment Bank assistance. This is an anomaly which must be corrected in the new Regional Fund regulation.

The rapporteur is right to stress that any definition of convergence must imply a reduction of sectoral and regional and national disparities by means of, or with the help of, Community instruments, and how right he is to state so emphatically that because of its small size and current structure the budget is failing to promote convergence! I have a sneaking personal affection for Amendment No 6, for the first time a Commission document refers to the problem of urban decay, which is of great importance to disadvantaged regions in Belgium, France and Italy and parts of the United Kingdom's older industrial regions, such as the North-West, with its shipbuilding at Barrow and its steel, paper and textiles throughout the area. This urban decay is rightly referred to in paragraph 19 of the document as a major factor of regional disadvantage. It is indeed, especially in the realm of outworn infrastructure.

It is in this connection that I welcome the rapporteur's emphasis on the importance of a Community loan mechanism. Local authorities throughout the United Kingdom receive great help from the European Investment Bank for infrastructure products, as do the Water and Electricity Boards. Moreover, in the United Kingdom we still have a lot of heavy industry such as paper-making, with its very heavy capital expenditure, and shoes, which have also been very much helped by the Bank.

But it is not only large firms that may take advantage of the help offered by the European Investment Bank. If we are to achieve the balance between the regions and the convergence of the Member States' economies that we all want, those areas which have in the past been too heavily dependent on one or two heavy and declining industries will have to diversify their economic effort. This means encouraging the establishment and growth of new small firms that have flexibility and dynamism and can adapt themselves repeatedly to changing conditions. These small firms must be helped and encouraged to use the European Investment Bank much more in the future than they have in the past, particularly as no country operates a claw-back, as they do with the Regional Fund.

The rapporteur rightly emphasizes the importance of multiannual planning for the budget, which is particularly important with the Regional Fund, where commitments entered into are frequently for long-term schemes which take years to complete and pay for.

With the very welcome accession of Greece and the future accession of Portugal and Spain, convergence becomes even more vital, for without it there can be

no real or lasting progress towards spreading the prosperity with the Community citizens demand and which the Community, given the will, can provide for itself.

**President.** — The Liberal and Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mr Delorozoy.** — (*F*) Mr President, I should first of all, in the few minutes I have been allotted, like to congratulate Mr Balfour on his excellent report. The European Parliament has been discussing budgetary questions for some months now, but in the majority of cases, it has not managed to discuss these problems as part of the wider issue of which courses of action the Community should adopt in the future; these choices are nevertheless of capital importance. I feel I must point out that the budget is not just an estimate of income and expenditure, but should also, and above all, express the will to achieve a thorough going European economic community, and not just an agricultural common market. Mr Balfour specifically, and quite rightly, stated that the Community budget must be a dynamic force enabling the Community to act. But what is the point of having a thrusting and forward-looking Community budget, if the Member States continue to pursue budgetary, monetary, financial and industrial policies independently from one another, to the extent where they even conflict with each other, rather than being converged?

Additional funds and better coordination and convergence of investment in forward-looking industries could and should help us to devise a European industrial policy with thrust and drive, which is vital for us to be able to compete on world markets. But if the Member States and the Community persist in aiding lame ducks and if, in addition, they prefer to compete with each other rather than coordinating their efforts at Community level in favour of the industries of tomorrow, then dark days lie ahead for us. The powerful effects of inflation and budgetary deficits on international trade and hence on the prosperity and social development of countries are only too apparent.

Without wishing to belittle the importance of a European agricultural policy, we may nevertheless ask ourselves — and many speakers have — whether it is altogether wise to devote nearly two-thirds of the Community budget almost entirely to this sector. For when we talk about convergence, we mean coordination and joint planning in several important economic sectors. The Commission report on the economic situation in the Community depicts national difficulties and possible Community solutions. If the Member States really want to work towards economic and social progress with joint action and in accordance with the Treaties, they ought to pay more attention to Commission proposals and be more receptive to them.

**Delorozoy**

We need to adopt a European strategy if we are to rise to the challenge of changes taking place throughout the world and to face the new demands with which we are presented. Mr Thorn made this point yesterday. From now on there will be no guarantee that the Community, or any of our individual countries, will survive with all the major changes that are taking place, unless we have the will to achieve true unity and convergence where the various Community policies are concerned. I do believe that this is vital if we are to be effective, and that it is a fact of life today. Let this be our strength rather than a defect in the years to come.

**President.** — The Group of the European Progressive Democrats has the floor.

**Mr Vié.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, once again we are trying to take stock of the difficult problems of convergence. It may be that this debate has become quite academic for some Members, but whether this is true or not, we are tackling it on the basis of Mr Balfour's report. I should like to congratulate him on the tremendous job that he has done, even though we do not agree with his arguments. The Community must not abandon the achievements which are its cornerstone and its the guarantee for the future. This essential cornerstone — let us remind ourselves once again — is the common agricultural policy. In this basic area, we can say that we are sure of our experience. We can tell ourselves that we are sure of the facts because we have experienced them. This policy has guaranteed us a supply of food, as well as stable prices for consumers. It has given farmers a steady income and is an element of hope when it comes to solving the problem of hunger in the world. Naturally, we are aware that there are some problems at the moment. We are open to any suggestions, but we are quite convinced that no reform ought to be aimed at principles and arrangements which we regard as sacred. Any such reform should however abolish certain types of privileged position which at present give rise to discontent and should eliminate once and for all the anomalies which have so often been pointed out and which jeopardize financial balance.

We do not believe that the problem of the common agricultural policy can be solved by either of the solutions that are being put forward. Reshaping it would be tantamount to dismembering it — and one can imagine the social upheaval which would result. On the other hand, neither do we think that an increase of the Community's own resources — the easy way out — is a solution. For it is not in the Community's power to do everything. Its budget does not even amount to 1 % of the gross domestic product of its members. It cannot achieve the unified economic performance of ten countries on its own. What does convergence at this level mean, then? It means the adoption of a common strategy to combat unemploy-

ment and inflation which takes account of all aspects of production. It means that Europe must adopt a coherent and well-planned policy on the supply, need for, and price of energy, in all its forms. It means a forceful and binding trade policy in the form of Community reference prices below which customs duties must be levied. We cannot carry on tolerating the countless exceptions we have known in the past, which have often been severely criticized and which have led people to think that our common market is full of loopholes. Convergence also means a political counterattack on Japanese expansionism, a pledge that greater unity in our trade policy is possible. Of course, such a counterthrust should not amount to mere protectionism. Convergence also means greater support for the key industries which guarantee our future development. It must be remembered — and this has been said before in this House — that we are a market of some 300 million consumers and that this is practically an ideal number to encourage bold investment and daring enterprises which will enable us to awaken to the promises of the future.

So that is what we in the Group of the European Progressive Democrats understand by greater convergence. Only in this way will we be able to improve the lot of the poorest areas in the future. It is not that we want to institute poverty by introducing draconian measures, but we do want to foster the potential and build on the riches we already have in a way that will enable our entire Community to develop with the help of voluntary and imaginative common policies. At the same time, of course, we must take care — and no one is unaware of Parliament's concern in this matter — that a boom in the wealthiest regions does not turn the gap separating them from the poorest regions into a gulf.

To sum up, we feel that the problem of convergence is not a budgetary question, but is primarily a problem of political will. We should like to involve not only our group but all the groups of this Parliament in doing our utmost to promote this will.

**President.** — The Commission has the floor.

**Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, at 11.58 p.m. I clearly cannot do justice to Mr Balfour's report. I am afraid the exigencies of the timetable are going to have to take priority over the importance of the subject-matter. However, I would like to place it on the record, without saying anything further, that there is no subject more central to the future of the European Community than what has come to be known as convergence. I believe that this report is a valuable contribution to the discussion and the decision-making on the subject. As the rapporteur said, it was prepared before the settlement of 30 May, before the Commission was given the mandate on which it is now working.

**Tugendhat**

In the time that has elapsed since this report was first produced a great many changes have taken place. I believe that one can now say with a good deal of confidence that all the institutions of the Community are now agreed on the need for change. The only question, and it is, of course, a very important question, is the form that the change should take. I would like to make it clear on behalf of the Commission that we believe that the existing achievements of the Community — the financial solidarity of our common policies and the own resource system — should not be prejudiced. These are major Community achievements which must be safeguarded, but changes in the balance of expenditure within the Community budget will need to be brought about and new policies must be developed, while existing policies must be maintained and improved and in some cases extended.

I would also like to make two particular points of detail. One is that the rapporteur talks about the need for more advanced long-term planning and hence multiannual planning of the Community budget. Secondly, he asserts that because the Community budget is an annual budget it is therefore a static instrument of policy. I don't accept either of those points, Mr President. Firstly, I would like to remind the House of the triennial forecasts which are presented each year in conjunction with the preliminary draft budget. They do not, I believe, receive the attention in this House that they deserve. I hope very much that they will in future.

Secondly, on the question of whether the budget is a static instrument or not, I would remind the House that the budget contains both commitment credits and payment credits. This concept is by its very nature a dynamic concept, since commitment credits are linked to programmes extending over several years. In fact, of course, one of the problems underlying the present dispute over the supplementary budget is the fact that the Council, or perhaps some members of the Council, it might be truer to say, have been unwilling to provide the payment credits to enable the commitment credits actually to be fulfilled. However, the concept of the Community budget with its commitment credits is a dynamic one.

Finally, Mr President, in the explanatory statement the rapporteur draws attention to the concept of financial equalization, an idea which Mr Lange first introduced to the House some time ago. I very much agree, as I have said before, with the rapporteur when he says that this concept needs further exploration. I cannot, of course, go into it now, but I do believe that that idea which emerged from this House is one that ought to be considered, even though the particular context in which Mr Lange put it forward has, of course, changed. It is something which is, I think, of far greater interest than simply the particular circumstances which surrounded its introduction.

It is now two minutes past twelve, Mr President. I am sorry to have gone slightly over the time.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

18. *Agenda for next sitting*

**President.** — The next sitting will be held at 9 a.m. tomorrow, Friday, 13 February 1981, with the following agenda:

9 a.m.

- decision on urgency
- motion for a resolution on energy
- motion for a resolution on tax-free allowances for travellers
- motion for a resolution on the visit by President Sadat and Egyptian participation in the Euro-Arab Dialogue
- motion for a resolution on aid to Calabria
- motion for a resolution on the charges brought against 13 trade-union leaders in Brazil
- joint debate on two motions for resolutions on the sugar cane industry
- motion for a resolution on the British prisoners in Iran
- motion for a resolution on drivers' hours
- motion for a resolution on the motor vehicle industry in the EEC
- Beumer report on books (continuation of debate)
- Nyborg report on the importation of certain goods
- Lenz report on the EEC-Romania Agreement
- Lalor report on the Western Sahara
- Luster report on compensation for victims of acts of violence
- Malangre report on UK immigration controls
- Curry report on apples
- Colleselli report on wine growing
- Key report on transport
- Kirk report on catch quotas
- Provan report on bovine livestock
- Fruh report on less-favoured agricultural areas in the FRG

Votes:

9 a.m.: vote on requests for urgent procedure

10.30 a.m.: vote on motions for resolutions on which the debate has closed

after 10.30 a.m.: a vote will be taken after the closure of each debate.

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 12.05 a.m.)*

## SITTING OF FRIDAY, 13 FEBRUARY 1981

## Contents

1. Approval of the minutes: Procedural motion: Mrs Castle . . . . .	266	Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul and others (Doc. 1-879/80): Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul . . . . .	275
2. Membership of committees . . . . .	266	Mr Pasmazoglou . . . . .	276
3. Decision on urgent procedure: Mr Hord; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Louwes; Mr Klepsch; Mr Maffre-Baugé; Mr Adam; Mr Pannella; Mrs Pruvot; Mr Pannella; Mr Glinne; Mrs Baduel Glorioso; Mr Irmer; Mr Vandenmeulebroucke; Mr Calvez; Mr Rogers; Mr Fernandez; Mrs Vayssade . . . . .	267	10. Crisis in the sugar-cane industry — Joint debate on the motions for resolutions by Mrs Castle and others (Socialist Group) (Doc. 1-884/80) and by Miss Hooper and others (Doc. 1-886/80): Mrs Castle; Miss Hooper . . . . .	276
4. Possibility of holding an additional part-session: Mrs Castle . . . . .	271	Mr Cohen; Mr Pearce; Mr Louwes . . . . .	277
5. Regulations on energy — Motion for a resolution by Mr Turcat (Committee on Energy and Research) (Doc. 1-836/80): Mr Turcat . . . . .	272	11. Agenda: Point of order: Mrs Lenz . . . . .	279
Mr Tugendhat (Commission) . . . . .	272	12. Membership of committees . . . . .	279
6. Tax-free allowances for travellers — Motion for a resolution by Mr von Wogau (Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs) (Doc. 1-861/80): Mr von Wogau . . . . .	273	13. Votes: ● Curry report (Doc. 1-748/80): Sugar quotas for the French Overseas Departments: Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	279
Mr Tugendhat (Commission) . . . . .	273	● Gautier report (Doc. 1-841/80): Common organization of the market in fishery products: Mr Gautier, rapporteur . . . . .	279
7. Visit by President Sadat to Parliament and Egypt's participation in the Euro-Arab Dialogue — Motion for a resolution by Mr Israel and others (Doc. 1-882/80): Mr Israel . . . . .	274	Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	280
Mr de Courcy Ling; Mr O'Kennedy (Commission); Mr Turcat . . . . .	274	● Nielsen report (Doc. 1-840/80): Substances with hormonal action: Mr Nielsen, rapporteur . . . . .	280
8. Community aid to Calabria — Motion for a resolution by Mr Antoniozzi and others (Doc. 1-883/80): Mr Antoniozzi . . . . .	275	Procedural motion: Mr Collins . . . . .	281
Mr Tugendhat (Commission) . . . . .	275	Mr Nielsen . . . . .	281
9. Charges brought against 13 trade-union leaders in Brazil — Motion for a resolution by		Explanations of vote: Mr Gautier; Mr Collins, chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection . . . . .	284
		Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	284
		● Balfour report (Doc. 1-136/80/rev.): Convergence and budgetary questions: Mr Balfour, rapporteur . . . . .	284
		Procedural motions: Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Sir James Scott-Hopkins . . . . .	285

<i>Mr Balfour</i> . . . . .	285	<i>Mrs Ewing; Mr Albers; Mr Habsburg; Mr Moreland; Mr Harris; Mr O'Kennedy (Commission)</i> . . . . .	291
<i>Explanation of vote: Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Balfour</i> . . . . .	286	<i>Explanation of vote: Mr Pearce</i> . . . . .	294
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	286	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	294
● <i>Turcat motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-836/80): Regulations on energy:</i>			
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	286	17. <i>Situation of the motor-vehicle industry in the EEC — Motion for a resolution by Mr Sarre and others (Doc. 1-896/80/rev.):</i>	
● <i>Von Wogau motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-861/80): Tax-free allowances for travellers:</i>		<i>Mr Sarre</i> . . . . .	294
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	286	<i>Mr Welsh; Mr Delorozoy</i> . . . . .	295
● <i>Israel et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 882/80): Visit by President Sadat to the European Parliament:</i>		<i>Rejection of the motion</i> . . . . .	296
<i>Mr Israel</i> . . . . .	286	18. <i>Fixing of book-prices — Report by Mr Beumer (Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs) (Doc. 1-554/80) (contd):</i>	
<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Pannella; Mr Hansch; Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul; Mr Schwencke; Mr Van Minnen</i> . . . . .	287	<i>Mrs Pruvo; Mrs Fourcade; Mr Schwencke; Mr Beazley; Mr O'Kennedy (Commission); Mr Beumer, rapporteur</i> . . . . .	296
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	288	<i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution:</i>	
● <i>Antoniozzi et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-883/80): Community aid to Calabria:</i>		<i>Mr Beumer</i> . . . . .	300
<i>Explanation of vote: Mr Pannella</i> . . . . .	288	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	301
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	288	19. <i>Exemption of certain imports from VAT — Report by Mr Nyborg (Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs) (Doc. 1-646/80):</i>	
● <i>Wiczorek-Zeul et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-879/80): Charges brought against 13 trade-union leaders in Brazil:</i>		<i>Mr Nyborg, rapporteur</i> . . . . .	301
<i>Mr Klepsch</i> . . . . .	288	<i>Mr Tugendhat (Commission)</i> . . . . .	302
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	288	<i>Consideration of the motion for a resolution:</i>	
<i>Procedural motion: Mr Kellett-Bowman</i> . . . . .	288	<i>Mr Nyborg</i> . . . . .	303
14. <i>Crisis in the sugar-cane industry (contd):</i>		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	303
<i>Mr Maher; Mr Enright; Mr Tugendhat (Commission); Mr Maher</i> . . . . .	288	<i>Procedural motion: Mr Colleselli</i> . . . . .	303
<i>Procedural motion: Mr Pearce; Mr Maher</i> . . . . .	290	20. <i>Western Sahara — Report by Mr Lalor (Political Affairs Committee) (Doc. 1-532/80):</i>	
<i>Rejection of the Castle et al. motion for a resolution</i> . . . . .	290	<i>Mr Lalor, rapporteur</i> . . . . .	303
<i>Rejection of the Hooper et al. motion for a resolution</i> . . . . .	290	<i>Mrs Van den Hewel; Mr Habsburg</i> . . . . .	304
15. <i>British prisoners held in Iran — Motion for a resolution by Mr Provan and others (Doc. 1-885/80):</i>		21. <i>Verification of credentials:</i>	
<i>Mr Provan</i> . . . . .	290	<i>Procedural motion: Mr Pannella</i> . . . . .	305
16. <i>Legislation on drivers' hours — Motion for a resolution by Mrs Ewing and others (Group of European Progressive Democrats) and by Mr Maher and others (Doc. 1-887/80):</i>		22. <i>Time-limit for tabling amendments:</i>	
<i>Procedural motions: Mr Albers; Mr Cottrell; Mrs Ewing; Mr Albers; Mrs Ewing; Mr Purvis</i> . . . . .	290	<i>Mr Pannella; Mr Patterson; Mr Pannella</i> . . . . .	305
		23. <i>Tabling of a motion for a resolution</i> . . . . .	306
		24. <i>Dates of the next part-session</i> . . . . .	307
		25. <i>Approval of the minutes</i> . . . . .	307
		26. <i>Adjournment of the session</i> . . . . .	307

## IN THE CHAIR: MR ROGERS

*Vice-President**(The sitting opened at 9 a.m.)***President.** — The sitting is open.1. *Approval of the minutes***President.** — The minutes of proceedings of yesterday's sitting have been distributed.

Are there any comments?

The minutes are approved.<sup>1</sup>

I call Mrs Castle on a point of order.

**Mrs Castle.** — Mr President, I want to ask whether there is to be a report of yesterday's meeting of the enlarged Bureau. Is it a fact that at that meeting it was agreed that there should be a second part-session in March? Is that not a decision which ought to be ratified by this Parliament? Is it not time we stopped this arbitrary decision of questions relating to our parliamentary procedure by a small body of people, without reference to the Parliament? Is it not also a fact that, if a part-session is to be held in the second part of March, it should be for this Parliament to decide where it is held?**President.** — I know that, in the enlarged Bureau yesterday, there was a great deal of discussion, with pressure being exercised by various political groups, including the political group to which you belong, Mrs Castle, for the expedition of certain items of business. There was a very large number of requests from committee chairmen to get their business on the agenda, so the possibility of another part-session was discussed. A decision was not taken, and I think the Bureau is going to consider the matter next week.

Let me add that an awful lot of nonsense is, on occasion, talked about small groups making decisions. The Bureau and the enlarged Bureau are elected by the Parliament, which decided that decisions of the Bureau and enlarged Bureau should be circulated to political groups. I understand this is done at the latest on the day following the meeting. If your political group secretariat are not giving you the information, then that is a matter for your political group.

**Mrs Castle.** — I am surprised to hear you say that no decision was taken yesterday. Members of the enlarged Bureau have informed me to the contrary. Secondly, what is the point of saying you will decide towards the end of February whether there is to be another meeting and where it is to be held? Will it not then be too late to consult Parliament? Can we have a report from the enlarged Bureau today, so that Parliament can endorse or not endorse the decisions taken yesterday and decide on meeting-places of this Parliament?**President.** — This matter is not an item on the agenda and it is not an item for discussion at the moment. It falls within the competence of the enlarged Bureau. I shall attempt to obtain as much information as possible, and this will be given later, following on the request from Mrs Castle. I am not allowing a debate on the functions of the enlarged Bureau, the Parliament or whatever.*(Applause)*2. *Membership of committees***President.** — I have received from the Communist and Allies Group, the Group of European Progressive Democrats and the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members requests for the appointment of

- Mr Ghergo to the Committee on Energy and Research, to replace Mrs von Alemann;
- Mr Vandenmeulebroucke to the Committee on External Economic Relations, to replace Mr Bøgh;
- Mr Kappos to the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning;
- Mr Geronimi and Mrs von Alemann to the Committee on Transport, the latter to replace Mr Helms;
- Mr Bøgh to the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport;
- Mr Vandenmeulebroucke and Mr Fanton to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, the latter to replace Mr Flanagan.

Are there any objections?

The appointments are ratified.

3. *Decision on urgent procedure***President.** — The next item is the vote on requests for urgent debate.<sup>1</sup> For details of petitions and other documents received, see the minutes of proceedings of this sitting.

**President**

We begin with the Hord *et al.* motion for a resolution on sales of butter to the Soviet Union (Doc. 1-908/80).

I call Mr Hord.

**Mr Hord.** — Mr President, unlike so many matters that come before this House, this issue directly affects the role, status and respect of our institution — the Parliament. The issue is both urgent and serious. It has very important implications for our relationship with the Commission. It is urgent because, firstly, the Commission, as we are informed, is shortly to approve the sale of a further 50 000 tonnes of butter — European butter with subsidies — through Bulgaria to the Soviet bloc.

Secondly, the Commission and the management committee concerned have taken the law into their own hands and flouted the will of this House — the Parliament — and the instructions of the Council.

Mr President, the motion for a resolution calls for a report from the Commission and the views of the Council so that we in Parliament can decide what action should be taken — for, as I do not have to tell Members here, it is for us to decide whether there should be any sanctions placed upon the Commission.

Mr President, in view of the large number of debates on the agenda this morning and presuming urgent procedure is granted for this motion for a resolution, I am prepared for this matter, with the approval of the House, to proceed without debate to a vote. It is a vital and urgent issue and I urge every Member here to vote for urgent procedure.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — I call Mr Tyrrell.

**Mr Tyrrell.** — Mr President, the position is that the Council passed a resolution directing the Commission to restrict butter sales to normal levels. During 1980, it appears that normal levels were in fact exceeded by something like a third. The Parliament, of course, instructed the Commission not to sell subsidized butter to the Soviet bloc. The Commission has ignored both the Parliament and the Council, and this is a matter that needs to be dealt with and dealt with as a matter of urgency.

**President.** — I call Mr Louwes.

**Mr Louwes.** — (*NL*) Mr President, this is a further page in the continuing story of the British struggle against the Community's butter policy. As I understand it, the European Democrats would prefer it if all

butter came from New Zealand and if it became impossible for our Community to continue its normal commercial activities.

When Mr Hord places the emphasis on the status of Parliament and respect for Parliament, I am on his side, on condition, however, that what Parliament asks for is possible. What Parliament is asking for now is not possible. We all know how these sales are effected. The butter is not sold directly by the Community to the Government of the Soviet Union: it disappears along the normal trade channels. Mr Hord and his colleagues also know perfectly well that, when normal commercial transactions take place on the world market, it is impossible to impose this kind of embargo. We therefore call for the normal course to be adopted and are opposed to this request for urgent procedure, Mr President.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — The Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) has the floor.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (*D*) Mr President, I should like to speak on all six requests made for urgent debates this morning, the opinion of my group being that it is absurd for us to be discussing the possibility of urgent debates at a time when we all know that we shall certainly not be able to deal with all the items already on the agenda.

(*Applause*)

I consider it an intolerable situation that we should now be wasting the little time we have available in discussing what else we should put on the agenda, even though we know that it is already hopelessly overloaded.

(*Applause*)

Consequently, Mr President, no other member of my group will now speak to these requests for urgent debates. I wish to inform the House that we shall be voting against all the requests for the reasons I have given.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — The Communist and Allies Group has the floor.

**Mr Maffre-Baugé.** — (*F*) It really is the last straw, Mr President, to hear those who protest the loudest against surpluses of dairy products regularly calling for a ban to be placed on exports to the USSR. These people have fewer scruples when it comes to exporting guns to fascist dictatorships to be used against the

**Maffre-Baugé**

common people, as is the case with El Salvador at this very moment. It is no coincidence that it is the same people who want to starve the people of the developing countries by upholding the neo-colonialist system to the exclusive benefit of the multinationals and the United States of America. They are carrying out the orders of their American masters, and you are so keen on being the servants of these masters that you do more than ordered.

