

Annex

Official Journal of the European Communities

No 2-323

English edition

Debates of the European Parliament

1984-1985 Session

Report of Proceedings

on 11 March 1985

Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

Sitting of Monday, 11 March 1985	1
Resumption of the session, p. 1 — Agenda, p. 1 — Deadline for tabling amendments, p. 4 — Lome III, p. 4 — Transport, p. 20 — Closure of the annual session, p. 26	

NOTE TO READER

Appearing at the same time as the English edition are editions in the six other official languages of the Communities: Danish, German, Greek, 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: *(DA)* for Danish, *(DE)* for German, *(GR)* for Greek, *(FR)* for French, *(IT)* for Italian and *(NL)* for Dutch.

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

SITTING OF MONDAY, 11 MARCH 1985

Contents

1. Resumption of the session	1	Bozzo; Mr Vergeer; Mr Turner; Mr Andrews; Mr Kuijpers; Mrs Pantazi; Mr Bersani; Mr Christensen; Mr McGowan; Mrs Rabbethge; Mr Clinton Davis (Commission); Mr Cohen; Mr Wurtz; Mrs Dury; Mr Seligman; Mr Alavanos; Mr Elliott; Mr Verbeek	4
2. Agenda: Mr Pearce; Mr Plaskovitis; Lord Bethell; Mr Collins; Mr Arndt; Mr Pitt; Mrs Gredal; Mr Collins; Mr Chanterie; Mr Fich; Mr Arndt; Mr Tomlinson	1		
3. Deadline for tabling amendments: Mr Fich	4	5. Transport — Report (Doc. 2-1763/84) by Mr Visser: Mr Visser; Mr Topmann; Mr Cornelissen; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Adamou; Mr Wijsenbeek; Mr Stevenson; Mr Clinton Davis (Commission)	20
4. Lomé III — Report (Doc. 2-1781/84) by Mr Cohen: Mr Cohen; Mrs Focke; Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken; Mr Christopher Jackson; Mr Trivelli; Mr Chinaud; Mr Guerneur; Mr Verbeek; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Ulburghs; Mr Baget-		6. Closure of the annual session	26

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

2. Agenda

President

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

1. Resumption of the session

President. — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 15 February 1985.¹

¹ Approval of Minutes — Membership of committees — Petitions — Authorization to draw up reports — Referral to committee — Changes in referral — Documents received — Texts of Treaties forwarded by the Council — Conciliation procedure: see Minutes.

President. — At its meeting of 12 February 1985 the enlarged Bureau drew up the agenda which has been distributed.

At its meeting this morning, the chairmen of the political groups authorized me to propose a certain number of changes.

(The President read out the proposed changes)¹

Mr Pearce (ED). — Mr President, I refer to the oral question with debate by Mr Plaskovitis, on circumstances in Cyprus. Could you please tell me what is the reason for it being withdrawn from the agenda, and am I to take your announcement to mean that it will feature on the agenda of a future session? If so, which?

¹ See Minutes.

President. — It was withdrawn at Mr Plaskovitis' request, Mr Pearce.

Mr Plaskovitis (S). — *(GR)* Mr President, I would be happy to offer an explanation. According to information we received after I had submitted the question, sensitive negotiations are currently in progress and the President of Cyprus, Mr Kyprianou, is to meet the Secretary General of the UNO in Geneva today. Following these developments, and since of course the purpose of the question was to promote the possibility of the negotiations and not to raise controversies, it was considered that even a simple debate might create certain difficulties at this delicate stage of the negotiations. That is precisely why I requested that the question be withdrawn for the time being, though of course this does not preclude its reinstatement should there be no favourable solution to the problem as a whole.

Lord Bethell (ED). — I wonder whether you and the Bureau were aware of the fact that the killing of seals will be resumed in Canada, probably tomorrow or the next day, and I wonder whether therefore you might think it appropriate to move the discussion of the Muntingh Report a little bit higher up the agenda rather than taking it as the last item on Tuesday when it will receive very little attention from the public and from our European Parliament. This is one area where the European Parliament did achieve something and did prevent the massacre of baby seals. Should we not try and get right the timing of this debate and hold it before the killing starts?

President. — It would, I believe, be a good idea to have this question on the agenda, and you have just provided an additional argument. The debate is scheduled for Tuesday. Tomorrow, Tuesday, much of our time will be taken up by the debate on the Commission's programme.

I think it would be difficult to bring this question forward to tomorrow. In any event, the important thing is that we should have a debate during this session on the matter about which you have expressed concern, Lord Bethell.

Mr Collins (S). — Mr President, I want to refer to two separate items on Tuesday's agenda and I wonder if you want me to raise them separately or together for convenience. That is a question.

President. — I think we should take the first question first.

(Laughter)

Mr Collins (S). — I will start off with the first one and then continue. That was a very fine and witty reply, Mr President.

The first question is this: since Mr Bachy's report has been placed on the agenda at fairly short notice. Might it not be better to set the deadline for amendments towards the end of tomorrow's sitting rather than at the beginning. Could we make the deadline about 6 p.m. instead of 12 noon?

President. — We shall come to the deadline for tabling amendments in a moment.

What is your second question, Mr Collins?

Mr Collins (S). — The second point concerns Mr Muntingh's report on whales. I was one of the people who signed the note to the Bureau asking that this be put on the agenda for this week. But since it was drawn to the Bureau's attention, apparently new information has been made available, particularly in relation to the position of the Faeroese. Because of that, I think it would be wise if the committee were invited to have another look at it, because I do not think we should make a decision based on incomplete information. I am authorized, therefore, by the rapporteur and in the absence of the committee chairman, to ask that this be put back for another look by the committee so that we can consider it, perhaps next month.

President. — I shall pass on the suggestion to the chairman of the competent committee.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, at first you made such good proposals, first for Monday, then for Tuesday, then for Wednesday. Could we not discuss and decide the agenda on the basis of your proposal, first Monday, then Tuesday, then Wednesday, and not suddenly discuss proposals for Friday now and then turn to Tuesday or Monday. I would be grateful if you would decide now, in accordance with your proposal, who is to speak on Monday, who on Tuesday, and who on Wednesday, so that we can proceed step by step.

President. — I am not proposing any change, Mr Arndt. I merely explained the proposals of the political group chairmen who met this morning. No change has been made.

Mr Arndt (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, then I note that no other proposals have been put for Monday. But presumably a change in the agenda is scheduled for Tuesday, namely that all oral questions with debate are to be treated as a footnote and not discussed as part of the general debate. I would support this proposal.

President. — The chairmen of the political groups, Mr Arndt — unfortunately you were unable to attend this meeting — decided to include all these questions on the joint discussion on the Commission's annual work programme. You have no objection, then? So we are in agreement. The amendments to the draft agenda will be voted on together.

Mr Pitt (S). — Mr President, it gives me no pleasure at all to raise a point which has been raised before on the first day of part-sessions and it does concern, I fear, the conduct of your own office. When you read out the business for the week, you once again did not tell us, as you frequently have been asked to do, the meetings of committees that you yourself have authorized to take place during the part-session. Once again I find myself, and so do other Members, with a timetable for the next three hours in which you have authorized a meeting of the Committee on Budgets to begin immediately after this brief discussion on the order of business is concluded and a meeting of the Committee on Budgetary Control at 6 p.m. Now since this discussion might well go on for some time, I want to know whether you know any way that I shall be able to attend the Committee on Budgets and still be free to attend the Committee on Budgetary Control, since I am a full member of both. And if you will not protect the rights of Members of this Parliament, I want to know who you propose should do that job.

President. — The first point I should like to make is that we are considering the order of business of the House. Committee meetings have never been discussed in this context.

Secondly, it is highly desirable that committee meetings should not take place during plenary sessions. However, as it happens, it is difficult to avoid holding meetings of the Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Budgetary Control as these are necessary for the successful completion of our work.

Mrs Gredal (S). — (DA) I did not fully understand your reply to Mr Collins. I think that Mr Collins was speaking on behalf of the rapporteur, Mr Muntingh, and every rapporteur, according to the Rules of Procedure, has the right to request that a matter be referred back to committee concerned for further consideration. I think that your reply should have been that the whales item was withdrawn from the agenda as of now, because the rapporteur had asked for it to be referred back to the committee so that we can have a more informed and fuller debate on the matter.

President. — Mrs Gredal, I do not think that anyone has requested referral back to committee.

Mr Collins (S). — Perhaps it is because it is Monday, Mr President, but I thought I had made it fairly clear

that we had new information available and, therefore, the committee would have to look at it again. So can we please be absolutely clear. Mrs Gredal is right. There is new information which the committee needs to consider. This Assembly should never make a decision on something where the information is incomplete. Can we please send this back to the committee and can we have it made clear in the minutes?

(Parliament approved referral back to committee)

Mr Chanterie (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, the point I wanted to make has just been raised. It is the question of the deadline for amendments to the Bachy report, which has been added to the agenda.

President. — We shall come to that in a moment, Mr Chanterie.

Mr Fich (S). — (DA) Mr President, I should like to comment on the reply you just made to Mr Arndt. Mr Arndt asked for an amendment to be tabled for Tuesday's agenda with a vote. You then said that there would be a vote on the agenda as a whole at the end. Of course we cannot do that; we must vote on Mr Arndt's proposal.

President. — Mr Fich, Mr Arndt has not asked that the proposal be amended. He stated that he was satisfied with the proposal.

Mr Arndt (S). — (DE) Mr President, I do not have a good memory but I have a feeling this is the first time we are deciding not on a day to day basis but voting as a whole. Hitherto, as far as I remember, we have decided on a day to day basis what business we will take and what we will not.

President. — Mr Arndt, it is at least the third time that we have followed this procedure and I think it is logical. Why? Because it is helpful for the House to have an overall view of the programme of work.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

If we were to vote, we could, of course, do so differently, i.e. vote on each day separately, but, in my view, this would be less satisfactory. It is better to have an overall view of what is being proposed for the session as a whole. In that way the House can vote with full knowledge of the facts. Therefore I am now submitting to the House the order of business for the whole session as drawn up in agreement with the chairmen of the political groups.