The EEC has observed the embargo on the USSR more closely than the United States, in that it has extended it to products such as butter in which there is no trade between the United States and the USSR. We are strongly opposed to any political discrimination in trade. Who can refute this argument in this Chamber? That is why . . .

**President.** — If Members will speak on the reasons for urgent procedure and not on the political substance of the matter, we shall get through the business much more quickly.

I put the request for urgent procedure to the vote. The request is rejected. The motion is referred to the appropriate committee.

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We proceed to the Adam *et al.* motion for a resolution on Parliament's agenda (Doc. 1-909/80).

I call Mr Adam.

**Mr Adam.** — Mr President, this directly-elected Parliament has been operating now for some eighteen months, and there are very few Members who are satisfied with the way we conduct our business. It is now clear that there will be no improvement unless the executive functions of the Bureau and the enlarged Bureau are made accountable to Parliament as a whole. As a first step towards this, the motion proposes a short question-period during which Members can direct their questions on parliamentary matters to the Chair.

The reasons for urgent debate are quite different from those which normally operate. There are no lives at stake, at least not unless one or two of our Members are overcome by the frustration of this place; there is no irreversible action about to take place, and this is not about something which will happen before the next part-session and which we wish to prevent. What is at stake is the future effectiveness of this Parliament. The question of urgency arises because sufficient Members now believe that an additional procedural instrument is needed. This is not something that we

could have known in the early days, it had to grow with our experience; and having reached that conclusion, we should have been irresponsible if we had not raised this matter in Parliament at the earliest opportunity. We should have been failing in our elected duty if we had not done so.

Parliament must respond in the same spirit. This resolution must not be lost in the labyrinth of the existing procedure. Nothing that I can say in favour could be more effective than the point raised a few moments ago by Mrs Castle. Mr President, I ask for urgent debate.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (*F*) Mr President, I support this resolution for reasons that have been explained, and I thank Mr Adam, Mrs Kellett-Bowman, Mrs Ewing and the others who have asked for this urgent debate. I should simply like to add something to what Mrs Castle has said. The enlarged Bureau, it seems, has decided that this extraordinary part-session should take place because Parliament must discuss 110 amendments to the Rules of Procedure in two hours on the first Tuesday of the March part-session. I confess that if this resolution had already been adopted by the Assembly, I would have been rather interested and even amused by the idea of seeing the Bureau dare to explain that to a Parliament, even on a Friday morning. It seems, therefore, that the enlarged Bureau is unanimous, or almost unanimous, in feeling that this Parliament must vote on 110 amendments to its own Rules in two hours at the next part-session. That, Mr President, justifies that request made by these Members.

**President.** — The Liberal and Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mrs Pruvot.** — (*F*) Mr President, it seems rather paradoxical to me that items should be added to an agenda which is already extremely heavy, particularly when time is limited. But this is a basic problem.

For the time being, I am opposed to an urgent debate, since I share Mr Klepsch's view. There are far too many requests for urgent debates in this Parliament, which result in a considerable loss of time every morning, or almost every morning, and in it being impossible to discuss the reports on the agenda. We shall oppose urgency primarily for this reason and also for the important reason that the organization of the proceedings of our part-sessions is obviously in need of revision. It is a basic problem, but one which we cannot deal with quickly. We are therefore against urgency, Mr President.

*(Parliament rejected the request and referred the motion for a resolution to committee)*

**President.** — As the Luster report is about to be presented to Parliament, perhaps some amendment along the lines of this motion for a resolution could be put down and adopted very quickly.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* Mr President, am I right in thinking that you have just said we may table amendments to the Luster report? Is that what you said?

**President.** — Mr Pannella, whether deliberately or otherwise, you have misunderstood me again. What I am saying is that the Luster report is going to be put before Parliament. As a signatory to this motion for a resolution, I think it would be appropriate to attach it to the Luster report in the form of an amendment rather than send it back to committee.

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We proceed to the Glinne *et al.* motion for a resolution on the Sahraoui people (Doc. 1-910/80).

I call Mr Glinne.

**Mr Glinne.** — *(F)* Mr President, I should like to say very briefly that this motion for a resolution contains the amendments we would have tabled to Mr Lalor's report if this week's proceedings had not prevented us from doing so for procedural reasons. We believe that it is important for Members to be able to see from this motion for a resolution the basic proposals my group wishes to make.

**President.** — I call Mrs Baduel Glorioso.

**Mrs Baduel Glorioso.** — *(F)* We approve Mr Glinne's request for an urgent debate, because it supports the activities now in progress within the UN and the OAU, which are aimed at finding a peaceful solution to the conflict in the Sahara and at giving these people their independence. However, as we have not had time to debate this question in the context of the debate on the Lalor report, I do not know if we shall have an opportunity to table amendments which would have supplemented the views expressed by Mr Glinne, while agreeing with them, by backing the Polisario liberation movement, which is trying to achieve independence for the Sahraoui people who live in this region. If it is possible to table amendments, we shall do so, and our amendments will aim at achieving

peaceful relationships between the protagonists in this region.

**President.** — I call Mr Irmer.

**Mr Irmer.** — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it seems to me that this is a classic case of the abuse of rights under the Rules of Procedure. We simply cannot accept that a committee such as the Political Affairs Committee should adopt a report as long ago as October which takes account of an amendment tabled by Mr Glinne, who is now requesting an urgent debate, that this report should be known for many months, meaning that everyone has had an opportunity to submit amendments, and that then, on a Friday morning, a request should be made for an urgent debate. I believe it would be difficult to find a more classic case of the abuse of rights under the Rules of Procedure.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

Let me put this in somewhat more basic terms by referring to the next request but one on the situation on southern Angola. The events to which reference is made and which allegedly justify an urgent debate, have been known for weeks. All the daily newspapers have been reporting on the situation in southern Angola for weeks. Why was the request for a debate by urgent procedure not made on Monday or Tuesday? Why do we have to wait until Thursday, when the agenda is already overloaded, to clutter ourselves up with these absurd and senseless requests.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it seems to me that in both cases — the requests for urgent debates on the Sahraoui people and the situation in southern Angola — certain Members are making the quite deliberate attempt to exploit what is already a difficult situation on Friday mornings to find the support of a majority they could not count on on a Tuesday or Wednesday.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

**President.** — I put the request for urgent procedure to the vote.

The request is rejected. The motion is referred to the appropriate committee.

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We proceed to the Coppitiers *et al.* motion for a resolution on the nuclear accident at La Hague (Doc. 1-913/80).

I call Mr Vandenmeulebroucke.

**Mr Vandenmeulebroucke.** — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Coppitiers resolution, on which we are requesting an urgent debate, has been prompted by a series of accidents at the nuclear installations in La Hague. The resolution is in no way intended to be anti-nuclear. When this problem was discussed in the Committee on Energy and Research in early February, the members unanimously called for more information on the situation in La Hague, and they asked the Commission to carry out an objective investigation.

But why is this request for an objective investigation urgent? There is a substantive and a procedural reason for this. The substantive reason is that the accident at the La Hague installations for the processing of radioactive waste was not the first or only one. There was an accident in January 1980, a power breakdown in April 1980, a dreadful disaster only being prevented at the last moment, and other accidents in May, September and October 1980. Finally, on 6 January, an accident occurred which, without their knowing it, exposed the workers for 15 hours to a radioactive dose which was far in excess of what the standards allow. It is therefore by no means hypothetical that other accidents may take place.

Then there is the second, procedural reason. One of the members of Mr Thorn's Commission is specifically responsible for safety matters. Three weeks the Committee on Energy and Research called on the Commission to carry out an enquiry into La Hague. So far we have not received an answer from Commissioner Narjes. This is not, after all, simply a question of an accident in one Member State, France. La Hague processes waste from various countries, and it is therefore a European responsibility. Hence this request for an urgent debate.

IN THE CHAIR: MR DE FERRANTI

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Calvez.

**Mr Calvez.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, you will note that no French Member has signed the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Coppitiers and others calling for an urgent debate.

It is wrong to claim that the incident in La Hague caused a level of irradiation far in excess of the admissible maxima and contamination in the surrounding region. And I should like to quote what was said by the responsible trade union official, a specialist in protection against radioactivity and an expert at the International Labour Office, who held a public meeting in Cherbourg on 30 January which was attended by about a thousand people, foremost among them elected representatives and representatives of the press. He said: 'The results of analyses of samples taken by our trade unions from the flora in the environment of the plant are not disturbing and indicate that there is no danger to public health.' Consequently, ladies and gentlemen, I would ask you to regard Mr Coppitiers' motion for a resolution as pointless and to reject the request for an urgent debate.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the right)*

**President.** — I put the request for urgent procedure to the vote. The request is rejected. The motion is referred to the appropriate committee.

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We proceed to the Rogers *et al.* motion for a resolution on the operation of South African troops in Southern Angola (Doc. 1-916/80).

I call Mr Rogers.

**Mr Rogers.** — Mr President, this is the very first time that I have put down a request for urgent procedure, so I am not being frivolous. The justification, which is written into the paper, is that the European Parliament should express its opinion before the ACP-EEC Joint Committee meeting in Sierra Leone. Mr Irmer in his previous remarks referred to this resolution as something which was familiar, which we all knew about. Quite frankly, if we have all known about it for so long it is a pity we did not do something about it, and this is what is asked for in the resolution.

The reason why it is coming forward on a Friday morning, Mr President, lies in the pressures on the translation service. I was unable to get it through the group on Tuesday, when I wanted to do so, because the text was only available in English. Otherwise it would have been tabled much earlier in the week. I apologize to the House for putting it forward so late in the week.

I would ask for Members' support. There is no argument on the substance. We all know what South Africa is doing to the poor people of Angola, and on this issue I think that we ought to express our opinion, as Mr Sadat said on Tuesday — and everyone in this

**Rogers**

House applauded him very warmly — in condemnation of the unwarranted incursion of major powers into Third World countries. If we can applaud Mr Sadat on Tuesday, we can support this motion today, so I ask for urgent debate.

**President.** — I call Mr Fernandez.

**Mr Fernandez.** — (*F*) Mr President, the whole region along the frontier between Angola and Namibia, which is occupied by South Africa, is in a permanent state of war. On the pretext of fighting SWAPO, which represents Namibia, the South African occupying troops constantly attack the territory of the Republic of Angola, slaughtering livestock, killing the civilian population, destroying crops and so on and so forth. Reports from journalists who have been there, statements, which have never been denied, by mercenaries serving with the South African army and protests from the government in Luanda show that a real and permanent war is being carried on by the racists in Pretoria against the newly independent Republics of Angola and Mozambique. The recent raid by South African commandos on Maputo, the capital of Mozambique, is an example of this. That is why, Mr President, we shall vote in favour of the motion for a resolution.

**President.** — I put the request for urgent procedure to the vote.

The request is rejected. The motion is referred to the appropriate committee.

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We proceed to the Vayssade *et al.* motion for a resolution on the dismissal of Judge Bidalou (Doc. 1-921/80).

I call Mrs Vayssade.

**Mrs Vayssade.** — (*F*) Mr President, to lighten today's agenda somewhat, we agree to withdraw this motion today. We will table it again in March.

(*Applause*)

## IN THE CHAIR: MR ROGERS

*Vice-President*4. *Possibility of holding an additional part-session*

**President.** — I should like to say to Mrs Castle and to others who are interested that I have asked the secretariat to obtain information concerning the decision of the enlarged Bureau yesterday.

The enlarged Bureau, following requests made by several committee chairmen, has decided to envisage the holding of an extraordinary part-session at the end of March. The enlarged Bureau has so far decided neither on the precise date, nor the place nor the agenda of this special part-session.

I remind the House that, according to Rule 1 (4) of the Rules of Procedure, it lies with the enlarged Bureau to fix the date of such extraordinary part-sessions. The enlarged Bureau will meet next Wednesday to take a decision after the group chairmen have been able to express their views concerning the date and place of such a meeting.

I call Mrs Castle.

**Mrs Castle.** — I am most grateful to you, Mr President, for obtaining this information. It is therefore clear that a decision has been tabled to hold an extraordinary part-session next month. If you tell me this power lies exclusively in the hands of the enlarged Bureau, then all I can say is that it is time the rules were changed and such decisions had to be endorsed by Parliament. I hope we can have an assurance that the meeting-place will be fixed in line with the last decision of this Parliament, which was that we should not come to Luxembourg in July, as originally agreed, so that it is therefore quite clear that we would not want to come in March either.

(*Applause from various quarters*)

5. *Regulations on energy*

**President.** — The next item is the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Turcat on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research (Doc. 1-836/80), on the

proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 526/80) for:

- I. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 725/79 on financial support for demonstration projects in the field of energy saving; and

## President

- II. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 726/79 on financial support for projects to exploit alternative energy sources.

I call Mr Turcat.

**Mr Turcat, rapporteur.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as you know, there are Community programmes for energy savings and alternative sources of energy, although I would prefer to call the latter complementary because, as we know, they do not represent an alternative. But you may not know of all the success that has been achieved. On the first chapter, 'Savings', more than 600 proposals were submitted from July 1978 to 1980, and 113 projects have been adopted by the Commission, costing about 50m EUA. On the second chapter over 350 proposals were received and 30 projects have been adopted. Many projects relating to the first chapter were serious enough to be adopted, but it was not possible to do so because the aids agreed were approaching the ceilings fixed by Regulations Nos 725 and 726/79, for 4 and 5 years respectively, and also because further funds could not be allocated for 1981 and 1982.

That is the background to the proposals now put forward by the Commission, which aim at doubling the ceilings fixed by the 1979 regulations, thus increasing the allocation under Regulation No 725 from 55 to 110m EUA and the allocation under Regulation No 726 from 95 to 200m EUA. It goes without saying that we fully support these proposals from the Commission, but while we are happy to approve them and refer them to the Council, will our deliberations be taken into account? The past has shown that we have very little guarantee of this. But we are not here to reel off arguments but, in this case, to discuss figures. We know from the past, therefore, that we should begin by clearing up a procedure and a situation which is paradoxical and absurd. Parliament's Committee on Budgets has given us a completely formal opinion on this point, and the Committee on Energy and Research has taken this over. On 17 November 1977 this Parliament adopted a motion for a resolution contained in Mr Brown's report on a proposal for a regulation from the Commission concerning the granting of financial aids to this type of project. On 12 June 1978 the Council adopted two basic regulations deprived of their financial implications. The abnormal nature of this procedure was immediately noted by our committees and our President. I will not go into the details of the action that followed our toing and froing, except to say that on 17 January 1979, when delivering an opinion on a new proposal for a regulation, Parliament expressed serious reservations in the Dalyell report and asked for the conciliation procedure to be initiated if the Council should unilaterally fix the ceiling on the financial aids, which is what happened. I would draw your attention to the date I have mentioned and call for action to be taken on this procedure without any renewed toing

and froing and starting tomorrow, and because the regulations which the Commission and Parliament and the Council itself, I hope, want to modify today were adopted unilaterally by the Council, which relied on what were in fact truncated framework regulations. Furthermore, the Council has not yet acted on the Commission's proposals. The Sassano report, which was approved on 19 September 1980, proposed that the maximum amount of aids to alternative sources should be fixed at 150m EUA and again called for the conciliation procedure.

Today, to make some progress, as permitted by the 1980 budget, moreover, and to safeguard Parliament's budgetary rights, the Commission proposes, very 'astutely', if you will permit the word, that the new ceiling to be fixed by the Council should be for guidance only. But we have no guarantee that the proposal before us will not suffer the same fate as the 1977, 1979 and 1980 proposals.

In the resolution I have tabled on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research what we ask of the Council is, since we consider that the conciliation procedure pursuant to Rule 22A was in fact opened two years ago, not to wait for the toing and froing, not to wait even a week before deciding to hold a meeting with the parliamentary committees and then to consult Parliament in accordance with the proper rules, so that, without another institutional quarrel beginning, but without this Parliament's budgetary responsibilities being ignored, an agreement can be reached to ensure us that the policies on energy savings and complementary sources will be very actively pursued and, this time, jointly.

Our motion for a resolution is therefore very brief, perhaps brutally so, but at least it has no frills, our hope being that an answer that is not evasive will be immediately forthcoming.

**President.** — The Commission has the floor.

**Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, I would like to say that the Commission agrees with the rapporteur that the present situation is not satisfactory and agrees with the Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Energy and Research that there should be institutional discussions on the regulations in question as soon as possible. It is important that the execution of the budget should not be impeded by problems of this kind. The Commission therefore supports the initiative of Parliament in requesting these discussions and will actively participate in them.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

### 6. Tax-free allowances for travellers

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is the motion for a resolution by Mr von Wogau, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on tax-free allowances for travellers within the Community (Doc. 1-861/80).

I call the author.

**Mr von Wogau.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this motion for a resolution calls for the tax-free allowances for travellers within the Community to be increased from 180 to 200 EUA as soon as possible. Ladies and gentlemen, I believe this is a small, but very important matter. It is something which repeatedly causes many citizens of the European Community problems on their private and business trips.

When we talk about the European Community and praise its advantages, we are referring primarily to the creation of the customs union, which was set up even more quickly than originally planned, and today customs duties are no longer levied in trade between Community countries. But a citizen who has heard us say this may perhaps the very next day travel to a neighbouring country, buy himself a pair of shoes, a suit and a few bottles of wine and be pleased that the European Community now offers him this advantage. But when he reaches the frontier, he is in for a shock. He must go through the formalities and state what goods he has with him. He must fill out forms on how many bottles of wine he has with him and how much they have cost. Finally, he is expected to pay something. He will then say to the customs official: But this is just not possible. I am entering one Community country from another. I have been told by my Representative that there are no more customs duties. The official will then tell him that what he has to pay is not customs duty but a turnover tax on imports. And any of us who have gone through this experience must surely feel they have been cheated. It is high time that this kind of thing was at last abolished and that particularly where private travellers are concerned, we had a situation and tax-free allowances which did away with this kind of thing in the future.

(Applause)

Last year, the European Parliament decided by a very large majority that these tax-free allowances should be progressively increased first to 210 EUA and finally to 300 EUA. The tax-free allowances in the case of coffee, wine and tea are also to be substantially increased and the restrictions gradually abolished. The Council of Ministers, to which this matter and the Commission's appropriate proposal have been submitted, was, however, unable to take a decision last year. It was not even decided to increase this tax-free allow-

ance by 30 EUA, although the last increase was made as long ago as 1972 and although, according to the rules of the Community, there ought really to be a reduction in these tax-free allowances owing, for example, to the strength that has been gained by the British pound in the meantime. I feel it is high time the Council should put its mind to it and take a decision. If the Council is to decide early enough for these advantages to take effect in July, when the holiday period begins, it will have to discuss this matter in March. I would therefore ask you to support this motion.

**President.** — The Commission has the floor.

**Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, as the House is aware, the Commission has always attached considerable importance to the development of tax-free allowance systems for travellers and in particular to maintaining the real value of these allowances. When the last major advance was made in the development of the system in 1978, the Commission undertook to carry out an annual review of the system, one of the particular aims being to ensure that the allowances do not diminish in terms of national currency. It has fulfilled this undertaking in presenting the proposal for a fifth Council directive on intra-Community travellers' allowances and in working strenuously for its adoption by the Council. Furthermore, in amending its original proposal in accordance with the wishes of this Parliament, it has called for a programme of increases in allowances over the next few years. Besides the general merit of such a programme, it would have the practical benefit of avoiding time-consuming discussion in all the institutions aimed at simply maintaining the value of these allowances and allowing concentration on genuine developments of the system.

The unwelcome position before us is that allowances will have decreased by approximately one-third in real terms by next summer's travel season. Even an increase to 210 ECU will then not be enough to maintain the level set in 1978. The position of the Commission is that it accepts supports and will continue to work for the idea of a programme of increases in allowance levels and indeed in the long term the gradual dismantling of monetary and quantitative limits for travellers within the Community. However, we must, I feel, recognize that politically something less must be accepted in the short term: in this connexion the Commission supports Mr von Wogau's call to the Council, and will do its utmost to encourage adoption of the level of 210 ECU in the very near future.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

7. *Visit by President Sadat to Parliament and Egypt's participation in the Euro-Arab dialogue*

**President.** — The next item is the motion for a resolution by Mr Israël and others, on the visit by President Sadat to the European Parliament and Egypt's participation in the Euro-Arab Dialogue (Doc. 1-882/80).

I call Mr Israel.

**Mr Israel.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, President Sadat's visit to this Chamber has a particular significance. President Sadat's statement must not be considered as it stands. Although he spoke to us with some optimism, his appeal was in fact an anguished appeal. President Sadat is well aware that he does not have everyone's support and above all that he does not enjoy the normal relations with Europe that the pilgrim of peace, to use Mr Tindemans' expression, should have. Mr Sadat's anguished appeal goes hand in hand with a particular kind of confidence in our Parliament. He addresses our Parliament through the governments, and we must give him an original answer.

But it so happens, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, that the Council of Ministers, joined by a representative of the Commission, is at present conducting what is known as the Euro-Arab Dialogue with the League of Arab States. Egypt is excluded from this Euro-Arab Dialogue. Egypt is excluded because it has been excluded from the Arab League. We consider this to be a completely abnormal situation, and we call for a solution to be found. We feel the best method would be to ask the Commission to propose to the Council a method whereby the normal dialogue might be established with Egypt, which is, as everyone knows, an element and a factor for peace in the Middle East. There is no reason why Europe should agree to take account of the break that at present exists within the Arab world. But, as I see it, that in no way means that Europe should not give any thought to the solution of the Palestinian problem. On the contrary. We feel that President Sadat, more than many leaders, wants to find a humane, just and satisfactory solution to the problems raised by the Palestinians' desire to find their national identity. Commissioner Cheysson pointed out at Question Time that during the negotiations forming part of the Euro-Arab Dialogue, the Arabs had insisted on discussing political questions. If that is the case, Mr President, it is incomprehensible that Egypt should not be involved in this political dialogue. Peace cannot be achieved in the Middle East without the support of Egypt, the most populous Arab State, and Europe cannot intervene in any peaceful way in the conflict in the Middle East unless it involves Egypt and President Sadat, this pilgrim of peace, in its activities.

**President.** — The European Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mr de Courcy Ling.** — My President, my group sympathizes very strongly with the spirit of the resolution by Mr Israel. None of us could have failed to be impressed by President Sadat and his effectiveness as a pilgrim of peace. A senior European diplomat, Lord Carrington, has recently visited President Sadat in Cairo and publicly shares this view of him as a pilgrim of peace and as a key figure in the Middle East. I fear, however, that the consequence of Mr Israel's resolution, however well-intentioned it may be, would be to stop the Euro-Arab Dialogue and to prevent the ministerial meeting in July taking place. We do not believe that this would be in the interests of the European Community. Egypt did, in fact, at an earlier stage have an opportunity to participate in the deliberations of the Arab League, and decided for her own good reasons not to do so. The dialogue is to a very large extent of an economic nature, although, of course, there are important political implications. Moreover, we must remember that a dialogue consists of two parties by definition, and it is difficult to see how one side of the dialogue could attempt to impose at rather a late stage an extra participant without the agreement of the other side of that dialogue.

So in short, Mr President, we shall regretfully vote against this resolution, although we sympathize with the spirit behind it and have no doubt of President Sadat's vital and important place in the diplomacy before us in the Middle East.

**President.** — The Commission has the floor.

**Mr O'Kennedy, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, the motion for a resolution relates in very great part to subjects which fall within the competence of political cooperation among the Member States and would therefore more appropriately be addressed to the Foreign Ministers.

With that said, the Commission warmly welcomes the visit paid by President Sadat to the European Parliament earlier this week. This visit marked the respect and regard in which this democratically-elected Parliament, and indeed this Community, is held by international statesmen. It is also significant in that it marked the fact that this European Parliament is the only public forum available to the institutions of the European Community for a visit of this importance; and it is a matter of significance, both for the Community and for the relations between the Community and the outside world, that a statesman of the status of President Sadat should thereby enhance this Parliament and through it deliver a message of the nature that he did to the people of Europe. I think it demonstrates, as Mr Thorn himself mentioned in the course of his address, that sometimes this Community is seen from the outside as being a more cohesive, committed Community than the judgments we make on ourselves from the inside. Further, it demonstrates, at a time of

O'Kennedy

great change and instability in the world at large, that there is a continuity in this Community assured by the institutions of the Community, such as this democratically-elected Parliament. Finally, President Sadat's visit and his address to this Parliament showed the commitment to, and potential for, a comprehensive peace settlement, and the significance that is attached in the Middle Eastern region to the Venice Declaration and the role that can be played by Europe in bringing about such a settlement.

As regards the Euro-Arab dialogue we obviously believe that it is a matter for each side as to how it should be represented, and in those circumstances I doubt that it would be wise for either side to try and advise the other in this regard. As for the proposed ministerial meeting, this was agreed in principle by both parties when they met here in Luxembourg some weeks ago. If in the event some governments are not directly represented at such a meeting, the Community will as far as possible ensure that those governments are kept fully informed of developments. Progress towards peace, Mr President, in the Middle East must, as clearly stated in the Venice Declaration, be on a comprehensive basis.