(Parliament adopted the agenda as amended)

Mr Tomlinson (S). — Mr President, now that the order of business has been adopted, can I come back to the question that I raised with you some four months ago and to which Mr Pitt alluded earlier, namely, the holding of committee meetings during the plenary session.

The rules of this House, as I understand them, require you to give permission to committees to meet. What I asked you four months ago was, in view of the frequency with which committees are meeting and the frequency with which that is hindering Members of this House from taking part in the plenary sittings, when you give permission to chairmen to hold committee meetings during the plenary session, whether you will explain to us at the beginning of a part-session the reasons why it is imperative they should meet.

It is happening far too often. It is happening to the disadvantage of this House because Members are being taken away from what they ought to be doing, which is paying attention to the business of this House in this chamber. So can I put to you once again my request that where permission is given for committee meetings to take place during part-session, that you give a justification to the House as to why they should take priority over the business of the House.

President. — Mr Tomlinson, I sympathise somewhat with your views, but you are mistaken when you say that committee meetings are authorized by the President and the Bureau. That is not correct. Committees are free to meet when they wish. All we can do is recommend to the committee chairmen not to call meetings during the sessions.

I am quite prepared to repeat this recommendation, but it can only be a recommendation since committees can meet without the Bureau's authorization.

3. *Deadline for tabling amendments*

President. — The deadline for tabling amendments to the following reports has been extended until 8 p.m. this evening:

- Bonaccini report (Doc. 2-1784/84)
- van der Lek report (Doc. 2-1778/84)
- Tolman report (Doc. 2-1795/84)
- Second Boserup report (Doc. 2-1793/84).

The deadline for tabling amendments to all the reports added to the agenda has been fixed for Tuesday, 12 March 1985 at 12 noon, with the exception of the reports by Mr Curry and Mr Fich on the fourth deci-

sion authorizing provisional twelfths and by Mr Wetzig, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, for which the deadline has been set at 12 noon on Wednesday, 13 March 1985.

Mr Fich (S). — (DA) Mr President, on a point of information: you constantly refer to the Curry-Fich report in the singular. I should like to point out to you that, in fact, we are dealing with three reports: one bearing my name only and two others which both bear the names Curry and Fich. One of the latter is to be discussed for the first time this evening in the Committee on Budgets. But I just wanted to draw your attention to the fact that three reports are involved.

President. — Thank you for making that clear, Mr Fich.¹

4. *Lomé III*

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 2-1781/84), by Mr Cohen, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation on the conclusion of the third Lomé Convention.

Mr Cohen (S), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, Lomé II is dead, long live Lomé III! The birth of Lomé III calls for congratulations, especially from this Parliament, because it will find in the new Convention many of the things it has always wanted, if not demanded. I will give you a few examples: the emphasis the Convention places on agricultural development and the implementation of food strategies, the need for account to be taken of environmental problems in the ACP countries, the sections on fisheries and, last but not least, the provisions that have been included on respect for human rights and the war we intend to continue waging against apartheid in South Africa, and the institutional reforms that have been carried out — that too is something Parliament has always wanted. Reason enough, then, for congratulations, but that does not mean there is no room for criticism.

Criticism, first, of the difficult negotiations themselves. It almost looked as if the negotiations might not be brought to a satisfactory conclusion because the Member States of the Community and the Community itself were reluctant to make the ACP countries a better offer, and at one stage the ACP countries were on the verge of breaking off the negotiations. It was eventually agreed that 8,500 m ECU should be provided under the Convention, but we all know that is not enough. The Commission itself had already said that 10,000 m ECU would be needed to allow for an increase in the number of ACP countries, inflation and

¹ *Speaking time: see Minutes.*

Cohen

population growth, and this Parliament had repeatedly said that 10,000 m was the absolute minimum. Nor — and this is something Parliament has been demanding for years — has the Development Fund been included in the budget. Parliament is extremely critical of these two factors, the inadequacy of the money provided and the failure, for the fifth time, to include the Development Fund in the budget. Those are the main criticisms.

The resolution I have tabled on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation therefore says that more money must be found if it transpires that the fine objectives set out in the Convention cannot be achieved because of a shortage of money, and that the Development Fund should be included in the budget.

So we now have the Lomé Convention, or at least it has been signed, and the question is what happens next? Because signing is not enough: it also has to be ratified by the national parliaments of the Member States and by the parliaments of the ACP countries.

We have listed five conditions in the resolution and explanatory statement on this Lomé III Convention. We have discussed the need for it to be ratified as quickly as possible, especially in the European Community, and on behalf of this Parliament we shall urge the national parliaments to bring this ratification to a rapid and satisfactory conclusion, because we must not, of course, delude ourselves: this debate may be called a ratification debate on Lomé III, but the power to ratify it rests with the national parliaments, not with us. What we are doing here is in fact giving a foretaste of what we feel the national parliaments must say. With this initiative of ours, this so-called ratification debate, we are trying to bring the national parliaments into line. We are trying to ensure that the national parliaments voice the same praise and criticism as we are voicing here this afternoon.

A second condition to be satisfied if the Convention is to be implemented without delay and in the proper manner is that what is known as the procedure for consultations on accessions is applied. Spain and Portugal are knocking at the Community's door. Their accession will have implications for the economic situation in the ACP countries, and it is therefore essential for this consultation procedure to be applied to the letter and in the spirit intended.

Transitional measures are needed. On 28 February, eleven days ago, Lomé II died and was replaced with Lomé III, but until it has been ratified, the Convention cannot really enter into force, and transitional measures must therefore be introduced for the period from 28 February until ratification.

As regards the trade policy measures, a solution has already been found, and I assume that there will be no further problems in this connection.

There are a few other problems. What is to be done with the money left over from Stabex and Sysmin and at the European Investment Bank? It is essential that this problem is solved in a spirit of mutual understanding, because that is what is needed: mutual understanding between the European and ACP countries. Angola must, of course, accede to the Convention of Lomé. It is the only country south of the Sahara that is not a member of the Convention. Namibia will undoubtedly join as soon as it becomes independent, but Angola should also accede, and we should do everything we can to ensure it takes this step.

The Commission must ensure that a start is now made on aid planning, and I have said in my explanatory statement that it does not seem unreasonable that particular attention should be given in the initial planning to the Caribbean region, the Pacific and the Indian Ocean because the special situation in Africa, the famine and other disasters, has rather created the impression that we are only concerned about Africa and not about the other ACP countries, and this impression must be eliminated, of course. It is true that the first letter in ACP stands for Africa, but that is no more than an alphabetical coincidence, and we must not give the impression that the C and the P are afterthoughts.

A sixth condition to be satisfied — this is not referred to in the resolution, but I will mention it here this afternoon — is that a solution must be found to the financial problems so that the new institutions may actually meet this year. A meeting of Joint ACP/EEC Assembly is scheduled for September of this year, but the budgetary problems mean that the financial resources needed are not available, and an *ad hoc* solution must therefore be found.

Mr President, the resolution quite deliberately refers not only to Lomé but also to what I would call 'the environment' of Lomé. Environment not in the sense used by the environmental experts but in the sense of the situation in the world, which also influences the Lomé Convention. Because this Convention is, of course, a development instrument, an instrument which the Community has invented and which is valued by the ACP countries, but it is equally clear that this Lomé Convention has no solution to offer for many of the problems. It is unable to alleviate the problem of the debt burden of the developing countries, including the ACP countries. It can do nothing about the high value of the dollar, interest rates or the prices of energy and plays a very limited part in the fight against protectionism.

The Community, which is the world's largest trading bloc and is also seeking to play an international monetary role with its European currency unit, is, of course, extremely well equipped for efforts not to solve the various problems but to help find solutions to them. I therefore believe the Community will have an important role to play in the coming years, particularly in

Cohen

the fight against protectionism and also in ensuring that monetary stability is achieved, that institutions like the World Bank and its subsidiary the International Development Association do not founder and that an institution like FIDA has enough money. These are all tasks which the Community should perform alongside and together with the ACP countries. Because the Lomé Convention, seen in isolation, can only provide partial solutions to many of the developing countries' problems. A great deal more is needed, even within the Community itself.

We must not, of course, be under any illusion. Since the economic crisis began, the climate in the Community has also changed. Interest in development cooperation has waned. Even in a country like the Netherlands — and I name this country not because I want to criticize it but because it happens to be the Member State I know best — even in a country like the Netherlands, which is known to contribute more than 0.7% of GNP in development aid, a debate on 'development cooperation and employment' is now in progress. The word 'employment' in this context is a reference not to employment in the developing countries but to the question of how development policy can help employment at home. This a new phenomenon. There was never a hint of this in the industrialized world before the crisis, but now we have a situation in which we are trying to pursue development policy in a way that improves our own economies. That is not a bad thing in itself. Self-interest is not to be scorned, but we must get back to what we were once accustomed to doing: promoting other things apart from Lomé, and the Community has a great deal to do in this respect in the future.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR DIDÒ

Vice-President

Mrs Focke (S), *Chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation*. — (DE) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as chairman of the Committee on Development and Cooperation I thank our rapporteur, Bob Cohen, for the excellent work he has done and his clear and comprehensible motion for a resolution. As a member of the Socialist Group I say yes on behalf of my group to this Lomé III Convention — in spite of all our reservations, which I will come to. First may I put the request, in this first ratification debate on Lomé III in the Community, to all Parliaments in the Member States to ratify the convention as soon as possible, in the interest of our partners in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific.