**President.** — I call Mr Turcat.

**Mr Turcat.** — (*F*) Mr President, I feel it would be deplorable if this Parliament could not make a gesture in reply to President Sadat's gesture, far more important though it may have been. But as I understand the objections raised by Mr de Courcy Ling and the Commissioner, it seems to me that they can be very easily overcome through the adoption of the amendment tabled by the Liberal and Democratic Group, which calls for the deletion from the end of paragraph 2 of the phrase: so as not to upset the organization. The only obstacle then remaining would be a lack of political courage.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

#### 8. *Community aid to Calabria*

**President.** — The next item is the motion for a resolution by Mr Antoniozzi and others, on Community aid to Calabria for the damage caused by the recent floods (Doc. 1-883/80).

I call Mr Antoniozzi.

**Mr Antoniozzi.** — (*I*) Mr President, I had the honour yesterday of explaining the reasons why we tabled this resolution based on the need to take action to assist

regions devastated by extremely violent natural disasters. Small centres, the countryside and coasts have been hit, livestock destroyed, landslides have affected traffic and transportation, and there has been a railway disaster.

I am requesting aid from the emergency funds and ask that the devastation referred to be taken into account when the region of Calabria comes to present its integrated development plan in accordance with the guidelines of the Regional and Social Fund.

**President.** — The Commission has the floor.

**Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, the Commission has already contacted the Italian Permanent Representation in Brussels and is now awaiting a report by the Italian Government giving details. Once it has received these details, the Commission will give urgent consideration to whether a disaster aid could be granted to the victims. The giving of such a grant would, of course, depend on the extent and the nature of the flooding and of the damage.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

#### 9. *Charges brought against 13 trade-union leaders in Brazil*

**President.** — The next item is the motion for a resolution by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul and others, on the charges brought against 13 trade-union leaders in Brazil (Doc. 1-879/80).

I call Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul.

**Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul.** — (*D*) Ladies and gentlemen, I wish to comment on the motion which concerns the forthcoming trial and condemnation of 13 Brazilian trade unionists. The best known among them is Luis Ignacio da Silva, known as 'Lula'. After years of a *de facto* ban on strikes in Brazil, these trade unionists supervised and supported the first strikes called in 1978 and 1979. They are now being put on trial because of the major strike in April and May 1980. They were detained for a time, and we have only now been informed that they will appear before a special military court on 16 and 17 February — hence the urgency — to be sentenced, arbitrarily sentenced, because the real charge against them is that they took part in these strikes. This is being done under Article 36 (11) of Brazil's so-called National Security Law, under which anyone who makes himself unpopular can be put on trial.

**Wieczorek-Zeul**

If these trade unionists are found guilty under this Act, they can be imprisoned for up to 12 years for what is known as 'incitement to collective defiance of the law'. But they are innocent. They have done only what any trade unionist, any worker in our countries is free to do, namely taken advantage of their right to strike.

All the political and legal forces in Brazil, regardless of their political affiliation, agree that the forthcoming judgment will be a purely political act, the object being to deter workers in the future from taking advantage of their collective right to strike, to refuse to work. Ladies and gentlemen, this does not tie in with the Brazilian Government's announcement that it intends to pursue a policy of open government.

During its last part-session, our Parliament approved the agreement on economic and commercial cooperation between the European Community and Brazil, stating that the Parliament has noted that for several years now a process of liberalization has been observed in Brazil and thinks that such a process will promote social and regional justice in that country.

The question now is, and the judgment handed down in this trial is a test, whether this open government really exists or whether it is merely a sham for the benefit of the outside world and nothing is known of it internally. It is also a test of whether democratization is to apply only to politicians or also to the workers in Brazil.

I therefore appeal to you, ladies and gentlemen, to adopt this motion by a large majority.

Join with us in calling in this resolution for a stop to be put to this arbitrary trial. Let us call on our President to make representations to this end to the Brazilian Government before 16 and 17 February, let us call on the Commission to make representations to this end, and let us call on our Member States to take action to this end. Let us also call for the abolition of this so-called National Security Law, because it is practices like these which make suppression possible in the first place.

I therefore call for broad support, because the people of Latin America expect our economic cooperation with their countries to have practical consequences for their human rights and for their social rights. I therefore ask you to approve this resolution. I am particularly pleased that this motion has the support of all the members of the Christian-Democratic Group and has been signed by them. I call on the other groups to do the same.

**President.** — I call Mr Pesmazoglou.

**Mr Pesmazoglou.** — (EL) Mr President, I support the motion for three basic reasons:

The first is the importance which the European Parliament has in defending human rights and political freedoms. The fact that the European Community and the European Parliament are involved in and have a particular influence on world affairs corresponds directly to our strong commitment to the defence of human rights.

The second reason is our conviction that the defence of human rights is a universal principle that is indivisible. It is clear that great importance is attached to this principle, which must be upheld very strongly in Europe. However, outside Europe too, people of all nations should know that in the European Parliament and in the European Community they will find support for human rights.

The third reason is to underline the fact that we do not act merely to make a declaration of principles, but to achieve some definite results by our actions. Furthermore, the conditions under which this trial is being conducted in Brazil are reminiscent of similar circumstances in Greece during the period from 1967 to 1974, when there was a military dictatorship.

These conditions, as presented by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul, highlight the fact that this trial is being organized by a special military court and therefore the essential guarantees that human rights will be upheld and observed are lacking.

Therefore I support the principle and the urgency of this motion.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

#### 10. *Crisis in the sugar cane industry*

**President.** — The next item is a joint debate on

— the motion for a resolution by Mrs Castle and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the intended closure of the Tate and Lyle cane-sugar refinery in Liverpool (Doc. 1-884/80); and

— the motion for a resolution by Miss Hooper and others, on the crisis in the sugar-cane industry (Doc. 1-886/80).

I call Mrs Castle.

**Mrs Castle.** — Mr President, I am grateful to Parliament for having agreed that it is an urgent matter for us to discuss the imminent closure of the Tate and Lyle cane-sugar refinery. I must say I deplore Mr Klepsch's blanket denunciation of urgent motions as a time-wasting device. Any parliament worthy of the name has provision whereby back-benchers can raise topical matters of public interest, and I would point

## Castle

out to him that Rule 25 of this Parliament clutters up the agenda far more than Rule 14 ever does, because there is absolutely no selectivity in the passing on of these motions under Rule 25 to a committee, which then has to produce a report, which then has to be debated and then amended. All sorts of urgent topical matters which ought to concern us are crowded out.

Now, of course, motions of urgency should be treated on their merits, and this is what I am asking the Parliament to do this morning: to examine the merits of the simple request we are making in this motion. First, it is a fact that the Tate and Lyle cane-sugar refinery will close in April unless some help comes from this Community or there is some change in Community policy. Fifteen hundred or more men and women will be turned out of work, but that is not the basis on which we are pressing it this morning. We know that other Members have cases of unemployment which they would like to ventilate. No, that is not the reason for urgent debate today. The reason is that with that closure there will be a shortfall in the cane-sugar-refining capacity in the Community, and no indication has been given as to how that shortfall is to be made good. The firm cannot give any guarantee that the cane sugar imported by the United Kingdom from the ACP countries under the Lomé Convention will still be able to be absorbed. So this is a problem right on the door of this Community, which has solemnly pledged itself to continue to take 1.3 million tonnes of cane sugar a year from the ACP countries.

Therefore what we request is this. We ask the Commission urgently, within the next four weeks, in time for our next part-session, to look into this question of the Tate and Lyle closure, to find out whether in any way it can be prevented with Community help and to try to prevent it, and failing that, to assure this Parliament that the shortfall in cane-sugar refining capacity will be made good so that our obligations under Lomé can be discharged. We ask for that report to come next month, in March, because otherwise it will be too late. Can anybody in this Chamber today deny that that is a reasonable request or deny that it is a matter of Community obligation and Community interest? We beg you to treat this on its merits: if you do, then you must accept this motion.

**President.** — I call Miss Hooper.

**Miss Hooper.** — Mr President, there can be no doubt that the cane-sugar industry in Europe has two operating disadvantages when compared with the sugar-beet industry. One is that the price cane-sugar refiners must pay for cane-sugar raws imported from the ACP countries is much higher than the price paid by sugar-beet refiners for beet. The second is that the Community in recent years, in encouraging the growth of sugar beet, has created a sugar surplus. This surplus is then sold on the world market, affects world prices,

makes exports unprofitable and makes the cane-sugar producers themselves in the ACP countries think twice about growing a commodity which is subject to such market fluctuations.

These surpluses arise because of the Community's current quota system, which is bound to create a surplus since it stems from 1973-74, when there was a world shortage caused by freak conditions, and has never been reconsidered in the light of normal conditions. This is why we ask in our motion once again that the Council of Ministers should cut the beet quotas in line with the very sensible and reasonable proposals made by Mr Gundelach last year.

This question should not go by default once again: the Tate and Lyle threatened closure simply highlights the issue.

It is also essential that the Commission and Council should apply themselves to the first point I made, which concerns the unfair market margins given to sugar-beet producers and refiners because of this difference in the basic cost of the commodities. Mr Pearce, in his question to the Commission on Monday, suggested that, for example, a STABEX system could be applied to cane sugar, and there must be other ways in which the Commission could create conditions of fairness in order to ensure the continuation of a sugar-cane refining industry in Europe, so that we can protect the livelihood of thousands of people from Mauritius to Fiji as well as that of the workers in the Tate and Lyle Liverpool refinery, who will suffer, as many others have suffered from the streamlining of the sugar-cane industry in recent years, unless urgent action is taken. I therefore beg this Parliament to support both these motions for resolutions and call for urgent action.

**President.** — I call Mr Cohen.

**Mr Cohen.** — (NL) Mr President, I should like to make just a few remarks. I always react in the same way, of course, when I hear that another factory in Europe, whether it is in Britain, Germany, France or my own country, the Netherlands, is to close. But that is not the reason — as Mrs Castle and Mrs Hooper have already clearly said — why we are discussing this urgent matter today. Both these ladies have said that the interests of the developing countries and our obligations under the Lomé Convention are involved. But I have my doubts about that. It has not been agreed under the Lomé Convention that sugar must be refined here in Europe: all it says is that we must import a certain quantity, 1.3m tonnes a year. It does not say that this has to be refined sugar.

We import a certain quantity of sugar, even if Europe no longer has the necessary refining capacity. In fact, even if the Tate & Lyle plant is closed in April, there

**Cohen**

will still be sufficient refining capacity in Europe for the 1.3m tonnes. Tate & Lyle have confirmed this themselves. They can transfer the refining to other factories. Besides this, there is additional refining capacity in other countries in Europe. So that is one problem that does not in practice arise.

But what I really wanted to say, more or less following on from what Mr Pearce said when he put his oral question, is that, of course, it has nothing to do with this refining capacity. The question is how we intend to act towards these developing countries in the long term. We are required to import a quantity of sugar. We must ensure that the developing countries can in fact export this sugar, but ultimately we must, of course, ensure that these countries can do the refining themselves. Not every sugar-exporting country: that would not, of course, be possible, but thought might well be given to making Community money available to enable refining capacities to be developed in certain regions. Various developing countries might profit from this. This cannot be done straight away: we shall obviously need a transitional period, during which, despite the closure of the Tate & Lyle plant, however unfortunate this in itself may be, there must be guarantees that the tonnage we are required to import can be refined in Europe. I shall not therefore vote in favour of this resolution.

**President.** — I call Mr Pearce.

**Mr Pearce.** — Mr President, this matter could not be more squarely within the competence of the Community and of this Parliament. The situation arises directly from the operation of the Community's common agricultural policy and, in my opinion, directly threatens one part of the Community's development policy as worked out in the Lomé Convention. This it is our business to consider.

The sugar quotas being proposed by the Council at the present time will have two serious effects. Firstly, they will put out of work 1 500 people and more in the place where I live. Secondly, they will have an effect on the operation of the Lomé Convention and certainly will be immediately politically damaging to the Community's standing with our partners in Lomé.

I believe that we have two reasons for supporting both these motions now. One is that we have a duty, and the Commission has a duty, to act speedily in this regard, and I would like to say that I was very disappointed, in the answer to my question on Monday, to find that Mr Cheysson apparently did not know that this refinery was going to be closed. I think that that illustrates some lack of coordination inside the Commission, where things that affect agricultural or development policy are isolated from the consideration of other matters. I think we must look for a better performance by the Commission in the future.

The second reason why we must act is that this Community of ours must be seen to be relevant and to be compassionate. We have a duty to people. How do you think I can face families where the breadwinner is going to be put out of work as a direct result of the operation of the Community's agricultural policy? We have a duty to be compassionate and to try to do things and make policies which actually benefit our people.

I deplore the cynicism with which Mr Klepsch tried to sweep this issue aside the other night. I think we should issue a warning. The common agricultural policy of the Community is a fine thing. Rightly it sets out to protect the interests of those who produce the food that we want to eat. But there are more people in this Community than just farmers, and I cannot go along with a system which, in order to benefit one section of society, totally disregards the interests of others, such as the people who work at Tate and Lyle's in Liverpool. I cannot go along with a system which, as it is operated at present, seems to disregard totally our obligations under the Lomé Convention.

Mr President, this is an opportunity, a golden opportunity, for the Council and the Commission to do something. I urge them to do something to solve this problem quickly. You have about five or six weeks to do something: please do it! I urge the House to support both these motions.

**President.** — I call Mr Louwes.

**Mr Louwes.** — (NL) Mr President, as I said yesterday, the refining of crude sugar has gradually become an obsolete business. Increasingly, the raw material is refined directly into white sugar. This is more rational and saves energy. I therefore agree with what Mr Cohen has just said, and I would point out that on the continent almost the refineries were closed long ago — the last one in my own country closed down as long ago as 1958. Tate & Lyle also know this and have not done anything to the refinery in Liverpool for years. They have not made any more investments, and this plant simply cannot be kept open.

I too fully appreciate the painful social problem, but what we have here are unavoidable developments in the long term.

The third point I should like to make is that sugar exports from the ACP countries are not in danger. The EEC guarantees them the same return as growers in the Community. What is important is not the refining capacity in the United Kingdom or sales in the EEC, but a guaranteed return on 1.3 m tonnes, which the ACP countries cannot supply every year. This guarantee must, of course, be honoured. Sugar can be sold anywhere in the world, especially now, when prices outside the Community are higher than they are

Louwes

in the Community. And I would also point out that the return these countries receive on their sugar is considerably higher than what they ever had under the old Commonwealth Sugar Agreement. I should like to emphasize that.

In short, Mr President, what we have here are developments which are unavoidable in the long term, and despite all the demagoguery from our friends from the United Kingdom, I cannot see how the EEC is in any way to blame. Admittedly, we have here a nasty social problem, but the tears my friends from the United Kingdom are shedding over the presumed fate of the ACP countries are — and this is the only conclusion I can draw — crocodile tears.

*(Mixed reactions)*

**President.** — As voting-time is approaching, this debate is suspended.

#### 11. Agenda

**President.** — I call Mrs Lenz on a point of order.

**Mrs Lenz.** — *(D)* Mr President, in view of the shortage of time and of the many votes that have to take place, would you please remove my report on EEC-Romanian relations (Doc. 1-678/80) from the agenda and hold it over until next month, where it will have a better chance if called at a more favourable time.

*(Parliament agreed to the request)*

#### 12. Membership of committees

**President.** — I have received from the Group of the European People's Party (CD) a request for the appointment of Mr Franz to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, in place of Mr Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berleburg; of Mr Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berleburg to the Committee on External Economic Relations, in place of Mr Antonozzi; and of Mr Brok to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, in place of Mr Nordlohne.

Are there any objections?

These appointments are ratified.

#### 13. Votes

**President.** — The next item comprises the vote on those motions for resolutions on which the debate has closed.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Curry report (Doc. 1-748/80): Sugar quotas for the French Overseas Departments.*

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

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the *Gautier report (Doc. 1-841/80): Common organization of the market in fishery products.*

*(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 6)*

On paragraph 7, I have Amendment No 2, tabled by Mr Provan and others and amending this paragraph to read as follows:

7. Welcomes the fact that price-fixing can be made more flexible through the producers' organizations and considers that automatic adjustment of reference prices would bring stability to fish prices for both producers and consumers;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Gautier, rapporteur.** — *(D)* I am against.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 2 and adopted in succession paragraphs 7 and 8)*

**President.** — On paragraph 9, I have two amendments:

— Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Battersby on behalf of the European Democratic Group and amending this paragraph to read as follows:

9. Welcomes the provisions laid down in Articles 12 and 13 relating to the principles underlying the fixing and application of withdrawal prices and on financial compensation to producers' organizations for fish which is withdrawn from the market;

considers that financial compensation paid to the producer's organization for fish which has been withdrawn from the market should not be calculated on the basis of a uniform Community buying-in price;

— Amendment No 3, tabled by Mr Provan and others and amending this paragraph as follows:

9. Welcomes the provisions laid down in Articles 12 and 13 relating to the fixing and application of withdrawal

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 50 of 9. 3. 1981.

**President**

prices and on financial compensation to producer organizations for fish which is withdrawn from the market, but further recommends that a variable import levy automatically adjusted in accordance with weekly market levels would bring stability for producers and consumers;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Gautier, rapporteur.** — (D) I am against both amendments.

*(Amendment No 1 was withdrawn. Parliament rejected Amendment No 3 and adopted in succession paragraphs 9 and 10 to 17)*

**President.** — I put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote. The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We proceed to the *Nielsen report (Doc. 1-840/80): Substances with hormonal action.*

We shall begin with amendments to the proposals for regulations.

On proposals for a regulation I, I have Amendment No 11, tabled by Mr Ceravolo on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and inserting the following new indent after the first indent of Article 8:

— Member States of the Community or third countries to which shipments of contaminated meat have already been consigned shall be informed immediately of contraventions.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) I am against, Mr President.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 11)*

**President.** — On proposal for a regulation III, I have Amendment No 12, tabled by Mr Ceravolo on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and deleting the second subparagraph of Article 6 (1).

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) I am against, Mr President.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 12)*

**President.** — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

*(Parliament adopted the first nine indents of the preamble)*

After the ninth indent of the preamble, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Lalor and others and inserting the following new text:

— having regard to the harmful nature of certain substances with hormonal or thyrostatic action used in the rearing of animals, for example: DES, HEXOESTROL, etc., and STILBENES,

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) I am against, and in general I should like to say that this applies to a number of other amendments aimed at weakening my report and resisting an effective course. I am therefore against.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1)*

**President.** — On the tenth indent of the preamble, I have Amendment No 13, tabled by the European Democratic Group and deleting this indent.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) I am against, Mr President.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 13 and adopted the tenth indent!)*

**President.** — After the tenth indent, I have two amendments by Mr Lalor and others, each adding a new recital:

— Amendment No 2:

— having regard to the harmful nature of certain substances with hormonal or thyrostatic action used in LONE, ZERANOL and the natural oestrogens involved in animal growth are undeniably effective for beef and veal production and for maintaining the incomes of producers who are already badly affected.

— Amendment No 3:

— having regard to the fact that very exhaustive studies carried out by competent authorities throughout the world have shown that the products mentioned in point 11 have no adverse effect on meat, which is not the case for the products mentioned in point 10.

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 50 of 9 3. 1981.

<sup>1</sup> By electronic vote.

**President**

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) I am against, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment 2; it then rejected Amendment No 3<sup>1</sup>)

**President.** — On paragraph 1, I have three amendments:<sup>2</sup>

— Amendment No 9, tabled by Mrs Castle and Miss Quin and replacing this paragraph by the following text:

1. Asks that the use in the Community of substances with a hormonal or thyrostatic action for the purpose of artificially accelerating the growth of livestock intended for human consumption be banned with the exception of those which appear on a list approved by recognized authorities in the Member States;

— Amendment No 4, tabled by Mr Lalor and others and amending this paragraph as follows:

1. Approves the Commission's proposal, which is designed to prohibit the use in the Community of certain substances with a hormonal or thyrostatic action for the purpose of artificially accelerating the growth of livestock intended for human consumption;  
(rest deleted)

— Amendment No 14, tabled by the European Democratic Group and amending this paragraph as follows:

1. Approves the Commission's proposal, which is designed to prohibit the use in the Community of certain substances with a hormonal or thyrostatic action for the purpose of artificially accelerating the growth of livestock intended for human consumption; asks the Commission to make it clear that the rules will also apply to anabolic substances which stimulate growth;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) I am against all three amendments, Mr President. As I said earlier, they amount to a weakening of my text.

**President.** — I call Mr Collins on a point of order.

**Mr Collins.** — The best, I would suggest to you, is to take Amendment No 9 second, because it is, in fact, advocating a positive list and therefore does not go as far from the original text as the other one.

<sup>1</sup> By sitting and standing

<sup>2</sup> Amendment No 29 had been withdrawn.

**President.** — I call the rapporteur.

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) Mr President, even to me it seems that there are certain nuances which it is very difficult to grasp. In any case, I am glad to find that Mr Collins appears to have a somewhat bad conscience about departing from my text and therefore, despite everything, is obviously lending this support to the amendment that comes nearest to it. I cannot help observing that I am somewhat astonished when I hear how much is talked, from time to time and in various quarters, about the need to take account of the consumer and then find that some members of the Socialist Group seem to have allowed national interests to get the better of this consideration for the consumer.

**President.** — What is your opinion, regardless of Mr Collins's conscience, of the order in which we should take them?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — I cannot in a hurry see the exact difference. It is up to you, Mr President.

(Laughter)

(In successive votes Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 4, 9 and 14 and adopted paragraph 1)

**President.** — On paragraph 2, I have the following amendments:<sup>1</sup>

— Amendment No 5, tabled by Mr Lalor and others and deleting this paragraph;

— Amendment No 10, tabled by Mrs Castle and Miss Quin and replacing 'these' with 'other'.

— Amendment No 32, tabled by the European Democratic Group and amending the paragraph as follows:

2. Stresses the need for a clear stipulation that use of these certain substances is prohibited in all their forms, including compounding with feeding-stuffs.

What is the rapporteur's opinion?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) I am against all three, Mr President.

(In successive votes, Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 5, 10 and 32 and adopted paragraph 2)

<sup>1</sup> Amendment No 28 had been withdrawn.

**President.** — On paragraph 3, I have three amendments.<sup>1</sup>

— Amendment No 15, tabled by the European Democratic Group and amending paragraph 3 as follows:

3. Recognizes, nevertheless, the need to authorize the use of approved hormones for the purposes of therapy, oestrus regulation and growth promotion;

— Amendment No 31, tabled by Mrs Martin and amending the paragraph as follows:

3. Recognizes, nevertheless, the need to authorize the use of hormones for the therapeutic treatment of livestock and in certain cases of artificial insemination carried out by qualified personnel.

— Amendment No 6, tabled by Mr Lalor and others and deleting the word 'nevertheless'.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) Mr President, I am opposed to these amendments, with the exception of No 31, but I will gladly offer my comments, after which the House can vote as it chooses.

The question of the artificial synchronization of oestrus in domestic animals is dealt with by the Commission's proposal, but only insofar as it repeats what is contained in the report. Some people in this House are uneasy about the last phrase, stating that this may be carried out by qualified personnel, since this might be a back door for the uncontrolled use of these products. That is how I see the matter with regard to Mrs Martin's amendment, and therefore I would leave the vote on this amendment to the House's discretion. As for the others, I am against them, Mr President.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 15 and adopted Amendment No 31.<sup>2</sup> Amendment No 6 consequently fell)*

**President.** — After paragraph 3, I have Amendment No 16 tabled by the European Democratic Group and inserting the following new paragraph:

- 3a. Believes there is a need for a negative list of these certain substances which must be legislated against;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) I am against, Mr President. The point here is that the authors want to see a negative list established. As is clear from my report, I have adopted the opposite view with my positive list.

<sup>1</sup> Amendment No 27 had been withdrawn.

<sup>2</sup> By electronic vote.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 16)*

**President.** — On paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 17, tabled by Mr Hord on behalf of the European Democratic Group and amending this paragraph as follows:

4. Asks the Commission to watch closely to ensure that stockfarmers do not take advantage of this fact to get round this regulation after it has been adopted by the Council; an assurance must be obtained that no residual traces of these certain substances on a negative list are present at the time of slaughter for human consumption.

Amendment No 26 has been withdrawn.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) I am against, Mr President.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 17 and adopted paragraph 4)*

**President.** — On paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 18, tabled by the European Democratic Group and amending this paragraph as follows:

5. Welcomes the fact that the Commission has submitted to the Council two proposals for regulations on control, but seeks an amendment to COM (80) 922, Article 5, that a negative list of compounds that cannot be administered for therapy or growth promotion use should be included in place of a current positive list indicated for therapy only; requests the Council to adopt these three proposals concurrently;

Amendment No 25 has been withdrawn.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) I am against, Mr President.