The European Parliament does indeed, as Mr Cohen pointed out earlier, have good reason to be proud of

its part in this Third Lomé Convention. If you read the motion for a resolution you will find a long list of the preparatory work carried out by the European Parliament and the joint ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly. The Joint Committee and the Consultative Assembly in particular have been pursuing a North-South Dialogue for years, which has demonstrably added to the quality of the new convention in many important areas and has also made Lomé III the outcome of a joint learning process. A few of the key points: the basic principle of development on the basis of self-determination, the cultural dimension, human rights and the view that satisfying the needs of men and women is the aim of all development cooperation, the focus on rural development, self-sufficiency in food supplies, the endeavour to gear development cooperation ever more closely to the human and natural wealth of the development countries themselves, which means participation, training, own technologies, measures to combat desertification and deforestation, i.e. environmental protection. All this and many other principles have been set out, if we read the convention carefully. The verbal framework is well constructed. But the European Parliament, the Community and in particular the Member States have no cause to rest on their laurels or to congratulate themselves on the Lomé model.

I would like to cite three main reasons why not. First, this convention still has serious defects. They are to be found above all in the trade provisions, which still do not make the common market completely open to exports from the ACP countries. Even more serious is the inadequate financing. It is quite simply not enough. The increase in financial resources does not even cover the inflation rate, let alone even nearly covering the tasks which the convention describes so eloquently. That is why Lomé III is no real answer to the dramatic increase in the pressure of the difficulties faced by our partner countries. An interim evaluation after several Yaoundé and Lomé Conventions would look like this: Africa has been hit by the worst economic crisis we have ever seen. Poverty is increasing, dependence is increasing; the terrible famine is only the tip of this iceberg. We will lose the race against time unless we finally have far greater development financing.

The second reservation which stops us from rejoicing at this agreement is that the convention is as good as its implementation. But that is still to come. Will the priorities really be treated as priorities? Will the common learning process which has been so well formulated in words really be reflected in the reality of development cooperation? Will we see less bureaucracy and more flexibility and imagination? We shall have to wait and see.

Lastly, the third main reason for a sober and guarded assessment of Lomé III relates to international economic development policy, as the rapporteur has rightly pointed out. Lomé is dependent on the North-South dialogue, on development financing as a whole, on the

Focke

increase of resources in international funds such as the IDA and IFAD, the activities of the World Bank, raw materials agreements based on a common fund, the liberalisation of trade and debt clearance. Things look bad in all these fields. In all these fields the Community is co-responsible, and that is why I say here loud and clear: Lomé III is not yet an achievement, but a task. On this basis, the implementation of Lomé III must be checked and accompanied wherever there is a need for it by pressure on the Commission, and especially also on the governments. The European Parliament will see to this.

(Applause from the left)

Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the excellent Cohen report gives a clear evaluation of Lomé III: its good and not so good sides, the ways in which it improves on Lomé II and the ways in which it does not come up to Lomé II's standards. The main point of the evaluation is made in paragraph 7 of the resolution, which reads:

'welcomes the new emphasis on the concept of self-reliant and self-sustaining development'

Many people, among them former Commissioner Pisani, have called Lomé III the convention of development, while Lomé II was the convention of cooperation. Where Lomé II funds were often used to improve the prestige of young countries through the construction of buildings and infrastructure, priority in Lomé III has been given to agricultural development and food supplies. This makes us hopeful since few of the great development goals set in 1975 have so far been achieved, at least not as far as the ACP citizen can see.

Despite the special trade preferences, the ACP countries' share of Community imports has fallen from 8.1 to 5.2%. Agriculture is not yet sufficiently advanced. Essential needs in the areas of health, education and above all food as well as housing have not been satisfied. The financial aid has been spent on what have been called the cathedrals in the desert. Too little has been done to implement efficient projects that are commensurate with the overall development policy of the country concerned. The implementation of many projects has not been adequately observed and evaluated. Is this not an important task for those delegated to oversee these projects?

Another ray of light in Lomé III is the greater attention it pays to the refugee problem, which is threatening to assume enormous proportions in Africa. It offers the prospect of projects and programmes for the integration or reintegration of refugees or returning emigrants. This is very laudable. But is there no way of preventing this evil? Food shortages and conflict situations have resulted in many people being allowed to cross frontiers, a major problem not only for the peo-

ple themselves but also for the recipient countries, many of which are already in serious difficulty. Can consultation structures not be developed to remedy this situation?

Another point in Lomé III's favour is the emphasis it places on human rights. The reference it makes to the Charter of the United Nations is important. Everyone seems to be agreed on this, but the individual whose rights are violated still has no means of defence or of appealing against such injustice. The recognition of the role played by women in development is important. But it must be ensured that they continue to contribute to the development process. How can the Convention be implemented without the cooperation of the social partners, both in Europe and in the ACP countries? Not a great deal is said about this in Lomé III, although there is an urgent need for structured cooperation.

A very important aspect is social and cultural cooperation. But in our view too little money is still being set aside for training and education, which are surely the most important stepping-stones to self-sufficiency. The provisions which seek to encourage private investment are extremely welcome. Can they not be accompanied by a code of conduct towards the workforce of the undertakings concerned?

Finally, we are sorry that the new Convention still leaves a great deal to be desired in the financial sphere, in terms not only of volume but also of the speed at which payments are made, the slowness of administrative procedures and the effectiveness of the decisions taken. And this is not to mention the major problem of debt burdens. Lomé III is but one step towards the great ideals envisaged in 1975. We still have a long way to go, but the many serious obstacles that remain do not alter the fact that the Convention forms an extremely valuable, even unique basis for North-South consultations, which must be exploited to the full.

Mr Christopher Jackson (ED). — Mr President, like my colleagues I would like to join in thanking the rapporteur for an excellent and comprehensive report. With the conclusion of the Lomé III Convention well over half the aid provided by the European Community will go to the countries of Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific which is, in population terms, 90% African. We should not forget and I am very glad that the Cohen report emphasizes this — that the European Community has a world role, a role dictated not least by the fact that we are the world's major trading power. So, even as we move further with Lomé and its special relationships, it is right to affirm our intention to strengthen our links with the countries of Asia and Latin America by exploring avenues of mutual benefit with them.

Turning to the Convention itself, my group is glad to welcome it as a real advance, with major areas of

Jackson

improvement, which make it, in most respects, a worthy development of this unique model of North-South relationships. I think the negotiators, despite all the problems they had, are to be congratulated.

However, all is not well. Funds, while substantially increased, are never enough. We wish they could be more, but we recognize the economic constraints under which the Community operates and we think it would be wrong at this moment to give unjustified hopes of a further increase. As we worked on the new Convention, we obviously looked back at what had been achieved in past years and, as Mrs Focke emphasized, the sad fact is that, despite the billions of ECU spent by the European Community and other donors in the last thirty years, the problems of Africa are greater than ever. Quite apart from the terrible famine, there are today more people in absolute poverty in Africa than there were thirty years ago. Food production per capita in Africa has been declining for at least ten years. As Mr McPherson, the administrator of the US aid, said recently 'Western resources and intentions are not enough. The real burden of decision and action must lie with the African countries themselves'. That is not to decry the enormous achievements in some areas but to point out that Africa is going downhill so far as the welfare of its populace is concerned. That is the magnitude of the challenge that Lomé III faces.

I am glad therefore to see in the new Convention provision for much more detailed programming discussions which should help us to fit our aid more effectively to the ACP countries' own plans than we managed to do before. We shall expect the Commission to keep back some extra resources in order to back programmes that have been shown to be particularly effective in stimulating food production and rural economies. This is the sort of flexibility we really want to see. Conversely, if programmes are not going well they should be re-examined. Equally, we shall look for greater coordination between Lomé III and Member State bilateral programmes because, added together, there is no doubt they account for far and away the greatest proportion of aid received by ACP States. All this must be in the interests of greater effectiveness in helping the poorest of the poor.

I think the heart of this must lie in what we call rather clumsily *ex-post* evaluation. We just have to learn faster and better what really works and what does not. I ask the Commission to take very careful note of our comments regarding this and I promise that my group will be following its progress on these with very close attention.

Of course, aid is not the whole Convention. We support strongly the new emphasis on human rights for, alas, government by minorities with lack of respect, for human rights does not occur only in South Africa. One part of the Convention that my group finds less than satisfactory relates to trade. In the medium and

long term our openness as a Community to increased imports from developing countries is far more important than aid. It is the only way they will get themselves up off the bottom of the world's economy. We will have to try to find a better way round the difficulties caused by one Member State or another blocking, for relatively minor reasons, concessions which other countries would be willing to give.

Finally, we welcome the idea of guarantees under Lomé III for private investment. My group put this forward in the first place, and we are glad to see it in the Convention. Like Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken, we would also welcome it being linked to appropriate codes of conduct.

We cannot be fully satisfied with this Convention, but it does represent a significant step in the right direction and it does include much of the thinking of this Parliament. We hope that the parliaments of the Member States will see fit to ratify it with all rapidity.

Mr Trivelli (COM). — *(IT)* Mr President, Mr Cohen's report undoubtedly emphasises the positive aspects of the third Lomé Convention. First of all there is the signing of the Convention itself, after a great deal of very hard work over a long period; and then there are the new features that it contains, of which we have been so many times reminded, and at such length, so that I shall only refer to them to emphasise the value of the priorities that they imply — autonomous and self-sufficient development, the emphasis on agriculture, the role of the social partners, the participation of the private sector, and cultural co-operation.

However, Mr Cohen also emphasises, and rightly so, the three grave defects of the Convention: the inadequacy of funds, the fact that it is not included in the Community's general budget, and the trade restrictions. To these we might add a number of critical, problematical aspects: there is no guarantee as to the speed of the procedures in general and the expenditure procedures in particular, and there is no guarantee as to the ability to plan effectively.

I also read, in the brief outline of the Commission's programme for 1985 — which we shall be discussing — a very succinct reference to the Third Lomé Convention. Its brevity may perhaps be redeemed by the clear intention to plan, but, however, there still remains here, as well, a suggestion of summariness and undervaluation.

What does the European Parliament, aware as it is of these limitations, propose doing to overcome them? This is in fact the political crux of the matter. Well, we have to help the Commission and the organs of the Community to work to improve the Convention whilst it is being applied. And this means at least three things: there must be more funds immediately, without waiting, that is, for another five years so as to have wider

Trivelli

funds available; we must resolve the real problem, which is the problem of the customs system; and, finally, we have to reform the Community's agricultural policy because, without this reform, we shall not solve the other problem — and I do not mean the problem of emergency aid for hunger throughout the world, but the chronic, deep-rooted shortage in Africa.

I should like very briefly to draw the Assembly's attention to two other points. Lomé is not designed specifically to solve the problems of development and hunger. And yet it is bound up implicitly with those problems, so that I think emphasis should be given to the decision taken at Busumbura, which is referred to in the general resolution, and which reaffirms the need to create an adequate alarm system, strategic stocks and an irrigation programme. I think that, when applying the Lomé Convention, this whole set of proposals that sprang from the Busumbura conference must be taken into account.

Finally, one last observation. In his explanatory statement, Mr Cohen shows a certain concern for the international picture and the freeze of the North-South dialogue. But where does this freeze originate? We cannot, Mr Jackson — and it was you that referred to indebtedness and devaluation — avoid asking ourselves this. Why is there this freeze? It comes from an economic point of view, a concept of free enterprise, which I would call 'Reaganian'. And I say this with no desire to stir up a discussion or start an argument about theories, but because we have to be aware of the fact that the Third World countries lack autonomous accumulative power, and it is made to work on a policy of *laisser-faire* for these countries. What is necessary here is a transfer of wealth, resources and technology, and this requires planned, responsible public action by the industrialised countries. Can the European Parliament open this great chapter, looking to Europe, to democratic Rooseveltian America, to the non-aligned countries — and even to the countries of the East, if you want to, circumspectly — to create this great turning point — the reopening of the North-South dialogue, which can only happen on an economic basis of something more than *laisser-faire*, and which must take into account how dreadful it would be for the world if the gap between the North and South of our planet were to grow still wider?

Mr Chinnud (L). — (FR) Mr President, I too should like to add my voice to those who earlier complimented the rapporteur for the fact that his motion for a resolution received the approval of all the political groups.

Lomé III exists, and that in itself is a good thing.

Lomé III exists despite its restricted budget. I would add that in this area, as in others, there is evidence all too often of an attitude within the Community institu-

tions — whether Council or Commission, and we shall be taking this up tomorrow — which some would qualify as 'the Fontainebleau spirit', but which I would prefer to call 'the spirit of the catalogue of irresponsibility', as those who compile a catalogue of good intentions invariably omit to provide the necessary funds. In this respect it will be necessary to find the financial resources to implement Lomé III. Failing this it will be necessary to curtail our aspirations.

Lomé III exists, and that in itself is a step in the right direction.

It is a step forward where human rights are concerned. It is an improvement as regards what I might call determining strategies. It is also an improvement as regards cooperation between ACP states and overseas territories and departments, for it will edge them towards closer regional cooperation, particularly in the Caribbean and the Pacific and, I might add, in the area of the Indian Ocean.

All of these improvements have led me, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, to add my voice to the appeal to our national parliaments to ratify Lomé III as quickly as possible.

There are improvements, but there are also some less desirable facets. I have already referred to the budget. I should like to add another point, echoing the views expressed earlier by the chairman of the Committee on Cooperation and Development, namely that Lomé III would clearly be better if we could scale down the technocracy and administration.

For us, however, the spirit of Lomé answers one of the fundamental tasks of the Community, namely the development of the poorest countries on earth. At issue is a question of the Community's dignity and history. It is a matter of its balancing role in the world arena, both economic and political.

Dignity and history at the service of humanity, of course. At present more than 500 million men, women and children are under-nourished. How many will there be in the year 2000? Perhaps twice that number. Dignity requires that we deal with this issue as a matter of priority. There are also economic considerations. Do we realize that more than 40% of the Community's exports go to Third World countries? Put another way, the Third World is far and away the Community's best customer. But there are political reasons too, for there is, of course, something else which justifies our policy with regard to the Third World, and that is purely and simply common sense, the realization that the gap between North and South could one day tear the world apart. Efforts to prevent this are also part of Europe's vocation.

I should like to make two comments before concluding.

Chinaud

On the issue of hunger we have all too often heard complaints from various quarters, but particularly from the Ethiopian Government, about the deficiencies in the aid provided by a number of Community Member States. Only a few moments ago one of the Members of this House referred to a financial and economic blockage. It is about time we clarified some misconceptions in this area. One should realise that there are two superpowers in the world. One of these prefers to supply its special ally, Ethiopia — the country most affected by hunger — with arms. That superpower would do well to give priority to food aid, rather than arms. That would be a more responsible attitude.

In concluding, Mr President, I should like to say that we attach the utmost priority to assisting all states to come to adopt a policy controlling population growth. This involves wrestling with the institutions, in order to force them to concentrate on micro projects, and to refrain as was stated earlier, from erecting cathedrals which serve no useful purpose in the middle of the desert.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

IN THE CHAIR: MR GRIFFITHS

Vice-President

Mr Guermeur (RDE). — *(FR)* I have not got much to add to what Mr Chinaud said. I shall merely try to provide a brief account of the perils and hopes affecting Lomé III.

I should like to begin by congratulating the rapporteur on his excellent report and pay tribute to his efforts in a difficult field, for I consider that Lomé breaks new ground in North/South relations. It is at present a unique instrument among industrialized countries, where the Community is, I feel, a front runner. Fully 50% of all Community aid is channelled to the Lomé Convention. It is also an expanding policy, as is evidenced by the arrival of 20 new associate states over the past ten years, and that 99% of ACP products have free access to Community markets. It is a realistic, rather than a utopian policy. We are interested in the developing countries as they are, rather than as we would like them to be. We have created efficient institutions, and the Joint Committee and Consultative Assembly make fruitful and open dialogue possible. This is something I find very positive. Lomé III has, furthermore, been endowed with clear guiding principles. Its working principles include youth promotion, respect for national sovereignty, equality among partners, interdependence and conciliation; man is the focal point of everything, and priority is given to the poorest nations. I consider it a truly admirable body of doctrine.

I also approve of the choice of priority areas. Agriculture and rural development: it is, I feel, a wise choice, to attempt to begin by developing the bases. Secondly, the inclusion of fisheries in Lomé III is a very significant development, given that its cost effectiveness level is one of the highest anywhere. Industry was singled out in a resolution by the Joint Committee, calling for the creation of a special fund of 50 million ECUs to promote joint ventures between EEC and ACP undertakings, and this is something I also welcome. Finally, the inclusion of an effective strategy to combat famine and desertification is also significant. This all adds up to making Lomé III a notable improvement on its two predecessors.

As there is invariably no joy without pain, it would, I feel, be dishonest to attempt to gloss over some of the more questionable aspects of Lomé III. These include a growing distrust among the partners, protracted negotiating procedures, undue delays, a financial endowment which fell far short of what we would have wished, and a number of misgivings. The policy dialogue and the abortive request for funding from the EDF should also be borne in mind. This shows that, although proceeding satisfactorily, the Lomé Convention is clearly leading to a hardening of positions.

Worsening living conditions, famine, desertification, political instability, the misery and death caused by war and the emergence of ideological intolerance and which is not unrelated to the fact that demographic growth easily outstrips economic growth, by a ratio of up to 1 to 3 are all cause for concern.

What conclusions can be put forward briefly? I believe the general course to be followed is clear. One should use the institutions to the full in order to promote on-going conciliation, and refrain from attempts to reduce the Convention in a sort of non-descript Third World forum. We must remain guided by our contractual commitments, for such a policy is the only one which ensures progress.

Finally, I believe it is worth highlighting a growing convergence between the Common Agricultural Policy and development policies being pursued by the poorest countries. I feel this success may be attributed to cooperation between the EEC and African States, particularly on diversification.

In concluding, Mr President, I should like to make several very cautious remarks on the subject of human rights, about which so much has already been said. I feel one may say that human rights contain the germ of development — one cannot deny it — but I feel it is even more true to say that development is a precursor of human rights. If we can keep this constantly in mind, perhaps we will be able to avoid an undue tendency towards the ideological quarrels and misgivings which only hinder the very cooperation for which we are striving.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Verbeek (ARC). — *(NL)* Mr President, I see this third Lomé Convention as nothing more than the outcome of the prevailing balance of power, with the Community making the demands and giving the orders. This Convention is still geared to the enrichment of Europe. Western Europe urgently needs its former colonies if it is to remain an economic superpower alongside the United States, Japan, the Soviet Union and an emergent South-East Asia.

The European industries greedily take advantage of the ACP countries as markets for their products, of the raw materials produced in these countries, dictating the low prices they obtain, and of the favourable conditions due to low taxes and wages, less stringent environmental legislation and so on. This is what we call the free market, and it is incompatible with self-determination, independence, democracy and balance in the world. The Lomé Convention is a neo-colonial agreement. The text of Lomé III devotes many splendid words to cooperation and aid, especially aid to the starving. Mr President, words do not go hungry, and there are no words to describe hunger. How powerless are our debates, reports and resolutions! History will forget our words, but not the Community's failure, short-sightedness and insatiable appetite for growth. The Cohen report and motion for a resolution reveal an intolerable dichotomy between the fine words of Lomé III and the niggardly financial resources to be provided. Lomé III is a crutch designed to enable the ACP countries to work harder in the Community's interests.

Mr d'Ormesson (DR). — *(FR)* Mr President, on human rights the report by Mr Cohen contains investments for the future — improvements which we should like to stress. We should like to make this clear to him at the outset. However, we feel obliged to make the following comments. Today hunger, malnutrition and desertification affect a large part of Africa. Despite the efforts of the United States, the Community and several industrialized countries it has not been possible to arrest the process of decline. Worse, it is involving more and more people. As the ravages of hunger spread they bring in their wake more and more violent upheavals. The rise in oil prices and the stagnation or reduction in aid from industrialized countries, caused by the economic crisis affecting some of them, further aggravate the devastating effects of these phenomena on developing countries.

Because this situation is totally unacceptable in the light of the Christian principles which have shaped it, the Community is devoting a large part of its resources to the Lomé Convention. But the economic and moral crisis affecting the developing countries takes the form of a steady decline in the growth of their international trade, a widening balance of payments deficit and the exploitation of poverty in the interests of international communism.