*(In successive votes Parliament rejected Amendment No 18 and adopted paragraphs 5 and 6)*

**President.** — On paragraph 7, I have Amendment No 7, tabled by Mr Lalor and others and amending this paragraph as follows:

7. Believes, in particular, that the purchase of hormonal substances should be permitted only on the prescription of a veterinary surgeon or, where appropriate, in a controlled manner from a pharmacy... (rest unchanged);

Amendment No 24 has been withdrawn.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) I am against, Mr President.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 7 and adopted paragraph 7)*

**President.** — On paragraph 8, I have two amendments:

— Amendment No 19, tabled by the European Democratic Group and amending this paragraph as follows:

8. Approves the principle of inspections, both at the farm and at the slaughterhouse, for the purpose of detecting the illicit use of illegal substances of a hormonal or thyrostatic nature or residues of hormonal substances, as would appear on a negative list; asks also for control and registration . . . (rest unchanged);

— Amendment No 8, tabled by Mr Lalor and others and amending this paragraph to read as follows:

8. Approves the principle of inspections at both the farm and the slaughterhouse, for the purpose of detecting the illicit use of certain substances of a hormonal or thyrostatic nature or harmful residues of hormonal substances (rest unchanged).

Amendment No 23 has been withdrawn.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) I am against this amendment, Mr President, as it again weakens the text.

*(In successive votes Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 19 and 8<sup>1</sup> and adopted paragraph 8)*

**President.** — On paragraph 9, I have Amendment No 20, tabled by the European Democratic Group and deleting this paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) I am against, Mr President.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 20 and adopted paragraph 9)*

**President.** — After paragraph 9, I have Amendment No 33, tabled by Mrs Schleicher and Mr Bocklet and inserting the following paragraph:

- 9a. Calls for the projected methods of analysis to be submitted in the form of a directive as soon as possible;

<sup>1</sup> By electronic vote.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) Mr President, this amendment I can recommend.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 33)*

**President.** — On paragraph 10, I have Amendment No 21, tabled by the European Democratic Group and deleting this paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) I am against, Mr President.

*(In successive votes Parliament rejected Amendment No 21 and adopted paragraph 10, then paragraphs 11 and 12)*

**President.** — After paragraph 12, I have two amendments, both tabled by Mrs Schleicher and Mr Bocklet and adding a new paragraph:

— Amendment No 35:

- 12a. Calls urgently on the Commission to revoke the proposals so as to produce a uniform system free of contradictions, covering all possible dangers, and workable in practice that will guarantee real consumer protection;

— Amendment No 34:

- 12b. Calls for all proposals submitted to be enacted not in the form of a regulation, but as a directive, as envisaged by the Council;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) I am against both these amendments, Mr President.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 35, rejected Amendment No 34<sup>1</sup> and adopted paragraph 13)*

**President.** — On paragraph 14, I have two amendments:

— Amendment No 22, tabled by the European Democratic Group and amending the paragraph to read as follows:

14. Asks the Commission to propose to the Council quality standards for agri-foodstuffs to prevent distortions of competition among the Member States; asks the Commission to draw up a list of forbidden additives to domestic animal feeds and to allow for the addition to

<sup>1</sup> By electronic vote.

**President**

this list of all possible new products including legalized hormonal substances for growth promotion which would fulfil the security norms;

— Amendment No 30, tabled by Mrs Martin and amending the paragraph to read as follows:

14. Asks the Commission to set up a body for discussions between producers, consumers and representatives of the distribution sectors to propose to the Council (rest unchanged).

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Nielsen, rapporteur.** — (DK) I am against both, Mr President.

(In successive votes Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 22 and 30 and adopted paragraph 14)

**President.** — I can now give the floor for explanations of vote.

I call Mr Gautier.

**Mr Gautier.** — (D) I think Amendment No 7 was adopted by mistake, because the Christian Democrats were somewhat inconsistent in the way they voted. This brings an element of confusion into the text, since we are now calling for two different things. I myself will, however, vote in favour, on the assumption that the Council will remove these contradictions.

**President.** — I call Mr Collins.

**Mr Collins, chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.** — I tend to agree with Mr Gautier that this text fails to make our intentions perfectly clear. However, I do want to respond to some of the things that were said earlier on by Mr Nielsen.

Mr Nielsen said that this report was about consumer protection and the welfare of consumers. He seemed to suggest that those people who did not agree with him did not have the welfare of consumers at heart. I want to explain my vote in these terms, Mr President. I have, of course, the welfare and the safety of consumers at heart, which is one of the reasons why we spent so long in producing this particular report. We spent a long time discussing it both in the Committee on Agriculture and in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. Contrary, I will admit, to some of my colleagues in the committee, I took the view that a total ban on the use of hormones might well have the opposite effect. It might, in fact, stimulate the black-market use of hormones, and I think that there is evidence in the Community to suggest that this is likely to happen.

That is why I have voted as I have. I really do believe that if we want to produce a report that is consistent in terms both of the protection of the consumers and the reasonable treatment of producers, especially in those areas where, for example, cattle are not restrained in close confinement in buildings, then we have to use the positive-list technique, which unfortunately this Assembly seems to have rejected. None the less, on the grounds that any proposal in this area is better than none, I shall support the report.

**President.** — I put, as amended, the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

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

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We come now to the motion for a resolution contained in the *Balfour report (Doc. 1-136/80/rev.)*: *Convergence and budgetary questions.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraph 1)

I call Mr Balfour.

**Mr Balfour, rapporteur.** — Mr President, it may help you and it may help the House not to take this resolution paragraph by paragraph but simply to adopt it as a whole, since I understand that under Rule 29 Parliament cannot deliberate on any amendment unless it is moved during the debate. Dr Seal was unable to be here last night during the debate and was therefore not in a position to put his amendments. I was in any event going to recommend to the House the rejection of those amendments. It would be a great saving of time if we could therefore vote on the resolution as a whole.

(Applause)

**President.** — If, when there are thousands of amendments, we required somebody to move them formally, we should spend all our time moving amendments. That is why the words used by the President at the end of a debate are that the voting will take place at such a time on the motion for a resolution together with the amendments that have been tabled so far. In this way there is a formal moving of all amendments that have been put in. It is not necessary for somebody to get up and move them. So the amendments are perfectly in order.

<sup>1</sup> By an electronic roll-call vote requested by the Group of the European People's Party (CD).

**President**

I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman on a point of order.

**Mrs Kellett-Bowman.** — Last night, Mr President, I was there throughout, and that was not the formula used. There was no mention of the amendments last night. As a matter of fact I happened to want to vote on one of these amendments, but they were not moved by any of the Socialists and the formula used was simply that the vote would be taken on the motion for a resolution.

**President.** — Without intending any disrespect to any of my colleagues, I must conclude that either they made a mistake or you did not hear correctly what was said, for the proper formula is in fact as I have just indicated.

I call Sir James Scott-Hopkins.

**Sir James Scott-Hopkins.** — I think we ought to proceed with the voting today as though the amendments had been moved, but I may suggest, Mr President, that you are perhaps creating a precedent here, because the practice in the past has been that if they were not moved by a person during the debate, then they were not valid. I do not think that we can do that now. I would suggest that you refer this to the Bureau for further examination and we continue now with the vote as though they had been moved.

**President.** — I am afraid I must disagree with you entirely. I have had this objection before, but there is also the view that if the substance of the amendment has been brought into the debate that is sufficient.

On paragraph 2 (a), I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Seal, amending this paragraph as follows:

- 2(a) Points out that, since the existence of the Community should not be seen as a 'begging-bowl' or 'crutch' for the disabled, progress towards convergence depends primarily on Member States' own efforts at national level (*remainder deleted*);

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Balfour, rapporteur.** — I am against.

(*Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and adopted, first subparagraph (a), then subparagraph (b) of paragraph 2*)

**President.** — On paragraph 3, I have Amendment No 2, tabled by Mr Seal and amending this paragraph as follows:

3. Emphasizes that any definition of convergence must imply the reduction of sectoral, regional and national disparities (*remainder deleted*);

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Balfour, rapporteur.** — I am against it, Mr President.

(*Parliament rejected Amendment No 2 and adopted paragraph 3*)

**President.** — On paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 3, tabled by Mr Seal and deleting this paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Balfour, rapporteur.** — I am against this amendment.

(*Parliament rejected Amendment No 3 and adopted, first paragraph 4, then paragraphs 5 to 8*)

**President.** — On paragraph 9, I have Amendment No 4, tabled by Mr Seal and deleting this paragraph.

**Mr Balfour, rapporteur.** — I am against the amendment.

(*Parliament rejected Amendment No 4 and adopted, first paragraph 9, then paragraphs 10 and 11*)

**President.** — On paragraph 12, I have Amendment No 5, tabled by Mr Seal and rewording this paragraph as follows:

12. Considers that the Commission's latest proposals for mitigating Member States' budgetary imbalances under Article 235 of the Treaty do not make any fundamental changes which will ensure convergence in the long term;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Balfour, rapporteur.** — I am against the amendment.

(*Parliament rejected Amendment No 5 and adopted paragraph 12*)

IN THE CHAIR: MR DE FERRANTI

*Vice-President*

**President.** — On paragraph 13, I have Amendment No 6, tabled by Mr Seal and amending this paragraph as follows:

## President

13. Emphasizes that this problem will not be satisfactorily resolved until there is a better balance between the Community's policies and therefore in expenditure from the Community budget and believes the problem can be resolved only by a fundamental reform of the Community budget, with a larger proportion being expended on the Regional and Social Funds at the expense of the CAP;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Balfour, rapporteur.** — I do not think that I have a view on this, Mr President. I personally will vote against it, but I could understand if the committee were split down the middle.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 6 and adopted, first paragraph 13, then paragraphs 14 to 16)*

**President.** — On paragraph 17, I have Amendment No 7, tabled by Mr Seal and replacing this paragraph by the following text:

17. Further believes that no consideration should be given to ways of increasing the Community's own resources until decisions on restructuring the budget due to be taken this June have been agreed;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Balfour, rapporteur.** — I think that this amendment is inappropriate given the fact that Parliament is already discussing an important document on the Community's own resources. It is therefore in my view inapplicable. I recommend voting against.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 7 and adopted paragraph 17, then paragraphs 18 and 19)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman for an explanation of vote.

**Mrs Kellett-Bowman.** — Mr President, I very much regret that we failed to adopt Amendment No 6, which asked for a fundamental reform of the Community budget with a larger proportion being expended on the Regional and Social Funds at the expense of the common agricultural policy. The Regional Policy Committee, on which I have served for many years, has been fighting for this equally for many years. I also regret the vote on Amendment No 7. Nevertheless, I believe that this report contains a very great deal of value, and with those two reservations I feel obliged to vote for the resolution.

**President.** — I call Mr Balfour.

**Mr Balfour, rapporteur.** — Mr President, I think it is only right that I should comment on that explanation

of vote and say that it was not at any stage the committee's responsibility to be prescriptive about the allocation of new own resources; and therefore we merely ask for a better balance between the policies of the Community in the future, since it is a subject that is very much before Parliament right now. That is why I guided the House as I did.

*(Applause)*

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

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

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — I put to the vote the *Turcat motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-836/80): Regulations on energy.*

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

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — I put to the vote the *von Wogau motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-861/80): Tax-free allowances.*

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

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the *Israel et al. motion for resolution (Doc. 1-882/80): Visit by President Sadat to the European Parliament.*

*(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraph 1)*

On paragraph 2, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by the Liberal and Democratic Group and deleting all words after 'Euro-Arab dialogue'.

I call Mr Israel.

**Mr Israel.** — *(F)* Mr President, I am grateful to the Liberal Group for tabling their amendment, and I would point out that at Question time Mr Cheysson told us that he was by no means certain that the meeting at ministerial level of the Euro-Arab dialogue could take place in the month of July.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1, paragraph 2, thus amended, and then paragraph 3)*

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 50 of 9. 3. 1981.

**President.** — I have had several requests from the floor to give an explanation of vote.

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Mr President, I feel it necessary and advisable to explain why I support and will be voting in favour of Mr Israel's motion.

At the time of President Sadat's arrival, because of Parliament's attitude and not to mark our opposition to President Sadat's policy, we in my group chose to demonstrate some reservations. We did not approve of this Parliament being confronted with a *fait accompli*.

I myself could not accept a situation in which a Parliament which has been faced with a *fait accompli* refuses to arrange a debate following President Sadat's statement. In addition, Mr President, I feel it is important, when you do not agree with an event of this kind, to act as your party and electors would wish, to state your views and to assume this responsibility.

I shall vote in favour of this resolution, Mr President, because I feel that we have a duty to support any man of peace, any man of good will. I feel for my part that President Sadat knew how to assume responsibilities at the time he assumed them, and they are of very great historical importance.

Therefore, Mr President, I shall vote in favour of Mr Israel's resolution — and I thank him for giving us this opportunity — because I feel we have a duty to take initiatives in all directions. Faced with the terrible position of the Palestinian people, it is our duty, Mr Israel, to do everything that is in our power, even if institutional organizations such as the PLO are somewhat suspect, even if they are conditioned by the atrocious position of certain sections of the Palestinian population, a situation which, without a doubt, is also due to a demagogic or dangerous policy in certain countries of the Arab League.

And I must say, Mr President, that when I read that Mr Uri Anneri yesterday raised the PLO flag in the Knesset, I see in this a sign of good will. It must not be thought that incidents such as these stem from treachery or a lack of serious-mindedness. If the will for peace is to dominate, I believe that we too must take initiatives with respect to the PLO.

**President.** — I call Mr Hänsch.

**Mr Hänsch.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I understand what Mr Israel is trying to do. I can also say that I welcome the fact that, following President Sadat's visit, Parliament is continuing to think hard about these questions in debates and resolutions. I shall nevertheless be voting against the motion,

because I feel it is a dangerous and dubious practice for Parliament to decide on a Friday morning, following a request for an urgent debate, on a question which forms part of a very sensitive and difficult area of external policy. We parliamentarians should not act in this way. We should discuss such subjects thoroughly in the appropriate committees and then adopt a position on such external matters on the basis of coordinated and carefully balanced resolutions rather than by some double-quick procedure on a Friday morning. I shall therefore be voting against the motion, Mr President.

**President.** — I call Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul.

**Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul.** — (D) Ladies and gentlemen, I shall also be voting against the motion. For one thing, I agree with what Mr Hänsch has said as regards the procedure. The Political Affairs Committee will be drawing up a report on the Euro-Arab dialogue, and so there is surely no reason why we should adopt a position by an urgent procedure without a thorough debate on a question which has been controversial for some years.

For another, from what the representative of the Commission said just now, it would not be in the Commission's interests for us to adopt a position in which we tell our negotiating partners whom they should include in their delegations. I feel that would be a kind of interference in the affairs of the other side in these negotiations. I shall therefore be voting against the motion.

**President.** — I call Mr Schwencke.

**Mr Schwencke.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I very much welcome Mr Israel's motion for a resolution and consider it helpful in its present form, even if it is being adopted on a Friday morning. It would be a gesture that would undoubtedly be clearly understood outside Europe.

**President.** — I call Mr Van Minnen.

**Mr Van Minnen.** — (NL) Mr President, although I do not consider the conclusions drawn by Mr Israel to be incorrect in themselves, I shall abstain in the vote on this resolution, precisely because I feel we should have had a debate — and a double-quick procedure will not do — and that this Parliament should not have regarded Mr Sadat as some kind of Santa Claus, but should have held a debate on this subject after Mr Sadat's visit and preferably in his presence. That would have been the duty of the parliamentary Assembly which we claim to be.

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

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

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We now come to the *Antoniozzi et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-883/80): Community aid to Calabria.*

I call Mr Pannella to give an explanation of vote.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Mr President, although I fear my position may lose us some votes in our constituencies, I wish to say that I shall abstain in the vote on this resolution. Why, Mr President?

There has been damage and flooding in Calabria. There will be more in a month's time. There will be more in two months' time. We must obviously help the people who are the victims of these disasters. But, Mr President, I feel it is high time that the Commission and Parliament became aware of the fact that the real disaster, that which reduces whole regions in Italy to a situation in which a few drops of rain are enough for a disaster to occur, is the ruling class of which Mr Antoniozzi is an eminent representative. The whole hydro-geological situation in Italy is threatened because we do not have any geologists. We have been battling with this problem for years, and it is time it was known that the Italian State has only 35 geologists to deal with these matters.

*(Interruption by Mr Bardi)*

For example, Mr Bardi, who interrupts me, is responsible for the destruction of Naples. That is why, Mr President, that I, an Italian, a Southern Italian, shall be abstaining, because it is obvious that we cannot go on financing corrupt ruling classes, who, moreover, spoil nature and upset the natural balance.

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

The resolution is adopted.<sup>2</sup>

\*

\* \*

**President.** — I put to the vote the *Wieczorek-Zeul et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-879/80): Charges brought against 13 trade-union leaders in Brazil.*

I call Mr Klepsch.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) Mr President, I should just like to say that the agenda that has been printed does not refer to the motion for a resolution that my group has tabled.

**President.** — That will be noted.

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

**President.** — I call Mr Kellett-Bowman on a point of order.

**Mr Kellett-Bowman.** — Mr President, I should like to raise a point of order, in view of something which happened earlier this morning. There are five ways in which a Member may express his wishes after the Chair announces a vote. He may vote for the motion, he may vote against and he may signify that he wishes to abstain. A fourth way is to do what most people have done this morning, namely, to be absent from the Chamber. But it is possible to express one's wishes in a fifth way, by being in the Chamber and not voting. If the President in any way encourages Member to change their position from any of those five, it *might* be inferred that he is being partial.

#### 14. *Crisis in the sugar-cane industry (contd)*

**President.** — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on the two motions for resolutions on sugar.

I call Mr Maher.

**Mr Maher.** — Mr President, I want to make a few comments about the problems concerning the refining of sugar cane in Liverpool at the Tate and Lyle plant. I am convinced, Mr President, that this has anything directly to do with the policies of the European Economic Community on sugar. I am open to contradiction, but I understand that Tate and Lyle in Liverpool have, in fact, been running down this plant for a very long period, for 20 years or more. They have not been making reinvestments in this plant, which indicates that the company itself did not intend to continue the refining process.

I have the greatest sympathy for people who are being put out of employment as a direct consequence of

<sup>1</sup> By sitting and standing. OJ C 50 of 9. 3. 1981.

<sup>2</sup> OJ C 50 of 9. 3. 1981.

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 50 of 9. 3. 1981.

**Maher**

decisions taken by individual firms in industry to run down plant or to change methods of production. I have great sympathy in this case, but I must say that this problem is not peculiar to Liverpool or the United Kingdom. It is happening in all our member countries. It is certainly happening in Ireland at the moment. However, I feel that it is not and should not be a Community problem. This is a domestic problem in the UK. It is a problem relating directly to Tate and Lyle, because they have apparently decided that they can process all of the cane sugar in existing plants and do it more effectively.

Another think I do not understand, quite frankly, is the argument advanced by Miss Hooper that you can in some way improve the situation by decreasing quotas for beet sugar and increasing the volume of imported cane sugar. We also refine and process sugar beet in the European Community, and if we reduce quotas we threaten employment in our member countries not only in the refining but also in the production of sugar beet. That is happening in our country: one of our sugar factories is presently under threat for this reason. In a sense it seems to be a case of giving with one hand and taking away with the other, but I would say the balance lies in favour of maintaining the capacity for refining sugar beet, because that is an internal product, one produced within the Community, and it would have a worse effect if we were to run it down.

I would ask both Mrs Castle and Miss Hooper and others to look at this problem in connection with the position in the UK and not to raise it at this level, because I do not think it is really a Community problem.

## IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Enright.

**Mr Enright.** — Mr President, I had not intended to intervene in this debate until I heard the two Dutch speakers who seemed to have no fears or reservations about what is going on in the sugar-beet régime. The way in which they spoke seems to me to be quite disgraceful.

Mr Cohen said that Tate and Lyle would be able to refine all the sugar cane which was guaranteed entry into the Community. In spite of what he has read, that is simply untrue. If they refine to maximum capacity with the plant which will be left, they will be at least one hundred thousand tonnes under what should be refined. It does seem to me that they, in fact, had a very real interest in propagating the sugar-beet régime.

I must say to Mr Louwes that really he cannot extend indefinitely his demands in regard to sugar beet and then expect people in tiny islands like St Kitts to starve. That, indeed, is what Mr Maher also is asking in the speech that he made this morning. It is very clear indeed that unless we have the capacity to refine sugar cane within the Community at the moment, then we are not going to be able to bring in that guaranteed amount of 1.3 million tonnes which is supposed to be sacrosanct in the Treaty.

I would point out to all three speakers as well that the Port Refineries Trade Union in Liverpool is one of the only unions I know that has said publicly that they will eventually be out of work because cane-refining capacity should be going to the Third World. They have openly admitted and accepted that, but the fact of the matter is that at this present moment it simply is not possible. Our over-production of sugar beet is reducing to absolute poverty and hunger a large number of people in the Third World. It is a régime which the Commission has attempted to get control of, only to be stopped by my own government. It is partly the fault of Peter Walker, and I would not deny my own country's fault in this.

Therefore I beseech this House to vote on behalf of the Third World and to vote for the motions tabled by Mrs Castle and Miss Hooper.

**President.** — I call Mr Tugendhat.

**Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, I should like to take up something that Mr Maher said when he appealed to Mrs Castle and Miss Hooper not to raise this question at this level.

It is, of course, the second time during the week that the matter has been raised at this level, and I would like to say to him that the reason why it has been raised at this level is that Mrs Castle and Miss Hooper understand the extreme importance of what happens in the European Parliament and are anxious to show their constituents that what happens in the European Parliament is of direct relevance to the economic interest that they have been elected to represent. I am glad that this matter should be recognized in this way.

My colleague, Claude Cheysson, answered a question on this matter very fully on Monday, and there is not a great deal that I would add. I would, however, agree with Mr Enright that the production of cane sugar in the islands of the West Indies, which are members of the Lomé Convention, is extremely important to them. They are in many senses a one-crop economy, and that is why the European Community entered into obligations under the Lomé Convention.

These obligations are, of course, expressed in white sugar and therefore include no commitment regarding

**Tugendhat**

a specific level of refining capacity. Of the 1.3 million tonnes of white sugar resulting from the sugar protocol, some 1.2 million have hitherto been regularly consumed in the United Kingdom. The protocol does not, however, lay down that this sugar has to be consumed in one member country of the Community, namely the United Kingdom, rather than in the Community as a whole. It is a matter of fact that it has been in the United Kingdom, but it is not something which is tied directly to the United Kingdom.

The difficulty stems, of course, from the rapid increase in the production of sugar-beet in the United Kingdom. The level of sugar-beet production has now reached 1.1 million tonnes and the total UK consumption of sugar is only some 2.2 million tonnes, so a difficulty has very clearly arisen, as even the simplest arithmetician would be able to understand. The nub of the matter therefore is that the changes referred to by the honourable Members, both in their exchanges with Mr Cheysson earlier this week and again today, do not affect the Community's obligations to the ACP countries. I think it is important to make that clear. Our obligations as a Community remain, and so they should. The problem is a different one. The problem is the impact on employment arising from the progressive shift within the United Kingdom from cane sugar to beet sugar. Obviously, that shift creates enormous problems of adjustment, to use a technical term, and enormous human problems for the people who are affected by it.

There is, of course, some compensation, since clearly the increase in beet production does mean that jobs on the land are maintained which might otherwise be lost. However, that in no sense reduces the human misery caused by the changes which are occurring in the pattern of production and consumption and which are, I perfectly well understand, of importance to the honourable Members who represent that part of the country in which the refinery is situated.

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

**Mr Maher.** — Mr President, could I direct a question at Mr Tugendhat? Would he agree that sugar beet has also to be refined and that therefore there are jobs in the refining end of sugar beet? It is not only on the land, Mr Tugendhat, that sugar beet gives employment.

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

**Mr Pearce.** — Mr President, under what Rule of Procedure is Mr Maher trying to pose questions to the Commissioner in the middle of a vote?

**President.** — The answer is very short. As an ordinary Member, Mr Maher was not, according to the Rules, allowed to take the floor. Only a rapporteur may put a question.

**Mr Maher.** — Very well, Mr President.

**President.** — I put the motion for a resolution by Mrs Castle and others to the vote.

The motion is rejected.<sup>1</sup>

I put the motion for a resolution by Miss Hooper and others to the vote.

The motion is rejected.

*15. British prisoners held in Iran*

**President.** — The next item is the motion for a resolution by Mr Provan and others on the British prisoners held in Iran (Doc. 1-885/80).

I call Mr Provan.

**Mr Provan.** — Mr President, in view of the very hopeful signs emanating from Iran, as well as the deep concern which, I am sure, all of us feel for the people in prison, and in view of the negotiations that the Archbishop's emissary is undertaking at this moment in Tehran, I wish to withdraw this item from the agenda.