The logic of the situation demands that the Community's wish to combat poverty should go hand in hand with its determination to fight communism. To refuse to do so would be tantamount to complicity. The Community cannot, therefore, confine its North/South policy to food aid, to aiding the development of the ACP countries and, on the basis of Article 2 of the Convention demonstrating its commitment to respect the right of all peoples to make their own political choices when it is often the case that these choices are based not on genuine emancipation but on pressures from the Soviet Union and its allies.

Let us open our eyes to the facts. We must be prepared to come to grips with the underlying causes of poverty in Africa, namely civil war which only serves foreign interests. It is vital that we urge the warring factions in Chad, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Angola and elsewhere to negotiate a ceasefire, the withdrawal of foreign troops and, where transport is concerned, to give priority to food aid rather than weapons.

Is there any need to point out that 60% of arms sales are to developing countries? Because it lacks the courage to call on the ACP countries to state in the preamble to the Lomé Convention that the right of peoples to determine their own destiny is limited by the right of others to live, means that we have allowed a moral principle to be twisted and transformed into a weapon for despotism and totalitarianism.

Why do we hypocritically single out South Africa, where famine is conspicuously absent, for criticism and attack, while our own countries and 37 black African nations maintain trade relations which are vital to our economies and to that of the European Community?

Exports from my country, France, like that of several Community countries, to the Republic of South Africa increased by 20% last year whereas our imports from the Cape and Durban rose by 35% between 1983 and 1984.

In my view, it would be more useful to try and discover why, of the 20 Community-financed farm projects in black Africa, 13 are in serious difficulty. The fight against hunger, increased food production, a general improvement in the standard of living all depend on peace and freedom and the promotion of free trade, and not on hypocrisy and illusions.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

Mr Ulburghs (NI). — *(NL)* Mr President, as a member of the European Parliament's Committee on Development and Cooperation I congratulate Mr Cohen on his excellent report. Nonetheless, I should like to refer to four inconsistencies and problems for which his report suggests no more than inadequate solutions.

Ulburghs

I note that, although famine is spreading at an alarming rate in Africa as a result of drought and desertification, Lomé III calls for a further increase in the export of ACP agricultural products to Europe. Mr President, is this not a glaring inconsistency? In a self-sufficiency strategy, can the food exported to Europe not be used to meet these countries' own needs, in the first instance to feed the people in Africa rather than our animals?

Secondly, the insistence that the Stabex and Sysmin funds be used in the relevant sectors will in fact encourage further export orientation and monocultures. As we all know, much of the best land in Africa belongs to large agro-business concerns, some of them European, which grow agricultural products on a large scale, not to feed the hungry in Africa but for their own profit. Would it not be better to use guaranteed incomes for local food strategies in Africa?

Thirdly, I go along with the warning in the Cohen report that tourism entails serious risks for the countries concerned by threatening their cultural identity, encouraging begging, creating islands of prosperity in a sea of human misery and placing the emphasis on the construction of chic tourist centres for rich westerners. May I ask the honourable Members of this Parliament, whether present or not, not to pay their first visits to Africa as tourists. It might be better if we gave the money to the non-governmental organizations and the missionaries who set up useful and small-scale development projects.

Nor am I so convinced of the advantages of large-scale private investment. I agree with Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken that European multinational undertakings must be required to abide by a code of conduct. Could the revised Vredeling directive not be extended to cover the subsidiaries of European firms operating in Africa and the ACP countries? This directive concerns the obligation to inform workers and their right to a say in the activities of European multinational undertakings in Africa and the ACP countries.

To conclude, I should just like to add that Lomé III must be accompanied by a fundamental change of structure and attitude.

Mr Baget-Bozzo (S). — *(IT)* Mr President, it is not up to us, but the national parliaments, to have the last word on this Convention. But the Cohen Report, which is highly critical, allows us to send a double message. First — the Convention is adequate now but will not remain so far a five-year period. Secondly — national aid must be co-ordinated with European aid, and I say this with reference to the fact that it was indeed the Italian decision to transfer part of its aid from unilateral to European level that allowed Lomé III to see the light of day.

Lomé III can once again therefore be considered as something positive, even with these limitations, since it

puts forward at least some ideas and some strategies for dealing with the problem.

As an indication of how far the present situation has deteriorated, I should like to recall what happened recently in Rome. The countries of the West and the OPEC countries discussed closing the International Agricultural Development Fund, which is a United Nations Agency responsible for granting loans to small farmers.

Now it is however remarkable that, in recent years, the production of cereals has grown considerably, that market prices have fallen over the last thirty years, and that there has even been surplus agricultural production in many Asian countries. This question is in fact correlated to the inadequacy of the free market, because this wealth of agricultural production has not affected the dramatic link between hunger and development.

The desire now to penalise the small farmers — who are after all, the key to the question of the fight against hunger in the world, for the very reason that they are the worst sufferers from it and, on the other hand, they are in the best position to provide for their own self-sufficiency — shows the lack of any basic appreciation of the problem. On the one hand, that is an indication of the inadequacy of the free market and, on the other hand, it shows the lack of understanding of how the fight against hunger in the world should be conducted today, in terms of growth and equilibrium.

Again in Rome, the Food and Agricultural Organisation has reminded us that aid has its limitations; in other words, it has reminded us that the system of aid and industrialized agriculture has in fact made the situation worse, and that the opportunity does exist to create a future in which there will be hope for everyone. Thousands of small-scale projects are being implemented all over the world, even though they are spread out. This is the new horizon.

The impetus given by this Parliament is along these lines, and I think it is important, therefore, to remember this.

Mr Vergeer (PPE). — *(NL)* Mr President, I should like to congratulate Mr Cohen on his excellent report and say that I am happy this debate is taking place for three reasons.

Firstly, the fact that a new Convention has been signed is a step in the right direction. Secondly, it is right that Parliament should be able to deliver its opinion on the new Convention before the ratification debates in the Member States are completed, and thirdly, this debate gives me an opportunity of making a few comments on our development and cooperation policy in general. I should like to congratulate the Commission and our

Vergeer

ACP partners on their success in drawing up this new Convention.

In content, the new Convention is an improvement on its predecessor. Certain aspects of policy instruments have been revised, and new areas of cooperation have been indicated. But although the new Convention covers a wider field, the same certainly cannot be said of the financial section. I fully appreciate that all the Member States are pursuing a policy of thrift at the moment. But if credibility is to be retained, there must continue to be a clear link between the objectives that are set, the instruments that are to be used and the financial resources that are set aside for the purpose. In the new Convention this link has clearly come under pressure.

Including the Member States of the Community, the Lomé Convention now has 75 member countries and may soon have 78. But however much it may be emphasized that this cooperation under an international treaty is unique, the fact remains that the Community must not restrict its attention to these countries. To put it more strongly, unless an active policy is pursued in many other areas, cooperation under the Lomé Convention has very limited prospects. I will only mention the Stabex system, which cannot compensate for the virtual absence of effective agreements on raw materials. And the debt problem hangs like a dark cloud over the developing and developed countries. Slowly but surely protectionism is creeping into our trade system.

The new Convention gives clearer expression than its predecessors to the realization that simply meeting food requirements is a goal that many of our partners can achieve only with great difficulty. Such phrases as rural development, self-sufficiency where required and the stimulation of food production for the market have become stereotype concepts in recent years. This reorientation was needed. In Africa per capita food production has been falling steadily for many years. Unless this trend is reversed, regular periods of famine will be a permanent phenomenon, with all that it entails for Africa's development.

Faced with this situation, we must have the courage to ask whether the present development policy, conceptually and financially, allows us to see light at the end of the tunnel. Or are we slowly but surely losing the battle, and is a whole continent sliding into permanent hunger and undernourishment? Taken as a whole, this question defies anything but a speculative answer. Moreover, there are clear examples of areas where a development process has been set in motion in a relatively short space of time, resulting in some developing countries becoming 'newly industrialized countries'. We are under an obligation to our partners to take this question seriously. Why has the policy of cooperation with the new African countries not eliminated hunger? Why is Africa slowly but surely losing its share of the European market to Asian and Latin American export-

ers? These are disturbing questions, but they must be asked. Whenever we talk about the security of food supplies, we must also realize that in very many cases there is no such thing: people are hungry — more and more of them; millions of people are leaving their homelands — more and more of them; large areas are turning into desert or infertile land — more and more of them.

It is sometimes said that to ask the question is to answer it. I am afraid that our approach will not automatically result in our emerging from the tunnel into the light. Let us study these hard facts ourselves and with our partners in the time to come, because neither they nor we will be forgiven if we close our eyes to the reality of the situation.

Mr Turner (ED). — Mr President, I want to raise one specific matter and that is to call for consideration for a new subject — the use of cane-sugar as a feedstock in biotechnology. This is without any prejudice at all to the sanctity of the sugar protocol, of course. Nevertheless, if there were an additional market for sugar then it would be very good for all sugar producers and for the world sugar price. There is also the prospect in the near future of a market for sugar as feedstock for a new biotechnology industry, which will certainly grow up in the next few years.

America and Japan already have competitive prices. The ACP can never provide a competitive price for sugar as feedstock for a biotechnology industry in Europe, and something has to be done about it.

The ACP countries have in the last month already shown interest in the possibilities for cane sugar in this market. I believe we ought to help them in this consideration and in their studies. I believe we should be sympathetic about considering new pricing and marketing systems and ideas for a new sugar market — a new area where sugar can be used — which will be of benefit particularly to the ACP countries.

Mr President, may I therefore ask that we give consideration to this in this Parliament in the near future?

Mr Andrews (RDE). — Mr President, I should like to take the opportunity of congratulating Mr Cohen on the integrity and excellence of his report. I think it would be improper of Parliament not to acknowledge the work the staff of the Commission has done over the past six months in helping with development aid and emergency aid.