*16. Legislation on drivers' hours*

**President.** — The next item is the motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Ewing and others on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats and by Mr Maher and others, on a derogation to Community legislation on drivers' hours in remote islands and depopulated and isolated areas (Doc. 1-887/80).

I call Mr Albers on a point of order.

**Mr Albers.** — (NL) Strange things are happening in this Parliament at the moment, but this is really outrageous. Here is a subject which could have been discussed in the normal way if it had been possible to debate the Key report on social harmonization, which is on the agenda. Mrs Ewing has already tabled two amendments to that report which concern this subject,

<sup>1</sup> By electronic vote.

but now she has produced a resolution by the urgent procedure for us to discuss.

Mr President, this surely shows that we are going about things in completely the wrong way. Pursuant to Rule 32 (1) (e), I would ask you not to allow this debate, because it would be partly responsible for preventing the Key report from being discussed, and this is a matter which should be discussed. I therefore request that this debate be disallowed and that the matter be referred to the appropriate committee.

**President.** — Mr Albers, Mrs Ewing's motion for a resolution was tabled on 10 February, and no objections have been submitted to the Bureau. You are putting the President in a somewhat embarrassing position: I regret that you did not present your objections earlier to the Bureau so as to give us an opportunity of discussing them.

**Mr Albers.** — Mr President, I will explain once again. According to you, it would have been more reasonable if I had indicated my opposition when we were discussing the request for urgent debate, but at that time I was not able to express my objections so forcibly because I did not then have Mrs Ewing's amendments to the Key report. I can assure you that, if we proceed in this manner, it will not be possible for us to do our work in a reasonable manner.

**President.** — I call Mr Cottrell.

**Mr Cottrell.** — I presume, Mr President, that your ruling is definitive on the point Mr Albers has made. I therefore wish to establish whether there is a quorum in the House, and I ask for ten Members to support me in this.

**President.** — Mr Cottrell, you can only ask the Chair to establish whether there is a quorum when we are about to vote.

I call Mrs Ewing.

**Mrs Ewing.** — Mr President, it was the House that voted for urgent procedure, and I am sorry if one Member does not think they should have done so. They did so. So I do not see why, if the wisdom of the House was to vote for urgent procedure, I may not now proceed, because I can answer Mr Albers's questions and I am sure I can satisfy him that he is incorrect in what he said. But unless I get my chance to speak, Mr President, I am not going to be able to deal with the matter. I would like to get the same opportunity as all the other people whose requests for urgent procedure were passed.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Albers.

**Mr Albers.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I propose that we call the Key report now, together with Mrs Ewing's amendments which deal with exactly the same subject. The dossier has already been drawn up by the Committee on Transport.

**President.** — I call Mrs Ewing.

**Mrs Ewing.** — A decision on urgent procedure was taken yesterday. If the procedure now suggested for another vote to see if it was justified is adopted, then I am being subjected to two ordeals of getting urgent procedure. Now why should I be singled out for this?

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Purvis.

**Mr Purvis.** — Might I suggest that you combine the two debates? Would that be a way out of this *impasse*?

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, I must ask you once more whether you accept my proposal that we debate Mrs Ewing's motion for a resolution.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I can give Mr Albers the assurance that the important points he has raised will be discussed in the Bureau.

I call Mrs Ewing.

**Mrs Ewing.** — Mr President, first I would like to try and deal with Mr Albers's point, because I have an answer to it, and I wonder if he really would give me the courtesy to consider it. The position is that my amendments were lodged at the same time as this motion, but since the Key report was a general report out to accomplish general things which, with the best will in the world, will take months and months — Mr Key would admit this to be the case, I am sure — it was not possible to make the specific type of amendment; nevertheless, I do assure Mr Albers that the amendments were lodged. We have had a lot of printing difficulties this week, I am told. Many names were added to my motion, including many from the Christian-Democratic Group, I think all the Scottish Conservatives and Socialists, and many Welsh and other people from the United Kingdom. I have had

**Ewing**

support from the Greeks, because they understand the problem. And so on. So there have been printing difficulties, as well. We are all up against that, so please do not blame that on me.

Secondly, I would like to say this. I have been here for nearly six years, and in answer to the person who criticized me yesterday, I have only presented two requests for urgent debate in those six years. I think that is not a bad record for a Member who does not wish to disrupt proceedings, and I think anyone who has been in this House a long time will know that that is the case. Therefore I would not, as an experienced parliamentarian, waste your time if it were not really and truly urgent.

Seeking to establish, not a Scottish but a European principle, I have tried to frame a very specific small extension to a derogation. It is not a derogation. It is a small extension that will enable the kind of areas I am covering by my criteria to benefit. These criteria include areas more than 50 miles from a motorway and any islands; and oddly enough, that covers almost all countries in Europe, because Germany has an island, Holland has Texel, which I have visited, most of Denmark, Western Ireland, parts of the United Kingdom, most of Scotland, parts of Italy, Sicily. So it is a European principle, and I am grateful for all the support I have had. It does not yet affect Greece, but it would affect most of Greece if Greece were not subject to special exemptions at the present time.

Why is it a terrible problem? I am not pleading any argument that would go against safety. I want the total hours to remain the same. I am only asking that two days a week slightly larger lorries, which are defined in my fourth recital, should be used, because the very spirit you ask people in remote places to show — namely, cooperation in dealing with European harmonization — has been shown, and these people have come together to use larger lorries — not juggernauts please, my dear Members, we do not have the roads for juggernauts; the juggernauts are not what we are talking about. We are asking for a bigger type of vehicle, because we have ferries: there is the waiting-time on ferries and getting on and off the ferry; we have no dropping off places; two-day journeys are going to become three-day journeys; we have sometimes 80 miles between towns; a man will have to stop on a moor or else that means an extra day is added. The workers are not going to want to work in these conditions. Hauliers are going to close down.

Another reason why it is urgent — and I would put this point particularly to Mr Albers and Mr Curry — is that all the bodies concerned, in the north and in the regional councils, the HIDB, the Farmer's Union and the hauliers, all went to the Commission and asked for this and the Commission quite rightly said to them, wait until 1 January and see how it goes. Well, we waited and I did not raise this in January because we had to give it time. It is not going. We are not going to

have these hauliers delivering fruit and vegetables to the Outer Islands of Scotland.

You are making the European law an ass, and it is not good for the credibility of Europe if the law becomes an ass. For example, we can take fish, because it is special, in a day, but we cannot take the empty boxes back. We need two days to take the empty boxes back. So every fisherman will be putting one dead fish in each box to satisfy the rule of Europe. This is not good for Europe. It is a very specific matter which I could not really have appropriately framed under Mr Key's excellent report, which I will be supporting.

I do not think it is fair to blame me for not reaching Mr Key's report, because Mr Key agrees with me that his report would not have been reached in any event and it is not just me. This is my second urgent item in six years. So I really do appeal to you — those who understand peripheral life and those who do not, those who have been kind enough to support me because they understand there is a problem. I would end with one line from Mr Thorn's address yesterday: 'What this Commission wants to do is to make every citizen of our Community realize we are sensitive to his problems'. It is so urgent that there will be no hauliers left in the north and many other parts of Europe if they do not get this done right away.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The Socialist Group has the floor.

**Mr Albers.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I have a great deal of respect for Mrs Ewing, for her Scottish disposition and also for her European disposition. During Question Time I noted that the answers she received to her question were unsatisfactory. I can therefore well understand that she thought to herself: 'I must find another way' — but the way she has found is not right. This is not a subject for debate by urgent procedure.

What we are concerned with here is the application of Regulation 543, which was adopted in 1969 and is in the field of transport policy one of the few achievements in this European Community that Mrs Ewing and I are well disposed towards. We know that the position as regards the application of this regulation in the Community — as is evident from the Member States' reports — is pathetic. The regulation is not properly enforced at present, and we must therefore be extremely cautious about calling for and allowing exceptions. If we permit exceptions to a regulation which is already poorly enforced, we shall simply be creating new opportunities, and a question like that raised here about exceptional circumstances in certain parts of the European Community calls for a thorough investigation and a precise answer from the Commission. Officials concerned with these matters must have an opportunity to carry out a meticulous investigation

**Albers**

into the advantages and disadvantages. This is something I called for early last year in a motion for a resolution on social harmonization in this field. It is also something that is taken up in Mr Key's report, on which we could have had a good debate here.

It is a matter of the utmost importance, but as a result of the strange approach here — and really, this is a serious criticism of the Bureau and of us all — we are unable to get down to our normal work and increasingly find ourselves in these mad situations. In short, Mr President, while I have every sympathy, in the present circumstances I find it impossible to vote in favour of a resolution of this kind, because I cannot see what the effect will be, what consequences it will have for the application of Regulation No 543 — one of the few regulations which have seen the light of day in the field of social harmonization.

**President.** — Mr Albers, there is much truth in what you say, but Parliament has adopted urgent procedure with regard to Mrs Ewing's motion.

One thing is certain: we must in general be much more careful with our decisions to adopt urgent procedure. The way we are going about things at present, it is impossible to prepare dossiers properly.

The group of the European People's Party (CD) has the floor.

**Mr Habsburg.** — (*D*) Mr President, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party I have the honour to say that we shall be voting in favour of Mrs Ewing's motion.

Life in remote islands and depopulated and isolated areas is almost always hard. Anything that can be done to make life easier — for example, by adopting the measures proposed by Mrs Ewing — should be done. The inhabitants of these areas have a right to our solidarity. Only then can we strike a sound balance in Europe, because otherwise we shall depopulate old areas of Europe which have a great rôle to play, particularly in the future.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — The European Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mr Moreland.** — Mr President, I shall also be supporting this resolution and I would like to emphasize that my objections yesterday were based on questions of procedure rather than on the substance. As Mrs Ewing will know, many members of my group have been pressing for some time on this issue, members who come from the areas concerned, such as Mr Hutton, Mr Purvis, Mr Harris and Mr Provan.

Nevertheless, we have one or two slight reservations. The first is that the resolution criticizes the Commission only: it does not include any mention of the Council's failure in the past to agree on appropriate derogations in this field. Consequently, I hope the author will agree with me when I say that this resolution should go also to the Council. Secondly, the current division between those included in the drivers' hours legislation and those excluded is untidy.

One of the reasons why I wanted this discussed in connection with the Key report is that there are additional changes I would like to see which would help particularly the remoter areas. For example, if I may sound technical, Mr President, I would like to see a change from the so-called rolling week to the fixed week. Indeed, the proposal which is before us only adds one hour to driving-time twice a week: it is a very modest proposal.

Subject to these reservations, I think it is obvious that there are extra transport cost burdens on the islands and remoter areas of the Community, and therefore I would like to support this resolution. Indeed, I would support this resolution as a further demonstration in our belief that the islands and remoter areas of our Community are essential to the future of our Community.

**President.** — I call Mr Harris.

**Mr Harris.** — Mr President, I merely want to support Mrs Ewing, representing as I do the other geographical extreme of the United Kingdom: she represents John O'Groats; I represent Land's End. I can bear out what she is saying, — namely, that this is causing problems on these peripheral areas. That is why the matter is urgent. I do not support every detail of the resolution; I think it needs to be looked at. But the object of this exercise is to galvanize the Commission and the Council into looking at the problem and taking action.

**President.** — The Commission has the floor.

**Mr O'Kennedy, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, the Commission is ready to be galvanized into action and in fact was already galvanized before the event. Indeed, it is not in principle opposed to considering the possibility of a derogation of the type foreseen in Mrs Ewing's resolution; but, as has been said and noted by a number of speakers, the question needs to be examined very fully. In this regard the Commission would very much appreciate it and indeed would welcome it if the honourable Members concerned could provide the Commission's services with more detailed information in order to accelerate the examination of this very important issue.

**O'Kennedy**

I think I should remind the House that the Council has only accepted part of the modifications to Regulation 543/69 which were proposed as long ago as 1976. In fact, the Council has still to decide on a number of major modifications. So the opportunity provided by further discussions with the Council should assist in helping to find a solution to the undoubted transport problems that exist in remote islands and isolated and thinly populated regions. The Commission is very ready and anxious to examine the matter in greater detail with a view to proposing a solution to those problems.

*(Applause)*

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

I call Mr Pearce to give an explanation of vote.

**Mr Pearce.** — Mr President, I am not unsympathetic to the problems that have been raised by the proposers of this motion, but I am rather tired of the way in which it seems to be acceptable in this Community of ours to indulge in special pleading for rural areas and yet with regard to industrial areas, as a recent debate has shown, Members are not disposed to support calls for assistance. I note that one of the signatories of this particular motion is Mr Maher, who not infrequently pleads for this or that cause to do with his part of the Community. Because I do not see why the Community exists to help some of its citizens and not all of them, I shall vote against this motion.

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

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

#### 17. *Situation of the motor-vehicle industry in the EEC*

**President.** — The next item is the motion for a resolution by Mr Sarre and others, on the situation of the motor-vehicle industry in the EEC (Doc. 1-896/80/rev.).

I call Mr Sarre.

**Mr Sarre.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, a month ago, during the debate on the automobile industry, the Assembly stated that it was in favour of obtaining from the Japanese, through negotiations, agreements limiting exports of Japanese motor vehicles to the European Community. Since that time there has been a new and very important development: the failure of the negotiations of 29 January 1981 between the Commission and the Japanese authorities is likely to make it clearer to us what is actually at stake. The

crisis in the motor vehicle industry is partly due to Japanese competition and the formidable commercial offensive launched by that country. We feel it is not enough to call on the Japanese to exercise self-restraint in exports, to believe that this pious hope will impress the Japanese. What is at stake is serious and decisive enough. We must therefore act with determination.

Of course, we are told that we must not venture into protectionism and that we must penetrate the Japanese market. But, and this is where the difficulty lies, Japan is not playing the game. It does not really want to limit its exports: on the contrary, it is trying to gain time. It is thus continuing its strategy of gaining a foothold on European territory by means of agreements with Alfa Romeo and between Leyland and Honda and also by installing actual production units in the United Kingdom, for example, where Nissan has decided to build a factory to make 200 000 vehicles a year from 1985. If Japanese undertakings multiply in Europe, we shall therefore no longer be able to protect ourselves effectively because Japanese cars will be manufactured or, what is perhaps even more dangerous, assembled in Europe.

On the other hand, it is impossible not to realize that the Japanese are trying to gain time over the problem of reciprocity, when it is known just how impenetrable their frontiers are. The longer the negotiations go on, the later the frontiers will open. Everyone knows that the Japanese, who sell over a million cars in Europe every year, allow only about 50 000 European vehicles into their own country. The nature of this trade, which is to say the least unbalanced, is due to the obstacles to the entry of European products into the Japanese market. For their part, the Japanese have no fear of protectionism, and it comes as a shock to be thought lessons by the very people who close their frontiers so shamelessly by resorting to the national tradition of tariff barriers. We have a long time to wait if we want reciprocity in trade. In fact, Japan is generally considered to be the big winner in these negotiations. While we have not succeeded in getting it to open up its market, it is attacking our positions. Japan has even succeeded in dividing the Europeans.

The European Community must stop procrastinating. The sacrosanct principle of free trade is leading to a fierce, savage war and to the ruin of the European automobile industry. We need to contain the enemy and to redress the balance. There is therefore an urgent need to change the terms of the negotiations. We must speak to Japan in clear and aggressive language. The target for the European automobile industry is to win. We must act. The responsibilities have been established. The motor vehicle industry is a crucial sector for employment and economic activity and it must be protected. That is the purpose of the resolution which I invite you to adopt. That is the purpose of the step we have taken, and I am convinced that the large majority of this Assembly will want to

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 50 of 9. 3. 1981.

**Sarre**

tell the Commission on what basis it should be negotiating if it is to defend our motor vehicle industry and, by the same token, the workers in that industry.

**President.** — The European Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mr Welsh.** — Mr President, the Sarre resolution is a very good example of the defectiveness of the House's urgent procedure, because what we have here is a singularly superficial treatment of an extremely complex problem. It is also, of course, a problem which the House discussed openly two months ago in great detail in connection with the Bonaccini report — and a very good report it was too. Mr Sarre and his friends have added absolutely nothing to the debate other than, perhaps, to waste the House's time.

The silly part of it is that, as we well know, Sir Roy Denman and his colleagues have only recently returned from Japan and there has been no report, either to the House or to one of its committees, on what happened there. All we have to go on are some press reports, couched in various highly-coloured terms, which speak of total failure and so on. So this resolution is entirely premature until such time as we know what the Commission actually did in Japan.

Its superficial nature is clear from the implication of Mr Sarre's concern for the motor industry, that the only problem the motor industry has is one of Japanese imports and indeed the only problem in our relations with Japan is that of the motor industry. Of course this is quite untrue. There is in fact a report being prepared even now by the Committee on External Economic Relations which goes into great detail on the whole question of Japan.

For the moment I would merely put down a couple of markers to explain what we in this group feel the Commission's position ought to be, and I do this simply as a curtain-raiser to the debate on Japan which will no doubt take place shortly.

We take the view, Mr President, that the deficit which the Community runs with Japan must at some point be restrained and reduced and that that must be done by agreement at the highest possible political level. Moreover, it is absolutely essential, if such agreement is to be obtained, that the ten Member States adopt a solidly common position.

We also take the view that the means of reducing the deficit will be, in the first instance, at least, a question for the Japanese themselves and that bankable commitments by them to import increasing quantities of European goods would be a much more satisfactory way of achieving a satisfactory trade balance than merely seeking to deprive European consumers of the

opportunity to buy Japanese goods through import controls, selective or otherwise.

In conclusion, Mr President, I would refer to Mr Sarre's comments on the Nissan agreement with the UK. I really wonder whether he would have displayed quite the same amount of righteous indignation if Nissan had decided to put its factory in France. But the fact is that, at a time of gross unemployment which concerns us all, we absolutely need foreign investment. We do not tell the Americans that they cannot put up motorcar plants in Europe because they are destroying the European motorcar industry; on the contrary, we encourage them to do so. The American manufacturers have made a very important contribution to the prosperity of all of us. So I do not see how one can discriminate against Japanese agreements in this way, especially when they are basically job-creating.

When one comes to look at the signatories to this motion, one finds some very, very surprising names: alongside Mr Sarre, Mr Delors and their friends, we find Mr Rogers and, dear me, Mrs Clwyd. The Nissan factory, Mr President, is going to be in South Wales! It is going to create a number of jobs in South Wales, and yet time after time we have heard Mrs Clwyd and Mr Rogers assault and batter our ears with complaints about the unemployment levels in South Wales and how important it is to do something about it. Then, when we actually have something being done about it, they sign a resolution which seems to imply that they did not want the agreement at all. Now this cannot be sensible, Mr President. Maybe Mrs Clwyd's tangles with the Luxembourg Police Force have addled her brains. At all events, I really ask the House to remember, next time we hear from our Welsh friends about the terrible conditions in Wales, that Mr Rogers, Mrs Clwyd and their friends signed a resolution which specifically opposed the introduction of a job-creating investment in that part of the country.

**President.** — The Liberal and Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mr Delorozoy.** — (*F*) Mr President, the urgent motion we are discussing is an up-dated version of Mr Bonaccini's basic report on the motor vehicle industry, which was adopted by this Assembly last month. Unfortunately we find today, at least according to the information available to Parliament and on the eve of the presentation of a report to the Council, that the Commission's approaches to the Japanese authorities have apparently ended in failure, and that because of the pressure and urgency of the situation scattered strategies and bilateral talks have begun or are being continued. The manufacturers have an obligation to face up to the situation created by the deterioration of their sector, and they can only be criticized in view of the growing incompetence of the authorities.

**Delorozoy**

We shall have to be down-to-earth from now on and not content ourselves with talks and negotiations which bring nothing. A coordinated offensive strategy must follow, and the Council must join with the Commission in considering what urgent measures are required. The European motor vehicle industry must be protected, with trade based on reciprocity and respect for the rules. On that we fully agree. But we must be firm from now on. We should demonstrate this by recalling that we are ardent supporters of free trade and of competition, but that faced with commercial practices as unfair as those we are now experiencing, we have no alternative but to take stringent safeguard measures to counter Japan's devastating imperialism. We hope the Commission and Council will take great care over the situation in the motor vehicle industry, because, if it is not settled soon, it will get out of control and have political, economic and social repercussions the extent and gravity of which it is difficult to calculate. I therefore say to the Commission and Council, act before it is too late, before the motor vehicle industry becomes an example of the inability of the European Economic Community to respond to the world industrial challenge it faces.

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

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The motion is rejected<sup>1</sup>.

#### 18. *Fixing of book-prices* (contd)

**President.** — The next item is a continuation of the debate on the report by Mr Beumer, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the fixing of book-prices (Doc. 1-554/80). The Liberal and Democratic Group has the floor.

**Mrs Pruvot.** — (F) Mr Beumer's report raises the important question of whether Article 85 (3) of the Treaty is applicable to books and thus touches on one of the basic principles of the Community structure as laid down in Article 3 (f) of the Treaty: 'the institution of a system ensuring that competition in the common market is not distorted.' The problem is a complex one, there is no denying that. Article 85 (1) describes 'as incompatible with the common market: all agreements between undertakings, decisions by associations of undertakings and concerted practices which may affect trade between Member States' and in particular those which 'directly or indirectly fix purchase or selling prices or any other trading conditions'. Paragraph 3 of the same article permits exceptions in the application of paragraph 1 where the agreement or decision taken 'contributes to improving the produc-

tion or distribution of goods or to promoting technical or economic progress, while allowing consumers a fair share of the resulting benefit'. Agreements are, then, admissible firstly, if distribution is improved as a result, and secondly, if consumers enjoy a fair share of the benefit. In this report Mr Beumer and the committee whose opinion he is stating on this subject notes that books cannot be treated like other consumer goods. It is true that, if we consider the specific nature of books, which cannot be traded as consumer goods, but as creative works, as intellectual, cultural, educational and pedagogical goods, Article 85 (3) is applicable. Mr Beumer calls on the Commission to reconsider the subject and to inform the European Parliament of its findings. Its study will be of very great interest and will tell us what interpretation should be adopted.

Mr Beumer's report, now before us, seems to me perhaps a little one-sided in the views it puts forward. It must be admitted that books are also economic products: they are made, distributed and sold. The provisions on the free market — Article 85 (1) — are therefore applicable. It is possible that freedom in the fixing of the prices of books will result in unjustified differences in price, greater disparities in the conditions of sale, the disappearance of small bookshops and so on but, as the Commission has not yet studied the matter, it seems premature to me to draw conclusions. But I should like to draw the attention of Members to the example of the distribution in supermarkets of records and cassettes at a very low price, which is often quoted as an example of the spread of culture. Let us be very cautious and ask ourselves the question: Is it really culture that is being spread in these circumstances? I do not believe so, and as far as my country is concerned, it is obvious that the true lovers of music, those who are really seeking culture in music, take their custom to the experts in the sale of records and cassettes. I believe the same conclusions can be drawn as regards the distribution and sale of books. The book market, the systems used in the Member States and the consequences of these economic practices must therefore now be subjected to a very thorough investigation. The Liberal and Democratic Group therefore hopes that you will adopt its amendment and that Mr Beumer's report will be adopted so that the Commission can study the matter objectively and in depth.

**President.** — The Group of European Progressive Democrats has the floor.

**Mrs Fourcade.** — Mr President, Mr Beumer has today presented an excellent report on the fixing of book prices, a report which is fully in the public interest, and I congratulate him on it.

Mr Beumer rightly stresses that books are not ordinary products, but products of a specific nature. Books cannot be sold like cabbages and turnips. Books are

<sup>1</sup> By electronic vote.

#### Fourcade

cultural and educational products, and in economic terms they must be treated as such. Until recently, books were distributed by a completely satisfactory traditional method: they were distributed by specialists or, to put it another way, bookshops. Now the supermarkets, the department stores, the self-service shops have discovered that they have a vocation as book-sellers. But they market books in the same way as any other product. Ideally, to further cultural development, there will not be certain excessive and reprehensible practices, particularly those consisting in making books into commercial products, with all the consequences that that entails.

There is therefore an urgent need for regulations in the public interest and, above all, in the interest of culture. Where freedom of price-fixing exists, as in my country, it is not long before the completely perverse effects of this system are felt.

In his report Mr Beumer deplors the effects of the freedom of price-fixing and of certain practices due in particular to the gradual disappearance of specialists in the marketing of books, who have been destroyed by cut-throat competition. We must therefore seek regulations and a pricing system which prevents the disappearance of those whose profession it is to sell books and to ensure their distribution, thus protecting education and the development of culture in the true interests of the consumer, that is to say the reader.

We cannot ignore the difficulties of literary creation, which are resulting in an increasing decline in cultural standards in the absence of a genuine European cultural policy. For all these reasons, the European Progressive Democrats approve the conclusions of the report drawn up by one of their number, Mr Beumer, and hope that the Commission will take action to ensure that the European book market is guided by quality and not entirely by economic interests.

**President.** — I call Mr Schwencke.

**Mr Schwencke.** — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the European Parliament is working on a package of measures which will bring improvements for artists and writers and for cultural policy in general. I would remind you that in Strasbourg in January we called on the Commission to provide data on the social position of the culturally creative, so that we might decide what needs to be done for the artist under the social policy. The point here is not — and I say this to various people in the Chamber — to introduce a uniform European price for culture, but to maintain and extend the cultural multiplicity of Europe and its various regions.

Books undoubtedly form part of this process. After all, who in Europe's past and present has done more than poets and philosophers, academics and writers to help

the development of the European identity? It must be ensured that they can make the same contribution in the future, and for this material safeguards will also be required. But this is at risk, as developments in France since July 1979 as a result of the unfortunate consequences of the Monori decree — to which the rapporteur refers in detail — and developments in Sweden since July 1979 as a result of the unfortunate consequence resulted in a kind of cultural clean sweep being made for the book trade and for writers. The trend is likely to be repeated in France and in all our countries in the near future if we abandon fixed prices for books.

Firstly, we shall have one-third fewer bookshops. This will principally affect the smaller towns, some of which are already without a proper bookshop. Secondly, there will be one-third fewer new books. What publisher will accept the risk of publishing the works of younger writers if prices are not fixed? This will also mean a further restriction of the range offered. The younger writers will be abandoned. Thirdly, it will also mean there being one-third fewer publishing houses. The smaller publishers in particular will perish, while the large ones will become ever larger and squeeze out the small ones. In other words, Mr President, we will have a collection of adverse effects if we treat books, as in France or Sweden or other countries, like silk, socks or eggs. Ladies and gentlemen, that would lead to a situation in which books could only be bought in supermarkets, practically the only books on offer would be bestsellers and the only publishers would be the big ones.

Who can want a development of that kind? It will, after all, affect not only those directly concerned, the writers, publishers and book-sellers, but all of us, because this process will restrict freedom of opinion, minimize the range of different opinions and result in our all losing some of the opportunities we have to express ourselves. A hundred years ago, Mr President, the German Adolf Kröner, the chairman of the German Publishers' and Booksellers' Association, was already referring to this danger. In view of the advanced hour I shall not quote what he said, but he did warn that, even if at first glance this development might seem to be in the interests of publishers and perhaps the authors of bestsellers, it ultimately meant a step backwards for us all. As Mrs Pruvot has already said, we must call on the Commission to give careful consideration to the possibility of fixing the prices of books under Article 85 (3) of the EEC Treaty.

Mr President, I can summarize my remarks as follows: freedom in the pricing of books will be accompanied by the death of literature. We Socialists fully approve Mr Beumer's report and his motion for a resolution.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — I call Mr Beazley.

**Mr Beazley.** — Mr President, I should like to support the compromise proposed by my colleague Mr Balfour between the general approach taken in book-prices by the rapporteur and the opinion of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, rather than the approach of those who would see no case for providing even minimal assistance for ethnic publications of cultural importance. As no opportunity was provided for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs to propose amendments before this report was submitted to the House, I would strongly recommend Mr Balfour's amendments to the rapporteur and to the House. If these amendments are not adopted, I fear that this Parliament will run the serious risk of overlooking what I understand is the heart of the matter — that is, to furnish suitable protection under Article 85(3) for cultural books provided for Dutchspeaking people in Holland and Belgium and for comparable situations.

I personally believe that paragraph 1 of the motion is phrased in terms that are too wide, and I am anxious that this House, by its necessary and desirable proposals on certain types of books, should not elevate this proposed exception under Article 85 to the position of a general principle, which might then be applied to cases where it was not relevant.

I should like to draw attention to the British Publishers' Association's net book agreement, the details of which have been before the Commission for a long time. This form of arrangement might provide a means of enabling the rapporteur to achieve his object, as it cannot be considered as a price-fixing cartel, being based on the decisions of an individual publisher and having twice successfully withstood the investigation of British courts under the British Resale Prices Act.

I submit that it is very difficult to decide when cultural values should override economic considerations. I believe that this is a value judgment which only a publisher can take, for it is he who bears the economic responsibility for his business as well as the experience to judge the needs of the market and assess the cultural value of the work concerned. In making these specific proposals to this House in the case of ethnic cultural works and other specialities, I still believe that book production and marketing for other types of books should be open to normal competition and economic discipline.

**President.** — The Commission has the floor.

**Mr O'Kennedy, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, this debate rightly emphasizes the great cultural significance of books, both to individuals and to the peoples of Europe. The Commission agrees with much that Mr Beumer has said in his report, we attach very great importance to the promotion of culture in Europe and indeed it is significant that this policy

sector is part of the responsibility of the President himself.

Against this background, the Commission supports the European Parliament in its endeavours to stimulate cultural diversity in Europe and fully accepts that the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs should concern itself with the problems which may arise when elements of economic policy enter into cultural practice. The Commission is aware also that excessive rigidity in competition policy can be harmful, but it is essential, at the same time, to maintain, as I am sure the House will appreciate, a consistent approach, particularly in the area of competition where various interests are at stake. In this sense the Commission can support the views put forward by Mr Beumer.

The Commission also agrees with Mr von Bismarck that competition policy is not a goal in itself, but an instrument to regulate economic activity. The competition rules of Article 85 *et seq.* are not well suited to the sphere of cultural policy, which is, moreover, largely subject to national policy measures. The Commission has hitherto always adopted a cautious attitude with respect to national measures relating to competition rules for books, while expressly maintaining its competence and tasks as stipulated in Article 85 *et seq.*

Now, the essential point, we believe, for that reason, is the balancing of the interests involved. I attach great importance to the view expressed by Mr Beumer that the case pending before the Commission related to the Netherlands linguistic area is the occasion of this discussion but not the subject of it. I also attach importance to the fact that Mr Beumer stated that he is not arguing in favour of a single specific form of distribution of books. This has especial significance because, as was stated earlier, this specific matter is under instruction in the Commission, and I would therefore advise against the reference to this case in paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution.

Now, there may perhaps have been some misunderstanding regarding the Commission's standpoint in this matter. There is no doubt that the general policy on competition which the Commission pursues is a legitimate subject for discussion in Parliament, and this indeed is the case with the debate on the report on competition policy. Likewise, there is no objection to general aspects of competition policy such as the relationship between competition policy and cultural diversity being discussed in Parliament. However, the fact that, in a specific case, other aspects, in addition to the economic one, are involved, for example culture or public health or unemployment, constitutes as such no reason for deviating from the rule that specific decisions relating to the application of Article 85 *et seq.* should not be subject to prior consultation in Parliament.

**O'Kennedy**

Now, turning back to the balancing of interests between competition policy and cultural policy, the fundamental question is, what limitation of competition is necessary or acceptable in order to achieve the cultural goals. In the specific case of book prices, various systems operate, as has been said, in the different Member States of the Community. This in itself raises doubts as to whether such an extensive restriction on competition as that contained in the system of frozen prices is indispensable.

The document before us discusses in detail the alleged adverse consequences of a liberalization of book prices, although paragraph 4 of the motion for a resolution is worded more cautiously than the conclusions which the rapporteur draws in his explanatory statement. It is the Commission's opinion that further studies and experience as well as more detailed information are required to justify the conclusions drawn in the report on these negative consequences.

The Commission is actively engaged in obtaining this further information. It cannot therefore take it as an established fact that, for example, the abandonment of re-sale price maintenance necessarily leads to a drop in consumption. In a number of countries, for example the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, a drop in book sales has been observed in spite of the existence of fixed prices. By contrast, there was no fall-off in 1980 in France, where prices are free. There are therefore other causes which affect book sales, such as the prevailing economic climate and the apparent growing popularity of public libraries. The Commission therefore believes, as I stated earlier, that more information is required before we can draw firm conclusions in this regard.

Before the end of the year, therefore, a new study will be undertaken on competition in the book industry and in particular on the distribution aspect, which affects many small and medium-sized undertakings.

I shall now say a few words on policy. With regard to the suggestions made in paragraph 5, the Commission will establish clearly, using Article 85, a standpoint with regard to agreements aimed at the sale of books at fixed prices which are likely to affect trade between Member States. As regards the recommendations made in the second indent of paragraph 6, I have already pointed out that the possibilities available to the Commission with respect to influencing book prices on the basis of the relevant articles of the Treaties are limited. So the Community's rôle in respect of books should be an integral part of cultural policy as appropriately formulated by the Community. The responsibility for this belongs not with the Commissioner who is responsible for competition but, as I have said already, with the President of the Commission. In this connection too, the competition aspects will have to be considered.

Finally, the suggestion made in Amendment No 5, by Mr Penders, that 'pending the outcome of the Commission's investigations, the existing arrangements should not be affected' would naturally deprive the Commission of any possibility of accepting its responsibility should the occasion arise. In view of what I have already said about the task of the Commission with respect to Article 85, it will be clear that the Commission would not be willing to accept such a suggestion.

**President.** — I call Mr Beumer.

**Mr Beumer, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, I am pleased that the tenor in which Parliament began its debate on Monday has been continued and that everyone, including the Commission, is convinced of the need for a more detailed study. The Commission is doubtful about certain of the assumptions I have made in my report. I have my doubts about other assumptions. In any case, there is a great need for a study, and I am happy that an assurance has been given in this respect and that a deadline has been set for it.

One further point, Mr President. The Commissioner has said that he has some difficulty over Amendment No 5. The Committee's intention is to ensure that until the results of the study are available, the present regulations remain in force. This means that this gap will also have to be filled afterwards. Amendment No 5 is therefore of fundamental importance.

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

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

(Parliament adopted the preamble)

On paragraphs 1 to 7, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by the Liberal and Democratic Group and replacing these paragraphs with the following text:

1. Considers the answer to Oral Question No H-324/79, in which the Commission states that consultation of the European Parliament on the procedures for implementing Article 85 (3) is not compulsory, to be inadequate given that the problem under consideration does not relate solely to the economic interests explicitly referred to in Articles 85 and 86;
2. Notes that the problem of fixed prices for books directly affects the interests of the public (the consumer) in the fields of culture, education and information, which are not covered by the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community;
3. Considers that these interests cannot be neglected for the sake of a purely economic approach;
4. Calls on the Commission to inform Parliament of how it intends to resolve this specific problem, taking account in particular of the cultural interests of the consumer;

**President**

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Beumer, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, I consider that the original wording conveys the meaning sufficiently clearly. The amendment does not, I feel, add very much, and it leaves one essential point out. I recommend its rejection.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and adopted paragraph 1)*

**President.** — On paragraph 2, I have Amendment No 6, tabled by Mr Balfour on behalf of the European Democratic Group and replacing this paragraph with the following text:

- 2 Emphasizes that the cultural identity of Europe (in its diversity) may be seriously jeopardized *if all books, particularly those relating to minority cultural and ethnic interests, are left subject to free-market forces;*

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Beumer, rapporteur.** — (NL) This I can accept, Mr President, since it makes the text somewhat clearer.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 6 and then paragraph 3)*

**President.** — On paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 7, tabled by Mr Balfour on behalf of the European Democratic Group and replacing this paragraph with the following text:

4. Notes that the liberalization of prices, whilst making a wide range of popular and cultural books more readily available to the general public, may also have economic consequences which may be detrimental to a minority of consumers, namely:
  - greater disparities in the terms on which small booksellers and bulk purchasers purchase their goods,
  - the disappearance of small bookshops which have not specialized or adapted to take advantage of the flourishing 'end of run' trade, particularly in small towns,
  - the potentially serious consequences from the cultural point of view such as the decline in the number of titles sold, particularly in languages with a limited population circulation;
  - no reduction in the price of books which are not bestsellers;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Beumer, rapporteur.** — (NL) This, too, I can accept, Mr President. The order is somewhat more

logical than in the text of the motion. I advise its adoption.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 7)*

**President.** — After paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 2, tabled by Mr Delorozoy and inserting the following new paragraph:

- 4(a). Notes, on the other hand, that competition which might lead to disparities in prices could be a positive means of extending the circulation of books and the dissemination of culture;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Beumer, rapporteur.** — (NL) Now that the previous amendment has been adopted, this no longer seems to me to be so necessary. I have no particular objection to it, but no particular liking for it either. I regard it as superfluous and am therefore against it.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 2)*

**President.** — On paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 3, tabled by Mr Delorozoy and amending this paragraph as follows:

5. Hopes in these circumstances that the Commission will, as is required in the case of the agreement reached in the Dutch-speaking region, clearly define its policy on agreements aimed at guaranteeing the sale of books at fixed prices *and hopes that it will investigate whether Article 85 (3) may apply to cultural and educational property;*

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Beumer, rapporteur.** — (NL) I prefer the existing text, Mr President.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 3 and adopted, first paragraph 5, then the first indent of paragraph 6)*

**President.** — On the second indent of paragraph 6, I have Amendment No 4, tabled by Mr Delorozoy and amending this indent as follows:

- to put forward the necessary proposals on book prices (taking account in this connection of the widespread practice of laying down recommended prices, cut-price sales in the major distribution centres, the need to guarantee bookshops transparent and fair terms for the purchase of books, the system of internal subsidies) in order to guarantee a policy on books in the Community which is worthy of the unique rôle of this educational and cultural instrument;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Beumer, rapporteur.** — (NL) This is an improvement. I am in favour, Mr President.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 4)

**President.** — After the second indent of paragraph 6, I have Amendment No 5, tabled by Mr Penders and inserting the following new indent:

- considers at the same time that (parallel) reimportation of publications in the national language should be included and, pending the outcome of the enquiry, should not be allowed to affect existing arrangements;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Beumer, rapporteur.** — (NL) I am for this amendment, Mr President.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 5)

**President.** — On paragraph 7, I have Amendment No 8, tabled by Mr Balfour on behalf of the European Democratic Group and rewording this paragraph as follows:

- 7 Considers that it is necessary for the Community to ensure that minority ethnic and culture publications are distinguished from the popular mass market and that, if necessary, national governments should be permitted to assist those sectors where natural market forces are not sufficient to safeguard cultural interests,

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Beumer, rapporteur.** — (NL) This relates to the difficult position of small linguistic areas; therefore I am in favour.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 8 and then paragraph 8)

**President.** — I put, thus amended, the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

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

#### 19. Exemption of certain imports from VAT

**President.** — The next item is the report by Mr Nyborg, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (Doc. 1-646/80), on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-290/80) for a directive determining the scope of Article 14 (1) (d) of Directive 77/388/EEC as regards exemption

from value-added tax on the final importation of certain goods

I call Mr Nyborg.

**Mr Nyborg, rapporteur.** — (DK) Mr President, a year ago the European Parliament delivered its opinion on a proposal from the Commission aimed at creating uniform rules within the Member States on relief from customs duty. Correspondingly, the aim of the present proposal is to establish uniform rules on exemptions from VAT. In considering this proposal, the main concern of both the Commission and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs has been to create the greatest possible harmony between the rules on exemptions from customs duties on the one hand and from VAT on the other. This will not only facilitate the task of administration, but will also make the situation clearer both for commercial operators and for the citizens of the Community.

I shall not go into details of the discussions which took place in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. This is a technical proposal, and as we have seen, this Assembly prefers to discuss the major political tasks of the future rather than study in detail what has already been achieved.

Nevertheless, I think this proposal deserves the Assembly's attention, because we are dealing here with a field in which the Community's existence is brought home to every individual citizen and to the commercial operators in our Member States. It therefore plays a part in determining whether our cooperation is regarded as taking an appropriate course. I myself have been concerned with this field for several years now, and have therefore gained quite a clear idea of how much progress the Community has made in terms of establishing uniform rules on exemptions from customs and excise duties and VAT. Some legal provisions have been enacted in the form of regulations, others in the form of directives; some rules apply to firms, others to private individuals; different rules apply depending on whether goods are carried in travellers' personal luggage or sent by post.

All in all, we are in the process of drawing up a set of rules which may appear confusing to the individual citizen and be difficult for him to grasp. In saying this, I do not wish to disparage in any way the significant contribution which the Commission has made in this field over the years. Nor do I wish to propose that the various rules should be gathered together in a single piece of legislation. My aim is rather to ask the Commission to consider how we can best inform the general public and the commercial world of which rules apply in the various fields concerned.

This problem is one which we also encounter in our own Member States. The public cannot keep abreast of developments, the wheels of legislation turn too

**Nyborg**

quickly, the information provided is not good enough, and the problem is even worse when it comes to telling the public which laws have been adopted at Community level. I therefore wish to call attention to the problem of information. I do not expect the Commission to come up with a ready-made solution here and now, but I think that Parliament should lay particular emphasis on this aspect of the matter, and I therefore hope that before long the Commission will submit proposals for solving this problem of information.

As regards the specific amendments which are being proposed to the Council directive, I would for the most part simply refer the House to the comments contained in the explanatory statement.

There is one point, however, on which I personally have encountered some difficulties, namely the proposed text of Article 39. In this instance, I found myself in the by no means unfamiliar situation of disagreeing, as rapporteur, with the majority of the committee. The amendment which the committee is proposing to Article 39 was adopted despite opposition from myself and certain other members. The majority of the committee were seeking to prevent the abuse of VAT relief on small consignments which could occur in connection with mail-order businesses. I also subscribe to this aim; distortions of competition could be created if mail-order businesses in neighbouring third countries, or possibly in other Member States, were able to exploit this scheme for VAT relief systematically. I agree that we should take steps to prevent this happening, but the solution which the committee has chosen is ill-judged. From the administrative point of view, it is quite unfeasible to intervene at the point when such consignments are received. How would it be possible to check whether the same person received a small consignment once or twice a month, containing on one occasion a shirt and on another a book? The only point at which it is feasible to check for possible abuse is when the consignments are posted. The problem should therefore be solved by making mail-order businesses pay VAT on small consignments in the Member State in which the consignments are posted. I do not therefore disagree with the aim which the committee has expressed, but I agree with Mr von Wogau, who has tabled the two amendments, that the problem should be solved in a different way.

Having said that, Mr President, I would recommend the Assembly both to vote in favour of the amendments and to adopt the motion for a resolution.

**President.** — The Commission has the floor.

**Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission.** — I have been fairly quick so far this morning, Mr President, and as there is a Commission meeting this afternoon I have every inducement to get back to Brussels as soon

as I can. I do, however, want to welcome the report drawn up by Mr Nyborg on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and make one or two comments on it.

The Commission submitted this proposal with a view to further alignment and simplification of the VAT systems of Member States. The committee has adopted its usual very constructive and helpful rôle, and of the specific amendments proposed in the report I believe that those relating to samples, i.e., Article 25, and damaged vehicles, Article 46 A, are praiseworthy and fill noticeable gaps.

I am less happy about the other amendments. One of these relates to the time-limit for disposing of goods imported tax-free, i.e., Article 3, and we cannot accept that without the undesirable effect of possible discrimination against Community countries in the operation of this form of tax relief. Acceptance of the proposed increases in the limits for small consignments, Articles 39 and 40, would lead in our view to unnecessary administrative complications which in fact the provision is designed to avoid. These would be in relation to imports from third countries where the Commission has obtained a lower rate in its proposed regulation on customs reliefs. It may be that the higher limit could be acceptable for intra-Community imports subject to certain conditions: in particular I would not favour the proposed limit on consignments despatched regularly to the same consignee. This view is shared by Mr von Wogau, as indeed is shown by his amendment. The Commission will have to study the problem in greater depth to see what solution can be found.

Finally, Mr President, I would like to express my strong support for the committee's call to the Commission to increase public awareness of the tax reliefs available under Community legislation. Certainly I can assure Parliament that the Commission will address itself to this matter when the texts are adopted by the Council.

I am sorry, Mr President, that I have to rush so quickly through it, but I have the exhortation of Members ringing in my ears to be quick.

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

We shall now consider the proposal for a directive.

On Article 39 (1), I have Amendment No 2, tabled by Mr von Wogau and amending this text as follows:

1. Goods contained in small consignments of a total value not exceeding 20 ECU shall be admitted tax-free.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Nyborg, rapporteur.** — (DK) As I said in my speech, I support both amendments.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 2)

**President.** — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 3)

After paragraph 3, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr von Wogau and inserting the following paragraph:

3a. Further requests the Commission to draw up proposals designed to prevent mail-order businesses from gaining an advantage in terms of competition by virtue of Community provisions exempting them from customs and excise duties and value-added tax on small consignments of goods;

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1 and paragraph 4)

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

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

I call Mr Colleselli on a point of order.

**Mr Colleselli.** — (I) In my capacity as rapporteur on the present situation in viticulture in the Community, I should like to put a request to you, Mr President. This is the second time that discussion on this matter — which in my opinion is of great practical importance — is being postponed in spite of the fact that it has been entered on the agenda of the plenary sitting. My request is that at the next part-session it should not be scheduled for the closing hours on the Friday, as it has been today.

On behalf of my group I deplore — this is not meant as a reproach to the Chair but as a wish — the fact that matters of such importance are left until the last few hours of the part-session to be discussed. Given that I cannot present the report, at least grant me this legitimate and reasonable request.

**President.** — Mr Colleselli, you are perfectly right in drawing attention to the fact that today's agenda is clearly overloaded. In these circumstances, which we all regret, it may well be better not to call your report today. I note your request and will lay it before the Bureau.

<sup>1</sup> By a roll-call vote requested by Mr Pannella on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members (see the minutes of this sitting). For the text of this resolution, see OJ C 50 of 9. 3. 1981.

## 20. Western Sahara

**President.** — The next item is the report by Mr Lalor, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on the Western Sahara (Doc. 1-532/80).

I call Mr Lalor.

**Mr Lalor, rapporteur.** — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, at the outset I must protest at the intensive lobbying and diplomatic manoeuvres that have taken place over the placing of my report on the agenda this session. These moves are deplorable and are an insult to the dignity of the House.

I would remind Members that my report was adopted by the Political Affairs Committee as long ago as 20 and 22 October by 15 votes to 9, with 1 abstention. The report before you is in response to a number of resolutions: a resolution tabled by Mrs Lizin on 27 September 1979, a resolution tabled by Mr Glinne, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on 16 January 1980, a resolution tabled by Mr Habsburg and others on 15 February 1980. My report has been fully and adequately debated in committee and members of the Political Affairs Committee have had every opportunity to discuss the various aspects of the situation in the Western Sahara. I was astonished therefore at suggestions that my report should be sent back to that committee.

While I am aware that there are ongoing developments in relation to the whole situation there, I cannot understand how a report which essentially calls upon the protagonists to enter into a dialogue can be the subject of repeated efforts at stalling, changing and pushing back into committee. There is quite a lot more I would like to say at this stage, Mr President, but I will desist as because it is built into my original report.

I want to voice concern at the fate of the innocent peoples caught up in the hostilities in the Maghreb region. We must condemn any intervention, particularly of a military nature by third countries, as outlined earlier this week by President Sadat. Both Algeria and Morocco should and must provide every facility to the United Nations and the High Commissioner for Refugees to carry out a census of refugees in the area. They should also refrain from any action likely to increase any tension in that area.

My resolution calls on the Algerian Government not to authorize the use of its territory bordering on Morocco for the launching of armed attacks on that country. It also calls on the Moroccan Government not to invoke the right of pursuit, lest border incursions develop into armed and officially declared warfare between the two countries.

Finally, let me say, Mr President, that my report calls on the ten EEC governments to mediate between

**Lalor**

Morocco and Algeria with a view to achieving and maintaining peace and stability in this area. Seeing that this report calls for mediation and asks for the achievement of peace, I cannot, quite frankly, understand, as I said at the outset, all the machinations that have gone on to prevent this report from being presented to the House and the resolution being taken.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The Socialist Group has the floor.

**Mrs Van den Heuvel.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I too deplore the circumstances in which the debate on the Western Sahara is having to take place. I cannot, however, comply with your earlier request that I should limit my statement to three minutes, because this is, in my opinion, too important a matter. The Western Sahara, Mr President, enjoys considerable international interest. To give you a few examples, in May and June 1975 a United Nations study committee visited the area and reported on its findings. In October 1975 the International Court of Justice delivered an opinion on Morocco's and Mauritania's claims to this area. In October 1976 the International Federation for Human Rights published a number of recommendations. In July 1979 the Organization of African Unity adopted a resolution on the Western Sahara. In September 1979 the Conference of Nonaligned Countries included a section on the area in its final resolution. In February 1980 the United Nations Human Rights Commission discussed the problem, and in October 1980 the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution on the Western Sahara to add to those it had adopted on various occasions in the past. And now, Mr President, anyone who has read all these resolutions and statements and then Mr Lalor's motion for a resolution, will not believe his eyes. The UN study committee concluded after two months of intensive work in the area that the Polisario Front must be regarded as the dominant political force. The International Court of Justice stated that — and I quote — 'the factors and information that have been brought to its attention do not provide any evidence for the existence of bonds of territorial sovereignty between the area of the Western Sahara on the one hand and the Kingdom of Morocco or Mauritania on the other'. The Organization of African Unity calls for the people of the Western Sahara to be given the right to self-determination by means of free elections. The United Nations Human Rights Commission agrees with the OAU's recommendations as regards the right to self-determination. The General Assembly of the United Nations has also confirmed, by 88 votes to 6, that the Saharan people have an inalienable right to self-determination, appealing to Morocco to open negotiations with delay.