We have heard a great deal, in the course of this debate, about self-reliance. I am one of those three Members of this Parliament who, in the past 10 days, have travelled thousands of miles through devastated areas of Sudan, in Northern Ethiopia and in Eritrea. If somebody in this House has more knowledge than I

Andrews

have as to how the areas in the Sahel devastated by drought, where projects worth thousands of ECU have been poured in, can be developed; where water can be found in these deserts; where people who had water 3½ to 4 years ago no longer have it, he should tell me how self-reliant these people can be. It is this natural catastrophe that has brought the horrors and agonies of this famine upon those people.

One of the major problems that I saw there was that food aid is being used by the armed forces of Ethiopia, who indeed, themselves are selling that food on the black market to traders who again sell it on the black market. We have documentary evidence to prove that. I would say, judging by the figures available to us — and we shall, in due course, be issuing a report to the Committee on Development and Cooperation — that at least 15% but maybe even 30% of the food aid is not getting through to the people of Ethiopia.

Let me just say this however. It is not simply Ethiopia. It is the same in Chad, and in Mali, but all we hear about in this Parliament is Ethiopia alone. I am not saying that we should stop food aid to Ethiopia. I am saying that we should have a clear and more precise check on the situation and that the supervision should be carefully provided by agencies of the European Parliament.

There is no question but that the problem is one of supervision, and this supervision is not being provided. Under the Lomé Convention we are told that we cannot interfere. I do not suggest we interfere with the political issues. I suggest that on a humanitarian basis we supervise all food aid, wherever it goes, and I think that this is one of the major things that must be done by the European Parliament.

Mr Kuijpers (ARC). — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, previous speakers have made it sufficiently clear that the Cohen report on the Lomé Convention signed on 8 December 1984 indicates the need for a North-South spirit, but this does not in itself mean that there has been any change of actual political will. With Niall Andrews and Paul Howell, we spent a few days in the Horn of Africa, where we saw with our own eyes that the written word has still done nothing to change reality. I will confine myself to quoting just a few of the facts.

In the Sudanese capital, Khartoum, we heard the message of peace as Vice-President Bush was welcomed, but in the same city, on 18 January 1985, another Ghandi, Mohammed Taha, was hanged for all to see, without any protest worth mentioning. In Eritrea, as Mr Andrews has said, the Soviet Migs continue to fly and shower napalm bombs on a peace-loving people.

The atmosphere of the Bujumbura congress has not yet died away, and we hear that already ten development helpers are being unceremoniously expelled after

years of loyal service. The arms trade between Europe and the developing countries continues unabated under the Lomé Convention, as the latest figures show.

In other words, Mr President, everything that happens here today and the Lomé III Convention itself, necessary though it may be, will remain a dead letter unless we establish a political code against which the spirit of day-to-day North-South relations can be measured.

Mr Pantazis (S). — (GR) Mr President, I feel obliged to begin my speech by congratulating Mr Cohen, who despite the burden of personal problems, was able to complete on time the report in question, in which the scope of the Lomé III Convention is analysed with clarity and absolute accuracy.

Compared with the previous conventions, the content of the new convention is positive and represents an improvement. After ten years of developmental policy within the Lomé framework, and perhaps for the first time, we can speak of negotiations taking place in a spirit of realism and understanding. Yet, the stage of implementation remains more difficult and more important. As Mr Cohen points out in his report, we too believe that the inadequacy of the resources made available will impede achievement of the Convention's qualitative aims. As for the matter of doing away with protectionism on the Community's part, our comments can be summarised as follows:

We regard as a real achievement by the Community, the fact that it is today the market most open to products from the Third World, especially by comparison with the market of Japan and the United States. However, we should not disregard the negative consequences of such a policy, which adversely affect regions of the Community whose products are similar to, and compete with those of the ACP countries.

We agree with the view that ultimately Sysmin will not be able to make the most of its resources, and that those resources will have to be converted to other uses. However, we believe that they should be devoted to the pressing needs faced today by many parts of Africa, mainly in the sector of provisioning and special aid, and more particularly the needs of refugees.

We fully share the view that a study should be carried out to examine all possible ways in which the ECU could be used as a means of dealing with the problems created by the rising dollar in relation to the Third World debt.

We welcome the improved arrangements for immigrants and students, and the recognition and participation of women in the process of development.

Finally, in connection with the racist situation in South Africa mentioned in the preamble to the Convention,

Pantazis

we explicitly declare our commitment to basic human rights and dignity. There is no alternative but to proceed decisively with specific measures leading to the substantial realisation of those attitudes.

(Applause from the left)

Mr Bersani (PPE), *Chairman of the Joint Committee of the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly.* — *(IT)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like, in turn, to express my full agreement with Mr Cohen's report: it is a lucid, objective, realistically critical and, in the main, constructive report. Other honourable members have already emphasised the significance of our debate, today, on the Convention.

Whilst we await the powers of formal ratification of the treaty, to replace the time-consuming procedure of ratification by the parliaments of Member States, our vote today, more so even than before, has a sense of political and moral ratification that is self-explanatory.

That is all the more true if we take into account the role, of which we are insistently reminded by the resolution, that our Parliament has played, both directly and as a fundamental partner in the ACP-EEC parliamentary institutions, in preparing the new Convention, in drawing up its more original innovative provisions, and in applying constant pressure for the appropriate updating of its more important parts.

Our Assembly rightly feels called upon therefore, to express its views on the complex questions implicit in the Convention and, equally, on the effect it automatically has on all the North-South problems and, hence, on one of the biggest questions of our time. On 8 December last year, in the capital of Togo, a small miracle was consolidated and extended, little more than a quarter of a century after the beginning of decolonization: all Africa now, with the accession of Mozambique and the more likely hope of being able soon to record also the accession of Angola and Namibia, accedes to this agreement for co-operation with Europe, as do also a substantial number of countries in the Caribbean and the Pacific, whose importance as international nerve-centres is destined to increase.

The renewal of the Convention, with appreciable improvements — these being more of a qualitative than a quantitative nature — and with a highly critical tone for the obvious inadequacy of the financial resources of the ESF and the other financial and technical instruments, is even more important in a situation of permanent stalemate in the negotiations in the South, and against a world background of returning protectionism, selfish bilateralism and permanent unemployment.

The inclusion of human rights and the rights of peoples, with the reiterated, uncompromising condemna-

tion of apartheid, together with the inclusion of cultural co-operation, environmental questions — including the fight against desertification — a more adequate exploitation of economic resources, including industry, small businesses and craft industries and fisheries, in close conjunction with the fundamental priority given to food self-sufficiency through real, authentic farming policies — these are some of the new items, alongside the reform of democratic institutions, the strengthening of social participation, and collaboration with the most vital elements in our societies.

I shall not repeat what those of my colleagues who have spoken before me have already said. The Convention, with its present financial limits, has barely covered the rate of inflation and more or less taken account of new members, in a situation that is weighed down by new necessities, encumbered by the grievous burden of indebtedness, and shaken by natural disasters of great magnitude. That diminishes the role that the Lomé Convention might play in this vast context of 75 countries and 4 continents. It leaves a role as a stimulator, a reference point that has been made credible by joint effort, joint building by the ACP and ourselves; a role that is capable of being used as a model of international co-operation, and capable of influencing, if possible and co-ordinating — once again, if possible — the many bilateral actions and actions by international agencies, as well as by satellite Conventions of the European Community itself.

From this standpoint the Convention shows its ability to define objectives and possible strategies within the framework of international co-operation. This, in the end, is its greatest significance.

(Applause)

Mr Christensen (ARC). — *(DA)* Mr President, the motion for a resolution unconsciously sums up the essential weaknesses of Lomé III. To begin with, the financial resources which are allocated to the ACP countries have declined in value when inflation is taken into account. Secondly, in the motion's own words, no real progress has been made with regard to the general terms of trade. Thirdly, the EEC restrictions on the import of a large number of agricultural products remain in force. The Lomé III Convention thus does not really meet the basic demands of the North-South Dialogue.

Also we do not think it right for the Community to interfere in the human rights situation in the ACP countries, and we warn against sowing this seed of confrontation and conflict. The Stabex and Sysmin arrangements also contain distinct neocolonialist features. The Danish People's Movement against Membership of the European Community must therefore point out that the UN is the proper forum for cooperation with the developing countries, not the European Community.

Mr McGowan (S). — Many of our colleagues are serious about giving development the priority that it does deserve. I think we have to be serious and consistent and realistic about the new Lomé Convention. We are talking about a response which can only be described as puny when compared with the scale of the development challenges and the enormous problems that face Africa and the rest of the developing world.

Mr President, I sometimes do really wonder how serious we are about meeting these challenges. I think we have seen from the debate so far the conflicting information there is about different parts of Africa. The need not to isolate particular African countries because some people do not like the politics of the government, the need not to discriminate politically or economically against particular countries becomes more and more apparent.

I think it is very disappointing indeed that the leadership of this Parliament, following the very important discussion we had in Burundi on Lomé, decided to cancel the official visits to Ethiopia and Uganda. It was left to comrades and colleagues on the Committee on Development and Cooperation — Katharine Focke, Niall Andrews and others — to practise self-help themselves and to visit those countries to bring back information.

I think we have seen over a period of time the isolation of countries like Ethiopia, a country that I visited on my way back from Burundi, a country that has been isolated by Western Europe. Only recently have there been ministerial visits from my own country to that country, the first since the Ethiopian revolution. We have seen Mr Bush declaring during his fact-finding mission how pleased he was that he had boycotted Ethiopia. And yet we know that we need real information about those countries and I would hope that fairly soon the leadership of this Parliament will be making sure, despite the wasted opportunities, the wasted facilities, the waste of resources involved in cancelling the official visits, that we will be making contact with Ethiopia and some of the other 20-odd countries that are facing so many problems.

I would also say that I am very disappointed indeed that even the Parliament is taking the same view as many politicians across the world, and the superpowers. They are trying to add fuel to cold-war politics, even putting in a good word for South Africa and that kind of evil regime at a time when in Ethiopia alone 10 million people's lives are at risk, while many, many millions more across Africa are similarly threatened. I think we have an opportunity to demonstrate our feelings and influence our Member States, putting our actions where we put our words and giving development the priority it deserves.