And these international efforts, Mr President, have not been unsuccessful. After all, Mauretania was

originally involved in the conflict, but a peace treaty has now put an end to the fighting between the Polisario and Mauretania.

And to be honest, I cannot help feeling that the rapporteur, whether deliberately or not, wants to close his eyes to the overwhelming number of international statements. According to the rapporteur and to the majority of the Political Affairs Committee the matter is very simple: what we have in the Western Sahara is a conflict between Algeria and Morocco, and the governments of those countries therefore simply have to start negotiating soon. How Mr Lalor arrives at this resolution has not been explained to Parliament today. And there is more: this resolution is not accompanied by any kind of written explanation for this Parliament. But there was an explanatory statement before the Political Affairs Committee at the time. Why that document is now being withheld from you Members of Parliament, ladies and gentlemen, I am unable to understand. I can only assume that the rapporteur does not consider his own arguments worthy of submission to this Parliament. All I can say is that there are in this Parliament a number of Members who, in the opinion of my group, intend to approve a one-sided position despite the weakness of the arguments supporting it. A classic example of this was the statement issued by a number of our colleagues after a few day's visit to Morocco. After they had talked with one of the parties involved in the conflict, they knew precisely what was going on, despite all the investigations which had previously been carried out and had resulted in completely different conclusions being drawn.

This Parliament, Mr President, must have a few particularly intelligent Members — or perhaps I should say: of all the nerve. To be honest, Mr President, even in groups apart from my own there are Members who think this is going too far. According to a press report, Mr Beumer has dissociated himself from the remarks made by Mr Janssen van Raay, a member of his own party, and others. I wonder why, Mr President, and this is not the first time that the thought has come to me, why people who are so sure that a given liberation movement does not have the backing of the people are not the first to call for free elections. That is the obvious way to find out who is right. It will not therefore surprise you, Mr President, that the Socialist Group completely rejects this resolution. In the resolution we tabled pursuant to Rule 14, this being the only procedural way still open to us, we made a final attempt to get Parliament to make a balanced statement. This is no longer possible because our request for an urgent debate was rejected. After all that has happened in this Parliament, we can only tell the Saharan people that, however the vote goes on this resolution, they can continue to count on the solidarity of Socialists in Europe.

**President.** — The list of speakers is closed.

**President**

I call Mr Habsburg to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD):

**Mr Habsburg.** — (D) Mr President, at the beginning of this week we listened to a voice of peace and freedom in this Chamber. Mr Lalor's report is one of the most outstanding appeals for peace in North Africa.

I am sorry that someone who does not have the slightest idea about North Africa should come out with all kinds of figures here. Again and again I find that those who have been there are in favour of the Lalor report, while those who know nothing about that part of the world are against it.

I ask you all to vote for the Lalor report. That is a personal request from me. But I do know that, with a few exceptions, the Christian Democrats are in favour.

(Applause)

**President.** — Time obliges me to adjourn this debate. It will be resumed at the next part-session.

### 21. Verification of credentials

**President.** — At its meeting yesterday, the Bureau verified the credentials of Mr Kappos, whose appointment has already been announced. Pursuant to Rule 3 (1) of the Rules of Procedure, the Bureau has made sure that this appointment complies with the provisions of the Treaties. It therefore asks the House to ratify this appointment.

Are there any objections?

This appointment is ratified.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Mr President, as you make announcements on behalf of the Bureau — and some very important ones among them — I would ask you to remember that we must wait until what has been said has been translated by the interpreters. When you ask us, for example, if there are any objections, you have already passed on to the next item before we have heard what the interpreters have to say. Therefore, Mr President, allow me to make this recommendation: when you read out announcements to us, please allow for the time the translation takes before asking us if we have any observations.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, I hope you are not protesting against the proposal to ratify Mr Kappos's appointment.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) No, Mr President, and for that reason I am very glad not to have intervened. I was not in disagreement; it was simply that I did not know what you were saying.

### 22. Time-limit for tabling amendments

**President.** — I propose to the House that the time-limit for tabling amendments to all reports scheduled for the next part-session, insofar as these have been tabled within the time-limits prescribed, be fixed for 2 p.m. on Friday, 6 March 1981, on the understanding that the corresponding time-limit for reports that have been held over until the following part-session remains in force.

Are there any objections?

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Mr President, I feel that the proposal that has been made to the few Members still present is vexing and unacceptable. You are proposing, Mr President, that amendments to the debates which are to be held during the next part-session should be tabled even before the part-session begins, on the previous Friday.

But, Mr President, as you know and as Members know, very often documents do not reach us before we leave, which means, Mr President, that this system prevents any Member who is neither the President nor a bureaucrat from stating his views through amendments. This is an almost scientific way of preventing Members from 'bothering' their groups by making suggestions, at least within the groups. What is even more serious — and, to be frank, this is unworthy of a Bureau — is that Members do not know that it is being proposed that at the next part-session, early on Tuesday morning, within the space of three hours, they should adopt 110 amendments to our Rules of Procedure, thus establishing a new set of Rules, a new constitution for our Parliament. It will not even be possible to study them at home before we leave or to discuss them. The EPP and the Socialists want to prevent such discussions at group meetings before the week set aside for this purpose and the subsequent tabling of amendments, if only on the Monday at 6 p.m. Mr President — and you know that this is not aimed at you, but at the Bureau or enlarged Bureau — this is quite simply shameful. It is a scientific attempt to undermine the very roots of the democratic rules which govern our Parliament. Consequently, Mr President, we object to Friday as the time-limit. This has nothing to do with the agenda. I call on the Assembly to reject the proposal that has been put to it.

To sum up, Mr President, I propose that the Assembly reject the proposal you have just made, that amend-

**Pannella**

ments should be tabled at the latest on the Friday before the part-session. I hope it will be possible to table further amendments up to 6 p.m. on the Monday, as has always been the case. I also propose, Mr President, that you should ascertain whether enough Members are present for the Friday before the next part-session to be set as the time-limit for tabling amendments. I therefore call on ten Members to support this request that it be ascertained whether a quorum exists, in order to avoid a situation in which absent Members are prevented from tabling amendments on the Monday of the next part-session.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, you know very well that if there are 100 amendments that have to be got ready for translating, you will be protesting on the Monday because they have not yet been translated. There is also another practical difficulty in that the printing has to begin at the latest on the Friday. That is why the Bureau proposes the time-limit of 2 p.m. on Friday, 6 March.

I call Mr Patterson.

**Mr Patterson.** — Mr President, I hope you and the House will forgive me if on this occasion I am on the same side as Mr Pannella, though for slightly different reasons. I ask you and the Bureau to think again before you put this matter to the House today, partly because there are so few of us here, and secondly, I find it curious that we are asked to fix a deadline for amendments on an agenda which we have not yet received.

The second reason, I think, is much more important. As Mr Pannella says, the Luster report is coming up for debate, or so we understand. Now if the deadline is fixed for the Friday, the groups will have met but will have never had any chance to get together to conciliate, and I suspect that the key to getting any of these reports through on the Rules of Procedure is that the groups shall agree and conciliate on the amendments. I know there is something in the pink pages about late amendments which are compromises being able to be tabled, but this is a very dodgy procedure — I hope that is translated properly — and is very seldom used. I beg of you, at least for the Luster report and possibly for other contentious reports, please allow at least one afternoon for the groups to conciliate before the deadline for tabling amendments. Otherwise, what the Bureau is going to do is to condemn this report to the same fate as the last report. Mr Pannella is right on this occasion, and I hope the House will agree with me and with him.

*(Mr Pannella repeated his request for the establishment of a quorum)*

**President.** — No, you cannot do that. Rule 33 states that 'Parliament may . . . settle its agenda whatever the

number of Members present'. The question of a quorum does not apply to the application of Rule 33(1) . . .

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* Mr President, do you really want to play that game at this time of the day?

**President.** — I am not playing!

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* In this particular case, it is more appropriate to cite Rule 29 (1), second subparagraph, than Rule 33 (1). I therefore ask those of our colleagues who are present to rise to their feet for the very reasons which Mr Patterson has just explained.

**President.** — Are there ten Members prepared to stand up to support Mr Pannella's request?

*(A number of Members rose to their feet)*

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* There are ten, Mr President!

**President.** — That is out of the question.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* There are ten, Mr President; I am sorry, but there are ten!

Mr President, I appeal to your personal honesty to establish whether a quorum is present.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, you asked me to establish whether there was a quorum and I asked whether there were ten Members prepared to support your request. In fact, there were only nine.

*(Lively protests from Mr Pannella)*

I propose that at the beginning of the next part-session Mr Pannella ask for a vote of no confidence in the present occupant of the Chair: the House will decide.

*(Cries from various benches)*

Mr Pannella, if you agree, I shall note the incident and the remarks you have made. If necessary, the Bureau will decide whether any procedural errors have been committed. The proposal you have criticized will be put to it; no decision has been taken.

### 23. *Tabling of a motion for a resolution*

**President.** — I have received from Mrs Van den Heuvel and others a motion for a resolution, pursuant

**President**

to Rule 54, on a modification of Rule 14 (3) of the Rules of Procedure (Doc. 1-922/80).

24. *Dates of the next part-session*

**President.** — There are no other items on the agenda. I thank the representatives of both Council and Commission for their contributions to our debates.

The enlarged Bureau proposes that our next sittings be held at Strasbourg during the week from 9 to 13 March.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

25. *Approval of the minutes*

**President.** — Rule 17 (2) of the Rules of Procedure requires me to lay before Parliament, for its approval, the minutes of proceedings for this sitting, which were written during the debates.

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

26. *Adjournment of the session*

**President.** — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting closed at 2.15 p.m.)*

---



ANNEX

AMENDMENTS<sup>1</sup>

relating to the motion for a resolution  
on the position of women in the European  
Community

---

<sup>1</sup> These amendments are reproduced in numerical order. Numbers missing belong to texts that were withdrawn before the vote.



Motion for a resolution  
on the position of women in the European  
Community  
(Doc. 1-829/80)

Amendment No 1  
tabled by Mrs Lizin  
on behalf of the Socialist Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 4a (new)

Add the following new paragraph after paragraph 4:

- '4a. Requests the Commission to propose as a matter of urgency a legal instrument to protect the status of unemployed women with a view to banning any practices, in particular indirect discrimination, which prejudice women's rights to unemployment benefit by establishing an entitlement based on their position within the household rather than their right to work. This instrument should enable priority to be given to the status of unemployed women, in view of the way women's rights have been infringed as a result of the crisis, and to remove the confusion about the status of women within the body of social security regulations referred to in the third directive but not applicable until 1984; it is essential for this time limit to be brought forward;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 2  
tabled by the Liberal and Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 52

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '52. *proposes that, to support and assist European policy to ameliorate the position of women, universities should participate in theoretical research into the role of women in all social sectors and . . . (remainder unchanged);'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No 3  
tabled by the Liberal and Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 27

(a) third indent

After the word 'child-care' add:

- 'having regard to the important need to bring about a change in the situation in families, especially of parents, through the use of local and regional media (radio, press, television);'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No 4  
tabled by the Liberal and Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 28 c)

Replace this by the following:

- 'c) abolition of the age limit for attendance by women with family responsibilities at courses of training,'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 5  
tabled by the Liberal and Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 54

Replace this paragraph by the following:

- '54. Since this report demonstrates that equality between men and women is far from being achieved:
- considers that the European Parliament must closely monitor the Commission's implementation of the three existing directives;
  - considers also that the European Parliament must ensure that the Commission implements the various measures contained in this resolution effectively;
  - considers that the European Parliament must examine all proposals for regulations, recommendations and directives to ascertain the effect they may have on improving the position of women;
  - therefore considers that a permanent committee on women's rights must be set up within the European Parliament, pursuant to Rule 37 of the Rules of Procedure.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 6  
tabled by Mrs Hoffmann, Mrs de March, Mrs Poirier, Mrs Le Roux, Mr Ansart, Mr Piquet, Mr Frischmann and Mr Chambeiron

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Preamble

Add the following two recitals after the fifth recital:

- '— considering that the particularly sharp increase in unemployment among women in recent years has essentially been caused by the European integration policy, resulting in the coordination of austerity measures by the governments in each country, and an unprecedented industrial breakdown in sectors with a preponderance of female labour such as the clothing and textile industry, data processing and the agrifoodstuffs industry etc. . . .
- therefore demands the cessation of all industrial restructuring plans,'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 7  
tabled by Mrs Hoffmann, Mrs de March, Mrs Poirier, Mrs Le Roux, Mr Ansart, Mr Piquet, Mr Frischmann and Mr Chambeiron

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraphs 1 to 6

Replace these paragraphs by the following:

1. Considers that the action taken to date by the European Institutions has not helped to reduce inequality nor to abolish the discrimination from which women in all Member States suffer;
2. Notes that, on the contrary, conditions for women have deteriorated in a whole range of areas such as employment, wages, education, vocational training and participation in social and political life;
3. Notes that the Council directives implementing Article 119 of the Treaty of Rome on equal pay and equal treatment of men and women workers have not actually been applied in any of the Member States and that, far from narrowing, the gap between men's and women's salaries is increasing;
4. Notes that of the 8 million unemployed in the EEC women account for 45 % and that one in four working women have a part-time job;
5. Notes that employment is becoming more insecure and that women are generally restricted to inferior jobs which do not require skilled training and in which there are no prospects of promotion;
6. Notes that existing legislation on vocational training is not implemented in the same way for the two sexes and that women workers generally do not receive vocational training suited to their needs;
- 6a. Notes that segregation of girls in education is more pronounced at secondary and tertiary levels;
- 6b. Notes that although legislation, forced through by women, exists on sex education and voluntary termination of pregnancy, this legislation is generally badly implemented through lack of finance and adequate structures;
- 6c. Considers that, in spite of increasing participation by women in the social and political life of their countries, the percentage of women in government and elected assemblies is still very low by comparison with their numbers and abilities;
- 6d. Considers that the worsening of living and working conditions for women in the EEC is a direct consequence of the coordination of austerity measures at EEC level, industrial restructuring plans and the acceleration of economic and political integration policies.'

\* \* \*

## Amendment No 8

tabled by Mrs Hoffmann, Mrs de March, Mrs Poirier, Mrs Le Roux, Mr Ansart, Mr Piquet, Mr Frischmann and Mr Chambeiron

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraphs 13, 14 and 15

Replace these paragraphs by the following:

13. Considers that part-time work is in fact only concealed and unpaid unemployment;
14. Considers that employment among women cannot be solved by a redistribution of work between men and women;
15. Calls for a general reduction in working hours to 35 hours a week and a fifth week of paid holiday for women workers who do not already have this; this reduction in working hours should not involve a reduction in earnings.'

\* \* \*

## Amendment No 9

tabled by Mrs Hoffmann, Mrs de March, Mrs Poirier, Mrs Le Roux, Mr Ansart, Mr Piquet, Mr Frischmann and Mr Chambeiron

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

## Paragraph 16

Replace paragraph 16 by the following:

- '16. Considers that it is in women's interests to promote the harmonization of social security, retirement and maternity legislation on the basis of the most advanced legislation in the Member States;
- 16a. Considers that the protective legislation in the majority of Member States, which is not of a discriminatory but essentially humanitarian nature, should be developed in line with technological and scientific trends;

\* \* \*

## Amendment No 10

tabled by Mrs Hoffmann, Mrs de March, Mrs Poirier, Mrs Le Roux, Mr Ansart, Mr Piquet, Mr Frischmann and Mr Chambeiron

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

## Paragraph 44

Replace this paragraph by the following:

- '44. Notes that the position of women in countries applying for membership of the EEC is considerably worse than in the majority of European countries;
- 44a. Considers that the inferior position of women in Spain and Portugal is one result of several decades of dictatorship;
- 44b. Notes that consideration of the situation indicates a lack of social legislation regarding:
  - access to employment,
  - access to vocational training,
  - education,
  - the exercise of trade union and political rights;
- 44c. Considers that enlargement of the EEC to include these countries, by extending the multinationals' field of operations, cannot improve the position of Portuguese and Spanish women and that it would be the means of forcing a deterioration in the position of women in the other EEC countries by harmonization of legislation on the basis of the worst situation;
- 44d. Therefore opposes further enlargement of the EEC.'

\* \* \*

## Amendment No 11

tabled by Mrs Spaak

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

## Paragraphs 13, 14 and 15

Replace these paragraphs by the following:

- '13. Asks for a reorganization of working time and a redistribution of work between men and women to facilitate a better division of efforts between partners in the household, in the raising of children and in active employment;
- 14. Urges the Commission to draw up proposals granting part-time workers the same rights as other workers whilst ensuring that the extension of part-time employment does not halt other forms of reorganization of working time.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 12  
tabled by Mrs Spaak

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraphs 34, 35 and 36

Replace these paragraphs by the following text:

- '34. Notes that owing to their role as mothers, women are confronted with specific problems for which training in matters of health, preventive measures, aid and research are necessary and considers that motherhood by choice is one of the most important features of the new role of women;
35. Requests the Commission to initiate an interdisciplinary research programme with the following goals:
- 1) Coordination and encouragement of research currently in progress to extend knowledge of conception and contraceptive methods with regard to their effectiveness and the physiological and psychological side-effects of methods currently practised;
  - 2) Coordination and encouragement of demographic studies on the basis of which developments in Europe can be forecast and which take account of the social parameters which may influence such developments;
  - 3) Coordination and encouragement of experiments and surveys concerning the present and future situation as regards sex education for young people and adults and advice on marital and family matters;
36. Considers that contraception has played a major part in improving the position of women; regrets however that the right to contraception, including appropriate information at the appropriate time for young people, is not yet recognized and operative in all Member States;
- 36a. Considers that in order to avoid clandestine abortions or abortions taking place abroad, voluntary termination of pregnancy should be available to all women of every social class in all Member States when they are in distress (concept defined by the World Health Organization) and that adequate specialist facilities should be provided;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 13  
tabled by Mrs Spakk

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 54

Replace this paragraph by the following:

- '54. Decides that a small working party should be organized to ensure the follow-up of the work of the *ad hoc* Committee on Women's Rights'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 14  
tabled by Mrs Hoffmann, Mrs de March, Mrs Poirier, Mrs Le Roux, Mr Ansart, Mr Piquet, Mr Frischmann and Mr Chambeiron

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 18

Delete this paragraph.

\* \* \*

Amendment No 15  
 tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Preamble, 12th indent

Replace this indent with the following new text:

‘— whereas for various historical, physiological, cultural, political, economic and social reasons, women in the Community still labour under certain social, educational and financial disadvantages and forms of discrimination which limit their opportunities for leading a full and satisfying life,’

\* \* \*

Amendment No 16  
 tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 6

Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 17  
 tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 7, first indent

This indent to read as follows:

‘— the Commission and the Member States to organize a large-scale information campaign in order to make the countries of the Community more aware than hitherto of the facilities offered by the European Social Fund (*remainder deleted*);’

\* \* \*

Amendment No 18  
 tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 8

Delete the phrase ‘by means of finance from the future social fund for women’.

\* \* \*

Amendment No 19  
tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION Paragraph 11

Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 20  
tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 11a (new)

After para. 11, add the following new paragraph under the heading 'Further action':

'11a. Believes that the role of European legislation in the area of womens rights should not be to coerce nations with different social traditions to follow exactly the pattern of the most sophisticated or furthest advanced, but to encourage Member States to create conditions in which it is possible for women to choose whether or not to take up employment in full freedom and with the same opportunities as those available to men;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 21  
tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 12, last indent

Delete the last indent

('a greater awareness . . . with development aid').

\* \* \*

Amendment No 22  
tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 13,

Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 23  
 tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 15

Replace this paragraph with the following new text:

'15. Urges that, wherever possible, the social and financial disadvantages of this type of employment should be eliminated;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 24  
 tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 17

Replace this paragraph with the following new text:

'17. Notes that the rate of shift-working in the Community is increasing and points out that shiftwork can be a help to the achievement of an equitable division of efforts between men and women in the home and in the care of children;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 25  
 tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 18a and 18b (new)

After para. 18, add the following two new paragraphs under the heading 'Social and family services':

'18a. Notes with concern that many married women who work outside the home are in effect required to do two jobs — paid work outside the home and unpaid domestic work at home — and consequently work hours which would be unacceptably long by the standards of any national legislation;

18b. Considers therefore that part of the Community's education policy should be devoted to encouraging the provision in all Member States of instruction for boys in skills (e.g. cooking, child care) which would in time encourage and enable men to share in domestic work responsibilities;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 26  
 tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 19

Delete the word 'education' in the phrase 'parental education leave'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No 27  
tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 33

Delete the second and third subparagraphs and indents (a) and (b)

\* \* \*

Amendment No 28  
tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 40

Replace the words 'draw up a European statute for such women based on the following principles', with the following text:

*'encourage Member States to consider incorporating the following principles in their legislation'.*

\* \* \*

Amendment No 29  
tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 42

Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 30  
tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 49, 3rd subparagraph

This subparagraph to read as follows:

'Points out that the ratio of men to women employed as officials in the institutions of the European Communities reflects the unequal ratio of men to women employed in the Community itself and requests the Commission to submit a report to Parliament within six months on the employment situation of *the* female employees of *Community institutions* together with adequate proposals for improving this situation'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No 31  
tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 51  
Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 32  
tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 53  
Delete the second subparagraph of this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 33  
tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 54  
This paragraph to read as follows:

'54. Decides that the *ad hoc* Committee on Womens Rights as of now be discharged of its duties (*remainder deleted*);

\* \* \*

Amendment No 34  
tabled by Mr Forth  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Preamble

Add the following new indents at the end of the preamble:

- having regard to the difficult economic environment and scarce resources of the Community,
- bearing in mind the many priorities competing for available resources,
- wishing to respect local and regional customs, mores and traditions;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 35  
tabled by Mr Forth  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 1  
Delete the following phrase:  
'and considers that further action is needed in this respect'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No 36  
tabled by Mr Forth  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 10  
Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 37  
tabled by Mr Forth  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 53  
Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 38  
tabled by Mr Cottrell  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 7

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '7. Notes with satisfaction . . . as regards access to these funds and therefore *suggests*:  
— that no Member State should in principle receive more than 30 % of the funds available but that where a Member State fails to claim its share by a given deadline, the funds outstanding should be distributed according to the order in which applications have been received; *and asks*:  
— (*remainder unchanged*);'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 39  
tabled by Mr Cottrell  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 12, first subparagraph

In the first subparagraph, replace the words 'undertake a wide-ranging policy', with the phrase  
'*support efforts*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 40  
tabled by Mr Cottrell  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 45  
Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 41  
tabled by Mr Cottrell  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 46  
Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 42  
tabled by Mr Cottrell  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 49, first subparagraph  
In the first subparagraph, replace the word 'strengthened' with the word  
'improved'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No 43  
tabled by Mr Cottrell  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 49, final subparagraph  
Delete this subparagraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 44  
tabled by Mr Forth and Mr Cottrell  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 47  
Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 45  
tabled by Mr Forth and Mr Cottrell  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 48  
Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 46  
tabled by Mr Forth

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 18  
Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 47  
tabled by Mr Forth

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 27 (c)  
Delete this subparagraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 48  
tabled by Mr Forth

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 44  
Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 49  
tabled by Mr Cottrell

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 38  
Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 50  
tabled by Mr Cottrell

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 49, 2nd and 3rd subparagraphs

Replace the second and third subparagraphs with the following single text:

'Requests the Commission to submit a report to Parliament on the employment situation of female employees.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 51  
tabled by Mr Cottrell

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 50

Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 52  
tabled by Mr Vie, Mr Cronin, Mr Davern, Mr Flanagan, Mr Lalor and Miss de Valera

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 2 (d)

Delete this paragraph.