(Applause from the Socialist Group)

Mrs Rabbethge (PPE). — *(DE)* Mr President, honourable Members, the still rather timid and sensitive

Article 123 of the new Lomé Convention shows, rather indistinctly, yet more clearly than the former Lomé Conventions, that we women both on the ACP and on the EEC side have obviously pestered the responsible authorities obstinately and tiresomely enough. Five years of persistent pressure has at last led to the creation of the joint ACP-EEC working party on women, which is to establish the role of women in the development process more precisely.

The resolution unanimously adopted in the Joint Committee in Burundi contains four main points which show the fundamental issues at stake. First, we need practical action after the many theoretic proposals produced by countless ACP meetings. How to do this? In such a way, at any rate, as to ensure that in future women are associated in good time in the planning and development stages of all projects affecting them.

Secondly, the national governments of the ACP are requested to encourage the setting up of centres for women's questions and women's organisations.

Thirdly, greater priority is to be given to the general and vocational training of women than before, especially in the area of agriculture, health care, family planning and drinking water supplies.

Fourthly, women must be given access to credit and selling arrangements in small-scale trade and to free legal aid.

This resolution by the ACP-EEC women's group has a wide significance for the climate of North-South cooperation. It will form an important basis for the UN international women's conference to be held in Nairobi in June this year.

(Applause from the centre)

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, I am speaking to Parliament today on behalf of Commissioner Natali who has special responsibility for development and cooperation, but who is representing the Commission at the International Conference on World Hunger, which is taking place in Geneva. I am sure that all of us are following with very great concern the debate on the quantity and quality of food aid being provided by the international community for the African countries hit by drought and famine. Therefore we await with interest the results of the Geneva Conference. Mr Natali will be reporting to you after his return to Strasbourg tomorrow.

May I first say that I thought that this was a very positive and important debate. I think it has given eloquent testimony to the views of many millions of people throughout the Community on the issues which have been addressed by Lomé III. I would like to pay, if I

Clinton Davis

may, as many others have done, a special tribute to the rapporteur who has tackled his task with consummate skill. I know that it is invidious to mention or to single out other Members of Parliament, but may I be forgiven on this occasion for paying my own tribute to Mrs Focke who has made a magnificent contribution to the debate on the Third World over so long a period of time and who has done so yet again today.

If I speak at rather greater length than otherwise I would have chosen, perhaps I may be forgiven, because the subjects that we address are so significant. The report and the resolution before us are of great importance. Lomé is the most advanced and comprehensive component of the Community's development policy. The renewal of the Convention has been the result, as has been pointed out by a number of honourable Members, of long, arduous negotiations with so much at stake. So Parliament's opinion is obviously of tremendous importance, particularly since this vote provides it with an opportunity to check on the extent to which the guidelines it put forward for the negotiations just prior to their commencement have been given effect. That is precisely what your rapporteur has established.

In general terms, your resolution approves of the Convention, despite certain shortcomings, and I shall be discussing the main one — the financial resources — in a moment. The Commission takes the same view and was aware on entering on the negotiations that it was facing an immensely difficult challenge in a hostile economic environment. Despite that, the new Convention contains many new and valuable guidelines and provisions and is much more specific than its predecessors in identifying the priority aims of development and the means of achieving them. It also contains many of the points which the Commission hope to secure at the outset of the talks.

The resolution notes that the new Convention is also broadly in accordance with the guidelines put forward by Parliament and the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly, and thus marks an improvement. That is my view too. I am delighted that the overwhelming majority of those who have spoken agree with it. I know that you will want to congratulate the negotiators on behalf of the Community whose immensely difficult task it was for 18 months, first of all to prepare the Community's negotiating position and then to thrash out the text with the ACP States, sometimes word by word, in order to give effect to the innovations so important to both of us and fortunately often to our ACP partners as well, whose competence I would also like to salute.

I have taken note of the recommendation in paragraph 3 of the resolution that we should not neglect other developing countries or contributions to international cooperation efforts, though not at the expense of ACP countries. In my view, we do need to take a constantly evolving overall view of all these elements together, each being interconnected. In any case, that

is how the Commission sees the relationship between the various components of its development policy.

The Commission will be doing all it can to give practical effect to the new provisions of Lomé III particularly in respect of such vital components as rural development, food production, measures to combat desertification and deforestation, the enormous damage being caused by acid rain and the way in which we move inexorably, unless we do something positive, towards ecological catastrophe. But we shall tackle other fields as well. The Commission is losing no time in getting down to the job. It is already making arrangements for programming which will have to start this year. This is in accordance with paragraph 30 of the resolution and also with the undertaking the Community gave the ACP States at the meeting of the ACP-EEC Committee of Ambassadors on 22 February when agreement was reached on the transitional measures to apply between the expiry of Lomé II and the entry into force of the new Convention towards the beginning of 1986. These transitional measures are in line with the Commission proposals which this House approved.

Now I would like to turn to a number of specific points. The resolution expresses the hope that food strategies will be adopted with our support by a large number of ACP States. That is our view too. We intend to encourage other ACP States, particularly those worst affected by the horrors of starvation, to follow in the footsteps of the four pioneers. Obviously, extending to one country the experience gained in another calls for flexibility and pragmatism. Local conditions have to be taken into account, but this vitally important issue deserves our fullest attention. It is the link between the immediate problem of getting relief supplies to famine victims and the longer-term effort needed to solve the underlying causes of the present situation.

The resolution also calls for the Commission to support an enhanced role for ACP and EEC workers' and employers' representatives. The Commission also supports the view that private investment in ACP States must be actively encouraged. This is wholly in accord with the Commission's declarations in support of enhanced dialogue between the social partners in Europe. But more than that, it accords with the determination of trade unions in the north to see fair labour standards in the south so as to ensure that the competition against their members' jobs is not based on exploitation whether in respect of wages or conditions of employment. As is stated in the Brandt report, to achieve these ends trade unionism must be allowed and encouraged to develop as an active and positive force in the industries of the south. It is our belief that only thus can ACP-EEC cooperation really flourish. You know, of course, how much the Commission has done in the past to give practical support to anything which might encourage a conceptual, technical or financial input from business or industry. But of

Davis

course, as Commissioner Pisani once said, the aim is not to sign a few cheques in order to salve one's conscience and create a circle of clients; the aim is to contribute to development.

There is one matter which I think I also ought to take up in relation to the backcloth of immense support from people all over our Community, indeed all over the world generated by the images of mass starvation in Africa. According to the latest reports, some 30 million people in the continent are now suffering the ravages of famine and drought. This explosion of human misery has impelled hundreds of thousands of people within the Community to send huge sums of cash to relief agencies and also to demand that the political institutions of Europe respond more generously, more quickly and more effectively to the life and death struggle faced by millions of people.

I am proud to pay tribute to the staff in the EEC Commission who work so long and hard to bring relief. I pay tribute too to the many aid agencies, among them *Médecins sans frontière*, *War on Want*, and many more which transform the spontaneous generosity of ordinary people into tangible support. I pay tribute too to all those who have given so much and so selflessly through the many aid agencies and the schemes which have been launched, for example, by the pop groups which have given up so much of their time and talent to raise money, by newspaper groups, such as the Mirror Group in the United Kingdom, which have raised hundreds of thousands of pounds from their readers. In line with what President Delors said to this Parliament in his January address, the European Community must here and now declare unconditional war on poverty in the developing world.

I turn finally to the question of the Lomé III budget. You point out correctly that the Convention's financial resources fall short of what the Commission thought desirable, while acknowledging that the performance of the Community and its Member States in this respect compares most favourably with the present regrettable trend in North-South relations. Understandably then, you call for consideration to be given to the possibility of an increase in the Lomé budget. The Commission welcomes these and indeed any pressures to increase aid programmes in line with the recommendations of the Brandt report and indeed with United Nations policy. But the unpleasant fact of life that all of us have to face is that Member States and indeed others both in East and West are not likely to enable aid to be increased in the near future.

We are pleased that Parliament has indicated the importance attached by Lomé III to human rights and the elimination of discrimination in all its forms warping as it does the human personality and assaulting the dignity of mankind. Mrs De Backer-Van Ocken and Mrs Rabbethge referred to the way in which discrimination attacks the rights of women. I fully accord with the views that they have uttered.

On the question of apartheid, Mr d'Ormesson says that no one is starving in South Africa. He is sadly misinformed. They are starved not only of food. They are starved of that most precious of human commodities — their right to dignity.

(Applause from the Socialist Group)

Lomé III calls for the eradication of the debased and evil concept of *apartheid*. However, if that strong assertion is to mean anything, if we are to be credible, positive action is demanded to refute once and for all the suggestion that by our conduct towards South Africa we are, as a Community, aiding and abetting the inhuman design of the South Africa *régime*. My personal view is that the time has come when we must not shelter behind words.

I conclude on the note that whatever the criticisms, and I accept many of them, whatever the shortcomings, and there are many, Lomé III, like its predecessors, marks a substantial advance in relations between the Community and the developing world. But in a situation where new challenges unfold almost daily, there is no room for complacency. That has been the view of most of those who have spoken in this debate. We are still only at the beginning of the war against poverty. As Adlai Stevenson once said: 'The journey of a thousand leagues begins with a simple step'. So we must never neglect any work of peace within our reach, however small that may be. That is the will of the Commission, and I hope therefore that today's vote of this House will draw the attention of the parliaments of Member States to the most outstanding features of Lomé III and encourage them to ratify the Convention promptly.

(Applause)

President. — The debate is closed. We shall now proceed to the vote.

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 11 — Amendment No 8

Mr Cohen (S), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, I have something of a problem with this amendment because, if it is adopted as it now stands, it would mean that the Community should pursue its action only with the populations concerned and not through non-governmental organizations. The governments would then be simply ignored. I do not think that is what is wanted. Nor do I think that is what the author of the amendment intends. If he agrees to the insertion of 'among others' after 'contacts with', I can accept the amendment.