\* \* \*

Amendment No 53  
tabled by Mr Vié, Mr Cronin, Mr Davern, Mr Flanagan, Mr Lalor and Miss de Valera

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 12, 2nd subparagraph — 6th indent

Amend to read as follows:

'— health protection for women, with particular reference to the right to responsible and freely chosen motherhood and the right of infants to benefit from the support of society *prior to birth*.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 54  
tabled by Mr Vié, Mr Cronin, Mr Davern, Mr Flanagan, Mr Lalor and Miss de Valera

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 15, first indent

Amend to read as follows:

— notes that the benefits of part-time work largely offset various social and financial disadvantages and urges that the right to the same working conditions, . . . (remainder unchanged);

\* \* \*

Amendment No 55

tabled by Mr Vié, Mr Cronin, Mr Davern, Mr Flanagan, Mr Lalor and Miss de Valera

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 18

Replace this paragraph by the following text:

'18. Requests the Dublin Foundation to draw up a report on the different legislation in the Member States on the reduction of working hours and part-time work and to submit this to the European Parliament;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 56

tabled by Mr Vié, Mr Cronin, Mr Davern, Mr Flanagan, Mr Lalor and Miss de Valera

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 22 — last subparagraph

Amend to read as follows:

'Asks the Commission, in the case of policy developments concerning new technologies, to state in concrete terms what will be their effects on the situation and employment and at the same time to state how consequences that might be prejudicial to *workers* may be avoided or otherwise dealt with;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 57

tabled by Mr Vié, Mr Cronin, Mr Davern, Mr Flanagan, Mr Lalor and Miss de Valera

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 34

Replace this paragraph by the following:

'34. Considers that the Commission is not competent in this matter and does not have the right to propose harmonization of the Member States' legislation on contraception, termination of pregnancy and abortion, in other words to impose a code of ethics that must develop from the individual's cultural, spiritual and moral background;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 58

tabled by Mr Vié, Mr Cronin, Mr Davern, Mr Flanagan, Mr Lalor and Miss de Valera

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 35

Replace this paragraph by the following:

- '35. Considers that these are purely matters of individual conscience and asks Member States to take the necessary measures to set up and develop reception and information centres and medical services, to pool their research work and support the efforts of the European Association of Doctors;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 59  
tabled by Mr Vie, Mr Cronin, Mr Davern, Mr Flanagan, Mr Lalor and Miss de Valera

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 39  
Delete this paragraph.

\* \* \*

Amendment No 60  
tabled by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Recitals, first indent  
This indent to read as follows:

- whereas even in the highly industrialized countries, including those of the European Community, unacceptable conditions of subordination of women have not been overcome and whereas developments in recent decades have raised new obstacles to the full and free affirmation of women in economic and social life, in the family and in relations between the sexes.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 61  
tabled by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

First recital, fourth indent  
In this indent, delete the words 'in the family'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 62/rev.  
tabled by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Last recital ('drawing attention')  
Delete the words  
'with the exception of certain unfortunate passages'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 63  
tabled by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 7, first indent

This indent to read as follows:

- The Commission and the Member States to organize a large-scale information campaign in order to make the countries of the Community more aware than hitherto of the facilities offered by the European Social Fund; (*rest deleted*).

\* \* \*

Amendment No 64  
tabled by Mrs Boot

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 2(a), second indent

Delete the word 'supplementary'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 65  
tabled by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 8

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '8. notes that the high and increasing number of unemployed women in the Member States of the European Community makes it necessary to draw up common proposals to combat unemployment among women; (*rest deleted*)'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 66  
tabled by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 10

Delete this paragraph.

\* \* \*

Amendment No 67  
tabled by Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 12, last indent

In this indent delete the word '(conditions)'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No 68  
tabled by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Part II, title of point 1

This title to read as follows:

'1. *Problems relating to the restructuring of working time*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 69  
tabled by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 15, first subparagraph

This subparagraph to read as follows:

'— insists that part-time work should not be treated as a form of work intended primarily for women but for all workers — both men and women — who have particular requirements (students, handicapped, retired persons, etc.) and that, in all cases, part-time workers should benefit from the same rights as other workers;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 70  
tabled by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 18

In this paragraph delete the words 'part-time working and'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 71  
tabled by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 27

This paragraph to read as follows:

'27. proposes to the Commission that it should submit to the Council a motion for a resolution calling upon the Member States to adopt provisions to promote in schools of all kinds and at all levels:

- equal training and co-education for boys and girls;
- the adoption of measures to encourage girls to follow technical and scientific courses;
- promotion of studies on the condition of women in society and introduction of relevant material into the syllabus;
- measures to give teachers of all kinds and at all grades up-to-date training for the above purposes;
- adoption of measures to prevent premature cessation of studies by girls, this to be facilitated by the creation of appropriate services;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 72  
by Mrs Macciocchi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 24a (new)

After paragraph 24 insert the following new paragraph:

- '24a. Deplores the absence of a woman representative among the 14 Members of the new Commission, in spite of the vote by Parliament which adopted a clear position in calling on the governments to appoint to the Commission a number of women proportionate to the female electorate in Europe.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 73  
tabled by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 34, fourth indent (new)

Add the following final indent:

- '— calls upon the Commission to exclude discriminatory provisions against women from directives on health protection at the work place thus ensuring equal protection for male and female workers.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 74  
tabled by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 38, first indent, sixth sub-indent (new)

Add the following new sixth sub-indent:

- '— the right to vote and stand for election in administrative elections.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 75  
tabled by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 40, introductory text

This text to read as follows:

- '40. takes the view that the large group of women working in family businesses makes a very important contribution to the social and economic development of the Community, and is concerned to note that their legal, financial and social position is in many ways deficient and calls on the Commission to prepare a directive on the harmonization of legislation governing family businesses to ensure the following rights for women in this category.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 76  
tabled by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 40, fourth indent

Convert this indent into the following new paragraph:

'calls upon the Commission to arrange forms of economic support, in the context of its policies, for family undertakings to enable the latter to pay the contributions necessary to ensure that women employed in them have the right to a fair system of social provisions, particularly as regards family benefits and replacement in the business during the last six weeks of pregnancy and the first six weeks of motherhood, and in the event of disablement or illness, the right to a fair amount of leave and the right to a separate old-age pension;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 77  
tabled by Mrs Barbarella, Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 41

Fifth paragraph to read as follows:

'41. points out that the phenomenon of women working in family businesses is particularly to be found in the agricultural sector where working conditions and pay are at present extremely poor, and urges the Commission to bear this in mind when drawing up proposals for the reform of the common agricultural policy, according to the following principles:

- specific actions for the benefit of family farms;
- stronger structural and infrastructural measures in particular in the Mediterranean regions and in hill and mountain areas;
- development in these areas of the establishment and strengthening of industries associated with agriculture;
- improvement, especially in these areas, of public service structures in rural regions;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 78  
tabled by Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 43, first indent

This indent to read as follows:

'— points out that in the Community regional disparities have worsened and that in the depressed areas exclusion from productive life, the widespread phenomenon of black work and the lack of social services are having an adverse influence on the life of women;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 79  
tabled by Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 45, add the following two subparagraphs after the third subparagraphs:

'stresses the obvious links between the cessation of economic growth in the Member States of the EEC and the major problems of world underdevelopment and disparate growth rates between the North and South; therefore calls upon the Commission and Council to reflect the wishes of European women by stepping up all actions in favour of peace and international detente with a view to a gradual reduction in armaments and the search for a new world economic order;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 80  
tabled by Mr Spinelli, Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mrs Squarcialupi

#### MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 53, second subparagraph

This subparagraph to read as follows:

'hopes that, beginning with the 1982 budget, the problem of own resources will be dealt with according to the proposals made in the report by the Committee on Budgets, Doc. 1-772/80;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 81  
tabled by Mrs Lenz, Mrs Gaiotti, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Narducci, Mr Del Duca, Mr Michel, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mrs Lentz-Cornette and Mrs Boot  
on behalf of the Group of the EPP

#### MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Preamble, final indent (new) to be added:

'— whereas the proposals that follow provide guidance for the achievement of women's rights and will be given exhaustive consideration in the appropriate parliamentary committees;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 82  
tabled by Mrs Lenz, Mrs Gaiotti, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Narducci, Mr Del Duca, Mr Michel, Mrs Cassanmagnago, Mrs Lentz-Cornette and Mrs Boot  
on behalf of the Group of the EPP

#### MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 2 (a) second indent to read:

'— a supplementary directive on equal treatment for male and female workers in the Member States' fiscal legislation *taking into account the relationship between family income and the number of dependants;*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 83  
by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase, Mrs Lenz, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Narducci, Mr Del Duca, Mr Michel, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mrs Lentz-Cornette and Mrs Boot  
on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group)

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 12, sixth indent

Amend as follows:

- ‘— health protection for women, with particular reference to the right to responsible and freely chosen motherhood and the right of infants to benefit from the support of society *even before* the moment of birth;’

\* \* \*

## Amendment No 84

by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase, Mrs Lenz, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Narducci, Mr Del Duca, Mr Michel, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mrs Lentz-Cornette and Mrs Boot on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group)

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 15, second subparagraph

Amend as follows:’

- ‘— hopes that shorter working hours will not be used as an instrument to increase *artificially* the flexibility of the labour market, to pursue conjunctural policies . . . (rest unchanged);’

\* \* \*

## Amendment No 85/rev.

tabled by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Lenz, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Narducci, Mr Del Duca, Mr Michel, Mrs Boot, Mrs Lentz-Cornette, Mr Bersani and Mr Estgen on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group)

## MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 34, 35 and 36

Replace these paragraphs with the following text:

- ‘34 (1) — Notes that, in their role as mothers, women are faced by special problems which call for health education, preventive measures, assistance and research;
- Regards the possibility to take a responsible decision on the question of motherhood as one of the most important aspects of the new role of women; considers, however, that, on the basis of present scientific knowledge of birth control and the risks connected with the contraceptives on the market, and of economic, cultural and psychological conditions, this possibility is still far from being fully guaranteed;
- (2) — Regrets that, as a result of this situation, recourse to abortion as a method of birth control is still increasing and that:
- on the one hand, in countries where there is no abortion legislation, illegal abortions are a regular occurrence and frequently have serious consequences for the women concerned (and for their physical and psychological well-being),
- on the other hand, in countries with abortion legislation there is frequently a shortage of specialist equipment and there may be a tendency to consider abortion as a normal procedure and enough in itself to solve the problems facing women;
- notes, nevertheless, that the relevant legislation in the Member States varies so widely that women frequently have to seek help in other countries, which also leads to unacceptable commercial exploitation;’
- (3) — considers that at Community level the whole problem of motherhood can be dealt with only in practical terms bearing in mind the radical changes which have already taken place in our society and the effects of new developments linked to the technological revolution;

- calls upon the Commission therefore to set up an interdisciplinary programme of research with the following objectives:
  - (a) coordination and development of existing research into conception, new methods of contraception for men and women (with particular reference to natural methods), their effectiveness and the physiological and psychological side-effects of the methods currently in use;
  - (b) coordination and development of demographic studies into future population trends in Europe, the social factors influencing them and related effects;
  - (c) coordination and development of studies into the experience gained so far and the future outlook for sex education for young people and adults and for family and marriage guidance;
  - (d) coordination and promotion of research into the position of children, changes in the mother-child and father-child relationship in the context of cultural change;
- calls upon the governments to consider specific action in the following fields:
  - (a) information and preventive education for young people;
  - (b) economic and legal support for single parents and the parents of large families;
  - (c) provision of nursery facilities for children including extended hours;

\* \* \*

Amendment No 86

tabled by Mrs Lenz, Mrs Gaiotti, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Narducci, Mr Del Duca, Mr Michel, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mrs Lentz-Cornette and Mrs Boot  
on behalf of the Group of the EPP

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Last indent of paragraph 38 to be deleted.

\* \* \*

Amendment No 87

tabled by Mrs Lenz, Mrs Gaiotti, Mrs Schleicher, Mr Narducci, Mr Del Duca, Mr Michel, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mrs Lentz-Cornette and Mrs Boot  
on behalf of the Group of the EPP

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 54, add two new subparagraphs:

'Invites its appropriate committees to consider this exhaustive catalogue of questions relating to specific problems and discrimination affecting women, and to draw up, within three months, a list of priority measures;  
calls upon the Commission to respond rapidly and effectively to the urgent problems, and to submit proposals for the adoption of a long term policy in this field;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 88

tabled by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Narducci, Mr Del Duca, Mr Ghergo, Mrs Schleicher, Mrs Lentz-Cornette, Mr Habsburg and Mr Aigner

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 35

Delete the second subparagraph.

\* \* \*

Amendment No 89  
tabled by Mrs Schleicher

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Third subparagraph of Paragraph 15 to be deleted.

\* \* \*

Amendment No 90  
by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

First and second recitals

To read as follows:

- whereas the historical development of civilization in general and the advent of modern industrial societies has so far failed to eradicate the age-old subordination of women and has often given rise to new forms of alienation and new imbalances;
- whereas this situation is unacceptable not only because it limits the individual rights of women but because it adversely affects the overall balance of society in terms of the relationships between the collective and individual levels of society, as far as the organization of responses to needs, relationships between the generations and the division of responsibilities between men and women are concerned;

\* \* \*

Amendment No 91  
by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Insert part IV between parts II and III.

\* \* \*

Amendment No 92  
by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 11a (new)

Add the following new paragraph after paragraph 11:

- '11a. Notes with great concern that the rising unemployment in the Member States of the Community is felt primarily by women, young and old alike, and considers that this problem should be tackled bearing in mind the following specific causes:
- the increasing number of women looking for jobs for social and cultural reasons, which must be regarded as irreversible,
  - the traditional fragility of female work as a result of its concentration in the weakest sectors, their lack of militancy and the pressure of inherited stereotypes,
  - the gap between the level of education for women and technological progress,
  - the position adopted by trade unions in defending jobs which has favoured workers already in employment;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 93  
by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 13  
Add the following to this paragraph:  
'as well as the right to leisure time;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 94  
by Mrs Gaiotti de Biase and Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 17  
Delete this paragraph.

\* \* \*

Amendment No 95  
tabled by Mrs Dekker

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 12, first indent  
In this indent, delete the brackets round the words 'and men'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 96  
tabled by Mrs Dekker

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 14  
After the words 'might be substantially improved' add '*in the short to medium term*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 97  
tabled by Mrs Dekker

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 21, first indent  
After the first indent, add the following new indent:  
'to promote arrangements for more flexible hours for public transport, establishments and shops and the adjustment of school timetables with the application of continuous working hours in schools'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 98  
tabled by Mrs Dekker

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 23

Add the following text at the end of paragraph 23:

'further requests the Commission to submit proposals at an early date for measures to put an end to the unequal distribution between men and women of participation in policy-making and decision-forming and for the temporary application, through a broad interpretation of Article 2 of the directive on equal treatment of men and women in access to the employment process, of preferential treatment for women, particularly in the sectors and at the levels of paid employment in which there is serious under-representation of women

\* \* \*

Amendment No 99  
tabled by Mrs Dekker

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 28(c)

This sub-paragraph to be amended as follows:

(c) *abolition of age limits for participation in courses of education*

\* \* \*

Amendment No 100  
tabled by Mrs Dekker

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 29, first indent

Replace the words 'domestic duties' by '*domestic work*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 101  
tabled by Mrs Boot

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Preamble — 6th indent

Add: 'articles 100 and 235'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 102  
tabled by Mrs Boot

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 2(b)

First indent

Not applicable to the English text

\* \* \*

Amendment No 103  
tabled by Mrs Boot

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 2(b)

Third indent

Delete this indent

\* \* \*

Amendment No 104  
tabled by Mrs Boot

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 5, 2nd sub-paragraph

Replace by the following text:

'considers it essential to include a provision requiring the Member States, in the matter of employment cases brought before the national courts, where an appeal is made on the basis of the Community directives, to reverse the burden of proof for the benefit of women'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 105  
tabled by Mrs Boot

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 12, 1st and 2nd sub-paragraphs

In these two sub-paragraphs replace the word 'juridical' by '*statutory*' except in line 7 where the words 'juridical and legislative inequalities' are replaced by '*legislative and administrative inequalities*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 106  
tabled by Mrs Boot

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 3

At the end of this paragraph replace the words 'the relevant committee of the European Parliament' by '*the European Parliament*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 107  
tabled by Mrs Boot

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 15, first sub-paragraph

At the end of the first sub-paragraph of paragraph 15 replace the words 'the responsible committee of the European Parliament' by '*the European Parliament*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 108  
tabled by Mrs Boot

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 38

At the end of this paragraph replace the words 'the parliamentary committee responsible' by '*the European Parliament*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 109  
tabled by Mrs Boot

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 34, third indent

In the first line of the third indent replace the word 'Commission' by '*the governments of the Member States*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 110  
tabled by Mrs Boot

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 35, second sub-paragraph

In the third line of the second sub-paragraph replace the word 'Commission' by '*the governments of the Member States*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 111  
tabled by Mrs Boot

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 36, second indent

In this indent replace the word 'Commission' by '*governments of the Member States*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 112  
tabled by Mrs Boot

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 28, line one

In paragraph 28, replace the words 'in agreement with the Council' by '*in agreement with the Member States*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 113  
tabled by Mrs Boot

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 29, line one

In line one, replace the words 'by agreement with the Council' by '*in consultation with the Member States*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 114  
tabled by Mrs Boot

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 42

In paragraph 42 replace the words 'asks the Commission and Council to propose and adopt the directive' by '*asks the Commission to propose measures and calls upon the Council to approve those measures, . . .*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 115  
tabled by Mrs Boot

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 49, fourth indent

This indent to read as follows:

'calls upon all the organs of the European Communities (Commission, Council, Parliament, Court of Justice, Economic and Social Committee, Court of Auditors, European Investment Bank) to report at an early date on the situation regarding the employment of women within their establishment'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 116  
tabled by Mrs Boot

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 19, second indent

In paragraph 19 replace the words 'to draw up proposals for a directive on this matter' by '*to prepare a study of the present position relating to leave on family grounds in the Member States to provide guidance for a future proposal on harmonization in this area*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 117  
tabled by Mrs Lizin  
on behalf of the Socialist Group

#### MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

After Paragraph 4 add a new paragraph worded as follows:

'4(a) Calls upon the Commission to propose immediately a legal instrument to protect the status of the unemployed woman, banning practices and particularly indirect discrimination which reduce their legal entitlement to unemployment benefit by basing it on their work in the home rather than their right to work. This instrument should enable priority treatment to be given to the status of the unemployed woman in view of the disadvantages she is suffering as a result of the crisis, no longer including it in the general regulations on social security in the third directive, which does not come into effect until 1984. This deadline must be reduced.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 118  
tabled by Mrs Roudy  
on behalf of the Socialist Group

#### MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Add the following new paragraph after paragraph 8:

'8(a) Considers that the Community resources which in the past have been used for pilot projects largely relating to the employment and training of women in general to be augmented by more specific measures, and wishes, in this context, to see reception centres set up where women who have been the victims of sexual or other forms of violence can receive the medical, social and legal assistance they need.'

\* \* \*

Amendment Mo 119  
tabled by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul  
on behalf of the Socialist Group

#### MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Sub-heading

*'Problems relating to part-time work'* to precede Paragraph 14.

\* \* \*

Amendment No 120  
tabled by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul  
on behalf of the Socialist Group

#### MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

*New subheading*

The subheading '*Combating unemployment among women*' to precede Paragraph 13.

\* \* \*

Amendment No 121  
tabled by Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul  
on behalf of the Socialist Group

#### MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

##### *Paragraph 8:*

Place paragraph 8 immediately before Paragraph 13 and amend to read as follows:

'Notes that the high and increasing number of unemployed women in the Member States of the European Community makes it necessary to draw up common proposals to combat unemployment among women and calls upon the Commission to prepare a positive plan to improve the position of women in which national measures will be coordinated and, where necessary, support provided for the measures envisaged by means of finance from the future social fund for women; calls for specific action by the Member States and the Community to enable women to enter professions hitherto traditionally reserved for men, so as to achieve a better distribution of the sexes in all occupations by giving preference to suitably qualified women candidates for an increasing proportion of appointments in the traditionally male professions and to achieve a better distribution of the sexes in middle-grade and executive posts by offering a higher percentage of such posts to suitably qualified women;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 122  
tabled by Mrs Vayssade, Mrs Fullet, Mrs Roudy, Mrs Lizin and Mrs Krouwel-Vlam  
on behalf of the Socialist Group

#### MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

##### Paragraph 36

Add a third indent worded as follows:

- calls upon the Commission, given that recourse to the voluntary termination of pregnancy has become inevitable, to require the Member States to approximate the legislation having regard to the following three principles:
  - (1) Women resident in the Community must be free to decide for themselves
  - (2) Abolition of criminal proceedings in respect of the voluntary termination of pregnancy
  - (3) Full cover of costs arising from voluntary termination of pregnancy.

\* \* \*

Amendment No 123  
tabled by Mrs Fullet, Mrs Vayssade, Mrs Lizin and Mrs Hoff  
on behalf of the Socialist Group

#### MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

##### Paragraph 54 (a) (new)

Add the following new paragraph after Paragraph 54:

'54 (a) Resolves to set up a monitoring committee to be consulted in relation to all Parliament's activities to ensure that the proposals in this resolution are implemented in practice;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 126  
tabled by Miss Roberts and Miss Hooper  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 49, 4th subparagraph  
Delete this subparagraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No 127  
by Mrs Macciocchi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 32  
Add the following to this paragraph:

'... and throughout their career in higher education and academic studies, against all the discrimination which affects women particularly at university level;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 128  
by Mrs Macciocchi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 32  
The beginning of this paragraph to read as follows:

'32. Appeals urgently to the Council of Ministers of Education *and to the Ministers of Culture and the Universities (where they exist)* to meet at least ... (rest unchanged).'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 129  
by Mrs Macciocchi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 35a and 35b (new)  
After paragraph 35 insert the following new paragraphs:

- '35a. Considers, as regards abortion, that the essential core of all legislation must be the recognition of the self-determination of women, whereby she alone can and should decide for herself, determine her own destiny and how and when to have children;
- 35b. Considers that this view of self-determination of women is closely linked to the existence of health and information structures to make it possible for women, before being forced into the ultimate and always traumatic choice of abortion, to make their own choice in harmony with the prospects which society offers them for the future;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 130  
by Mrs Macciocchi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 45, third subparagraph (new)

Add the following new subparagraph to this paragraph:

'Notes with alarm that out of 122 million children born in 1979, the International Year of the Child, 12 million died from malnutrition in the Third World and that unless suitable emergency measures are taken this figure will continue to rise between now and the year 2000 according to the disturbing forecasts contained in the United Nations report on infant mortality;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 131  
by Mrs Macciocchi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 46, 6th indent

Add the following to this indent:

'... while taking care not to impose on the customs and traditions of the developing countries European-centred views of women's liberation which are meaningless and unacceptable — as was demonstrated by the hostile position adopted at Copenhagen by the Third World delegates — unless accompanied by a profound social transformation to allow the women of the Third World self-determination and the freedom to adopt new customs'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 132  
by Mrs Macciocchi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 46, 5th indent

This indent to read as follows:

'— the adoption as an immediate and fundamental objective of measures to combat illiteracy;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 133  
by Mrs Macciocchi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 49 6th indent (new)

After the 5th indent add the following new indent:

'— To take the decision to suggest to the European University Institute in Florence to devote, during the academic year 1981-1982, most of its courses to the study of relations between women and the European Community from an economic, social, political and scientific viewpoint, giving greater encouragement to participation in these courses by a majority of women of every age group;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 134  
by Mrs Macciocchi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 49, 6th indent

Add the following to this indent:

'... and for this purpose to undertake to support European Universities which create university departments for the study of the history of women in Europe throughout the centuries, entitling these academic departments 'Women's Universities;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 135  
by Mrs Macciocchi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 50a (new)

After Paragraph 50 insert the following new paragraph:

'50a. Asks the Commission that this consultative committee should draw up a charter of the rights of women in Europe solemnly affirming the principles on which true equality must be based;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 136  
by Mrs Macciocchi

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 50b (new)

After Paragraph 50 insert the following new paragraph:

'50b. Calls upon the Council to declare 1983 a Year of Women and Culture in Europe, instituting a prize to be known as the 'Europe Prize', with an award of 20 000 EUA for the work of any woman making a significant contribution to the role of women in the construction of Europe, to be chosen in the fields of thought, science, art, politics, literature or even for humanitarian action towards the Third World; this should be a permanent institution making it possible each year to elect a woman to receive a sort of 'European Women's Nobel Prize;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No 137  
tabled by Mr Pannella

MOTION FOR A RESOLUTION

Paragraph 35

First indent:

Following the words: 'voluntary termination of pregnancy,' insert the following phrase: 'or where legislation is repressive or otherwise inadequate;'

\* \* \*



## Price

	United Kingdom	Ireland	Belgium and Luxembourg	Denmark	Germany	France	Italy	Netherlands	Other countries
	UKL	IRL	BFR/LFR	DKR	DM	FF	LIT	HFL	BFR
Annual subscription 1980—1981	21 25	23 25	1 400,—	252,—	87,50	204,—	39 100	96,—	1 400,—
Single copies up to 32 pages	0 60	0 70	40,—	7,20	2,50	5,80	1 120	2,80	40,—
up to 80 pages	1 20	1 40	80,—	14,40	5,—	11,60	2 240	5,60	80,—

more than 80 pages : price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprises :

- report of proceedings,
- annual indexes.

## Sales

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February.

Orders may be placed with the Secretariat of the European Parliament or the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

### Secretariat of the European Parliament

Centre européen

Plateau du Kirchberg

Boîte postale 1601 — Luxembourg

### Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

Boîte postale 1003 — Luxembourg  
and 5, rue du Commerce — Luxembourg

Postal cheque account : 19 190-81

Bank current account : B.I.L. 8-109/6003/300

Price: UKL 7.80 / IRL 9 10



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS  
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

ISSN 0378-5041

Boîte postale 1003 — Luxembourg

Catalogue number: AX-AA-80-014-EN-C