President. — That causes a slight problem, Mr Cohen. I shall have to ask the House if it is prepared to accept a verbal amendment before I put it to the vote. I think that generally there is a feeling that that should not be done, and for the sake of good order I think that is best.

Explanations of vote

Mr Wurtz (COM). — (FR) Mr President, the Communist and Allies Group agrees with many of the conclusions in the Cohen report and will therefore vote for it. My friend, Renzo Trivelli, has already made this clear so that there is no need for me to say anything more about it.

Lomé III has clearly failed to counterbalance the attitude both of the Community and most of the Member States which is in many ways prejudicial to the interests of developing countries, including those of the ACP. As the general rapporteur, Ambassador Chasle, quite rightly stressed at the last meeting of the Joint Committee in Bujumbura and as the chairman of our own Committee on Development and Cooperation pointed out a moment ago, inadequate funding seriously compromises the chances of achieving the goals of the third EEC-ACP Convention.

Nonetheless, Lomé III at least exists. It contains a number of positive commitments some of which, like the commitment to promote stable prices for raw materials, are unprecedented. It is now up to us to play our part in ensuring that these commitments are kept. We in the Communist Group will play our part.

A useful corollary to Lomé III would be for the Community to take positive steps to curb the frightening rise in the indebtedness of ACP countries, even if this is not directly part of the Convention. We should bear in mind the disastrous effect of the increase in the value of the dollar and high interest rates on the ACP economies which has reached the point where debt-servicing absorbs almost one-third of their export earnings.

Finally, to turn to just one point which the ACP States regard as a test of credibility where our cooperation is concerned, the question of relations between the Community and the *apartheid* regime is still very much alive. The Joint Committee put forward explicit requests on this matter which we referred to in our amendment and we can only regret the cynicism with which it was rejected by the right in this Parliament. Recent events in South Africa make this request all the more urgent and my denunciation of the attitude of the right all the more serious.

These are just a few short comments which we wish to add to our votes. It now remains for the Convention to be ratified as quickly as possible. The battle to ensure that it is properly implemented has begun.

Mrs Dury (S). — (FR) The report which Mr Cohen has just presented is the result of lengthy work on the Lomé Convention. I believe that the report will be illuminating for the national parliaments. I also hope that the national parliaments will ratify the Convention as quickly as possible, but that they will also consider it carefully.

I believe that the national parliaments should reflect on the fact that on the one hand we ask, in the case of the Lomé Convention and more generally of the Community's development policy, for the establishment of food strategies and for effective action to combat hunger in the world whereas at the same time in each of the Member States projects are sometimes supported which run absolutely counter to these policies.

I also believe that if we ask for increased funds for the Lomé Convention, this should also be a matter for reflection by each national parliament since none of our countries has as yet reached the United Nations goal of donating 0.7% of the GNP in development aid.

Finally, I would state that we have been pioneers where cultural cooperation is concerned. Nonetheless, it must be said that in certain Community countries education policy is exactly the opposite of what we wish. In Belgium, in particular, students from the Third World . . .

President. — Mrs Dury, I am sorry, we have got to be very strict on the time. I am very sorry — that is the end.

Could I appeal to those who have got explanations of vote to keep within the time limit, please.

Mr Seligman (ED). — Mr President, I will vote for Cohen, but I am disappointed that it does not say more about the technical and research help which is needed by the African States. The African climate is such that the EEC can only give limited help, because our climate is completely different and we do not have the same problems. But Israel and South Africa do have similar climatic and technical conditions. Cohen is concerned about drought and desertification. Israel has rainmaking knowhow. South Africa has new crop species suitable for drought conditions and so on. To continue this doctrinaire feud with South Africa is sterile and wasteful, and it should cease. I would tell the Commissioner, incidentally, that I saw no one starving in South Africa when I was there last month and I went to Crossroads and I went to Soweto and many other places. What I did see was over one million immigrant workers from frontier States being given jobs in South Africa.

Mr Alavanos (COM). — (GR) Mr President, Greece is not one of those countries which, as Mr Cohen him-

Alavanos

self points out in his explanatory report, subscribe to the ACP-EEC agreement for reasons of enlightened self-interest. On the contrary, it could be argued that to some extent Greece's interests are threatened, since our relationship with the economies of the ACP countries is competitive rather than complementary, whether we consider sugar, tobacco, or fruit and vegetables. Nevertheless, those are not to be the criteria that will determine our vote, and on that point we agree with what our colleague Mr Wurtz said a little while ago. We too have important reservations concerning the 8.4 billion ECU, which we consider quite inadequate to bring about the aims of the agreement, and indeed for the more general policy towards the underdeveloped ACP countries, whether in relation to loans, to defining the prices of raw materials, or to the matter of the North-South dialogue as a whole.

The favourable vote we shall cast on the Cohen report should not be seen as approval of the ACP-EEC agreement — rather the opposite, in fact — but as support for the very critical comments made by Mr Cohen and the Committee on Development.

Mr Elliott (S). — Mr President, obviously this resolution will be carried overwhelmingly and, of course, it should be.

I would just like to make three quick points. First of all I hope the Commissioner, whose remarks I was very pleased to hear, will ensure that support and aid is given in the ACP countries, and in the developing countries generally, to cooperative forms of enterprise and development which have shown themselves to be particularly appropriate to developing countries, although by no means exclusively to those countries of course.

Secondly, I must say that I hope we will not be in the position of doing too little and too late as we have so often been before. I too regret how few countries have reached the levels of aid to the Third World that we once pledged ourselves to achieve. I am sad that my own country is giving a much smaller proportion of aid to the Third World than it did some years ago, despite the fact that it claims to be a very rich country.

Finally, may I say that I was pleased to hear what the Commissioner had to say about the intention to try to direct help and cooperation towards other countries beyond those of the ACP, provided of course, there is no detriment to the programme for the ACP countries, I am very pleased about this, because whilst it may well be true that through the ACP we are aiding two-thirds of the nations in the Third World, we are only assisting about 20% of the population. I would like to see more aid go to the Indian subcontinent, for example, with which we have such close links and so many people from which are now resident in the countries of Europe.

Mr Verbeek (ARC). — (NL) Mr President, I have advised the Graef Group to abstain during the final vote on the resolution as a whole because I believe it sounds far too satisfied on major issues if we consider the confusion in the ACP countries and the niggardly resources with which the Community intends to cope with this situation.

(Parliament adopted the resolution)¹

5. Transport

President. — The next item is the report (Doc. 2-1763/84) by Mr Visser, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on

the proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-1375/83 - COM(83) 764 final) for:

I. a decision amending Decision 75/327/EEC on the improvement of the situation of railway undertakings and the harmonization of rules governing financial relations between such undertakings and States

II. a regulation amending Council Regulation (EEC) No 1107/70 on the granting of aids for transport by rail, road and inland waterway.

Mr Visser (S), rapporteur. — (NL) Mr President, the Committee on Transport met three times to discuss the Commission's proposals and twice to discuss my draft report. In the end, it was unanimously decided to approve the Commission's proposals, with some amendments, and the motion for a resolution. It is therefore strange that, despite the generous deadline allowed for the tabling of amendments in the Committee on Transport and despite the unanimous decision taken, another thirteen amendments have been tabled for discussion in this plenary Assembly. Most have been tabled by the Liberals and Conservatives, who missed their chance in the Committee on Transport. I do not think this does a great deal for working methods and decision-making in this Parliament.

The railways are particularly important for the Community. They employ over a million workers, they transport passengers and goods, which is essential to all the Community's economic and social activities, and they therefore form an indispensable link in the process of creating the internal market. The railways are safer, do less damage to the environment and use energy more efficiently than the other transport sectors. For these reasons alone transport by rail must receive greater encouragement. It must be realized, however, that, although the railways cannot run without financial support from governments, they must

¹ The rapporteur also spoke:

— AGAINST Amendments Nos 1 to 3, 5, 7 and 9.

Visser

continue their efforts to promote greater cost-awareness and improve their operational efficiency. The sharp decline in the railways' share of the transport of goods is therefore to be regretted. The Committee on Transport was told by the Commission's representative that it had fallen from 40 to 20% over the years. In fact, the situation is even less favourable. Only 15% of the goods transported between Member States in 1984 went by rail, compared to 42% by road and 43% by ship. Fortunately, in view of the advantages I have just mentioned, the outlook is still good for the railways. Transport by rail has grown at a faster rate than transport by other means, 14% in 1984, and the growth rate is expected to be almost 11% in 1985.

The Committee on Transport fully endorses what the Commission is trying to achieve with these proposals. Its aims are: 1) the harmonization of the conditions of competition among the various transport sectors; 2) transparency in the financial situation of the railway undertakings and in relations between these undertakings and the Member States; 3) the achievement of financial balance by the railway undertakings.

However, Mr President, the Committee on Transport unanimously agrees that the Commission fails to take various basic factors sufficiently into account. These factors, which are also referred to in the motion for a resolution, are, firstly, that railway passenger and goods traffic are different economic and social propositions and therefore cannot always be subject to the same rules. Passenger traffic in particular cannot be regarded as a purely commercial activity. Secondly, the ownership and management of railway infrastructures must remain the responsibility of a single authority, especially in countries where this is now the case, with governments possibly assuming financial responsibility. Thirdly, a commercial policy to improve the financial situation of the railways must not under any circumstances entail the risk that underdeveloped regions of the Community or those affected by economic crisis are further disadvantaged by reductions in transport services.

The Economic and Social Committee has also emphasized these aspects. It too is in principle satisfied with the Commission's initiative and proposals, but warns that there must be no tampering with the obligations associated with the concept of 'public service'. It notes that the term 'rationalization' is used rather vaguely by the Commission and warns that the situation in the less developed regions must not be allowed to become any worse. Account must also be taken of the existing legal and organizational structures of the railway companies, which are not the same in all the Member States.

The Committee on Transport also feels that the difference of opinion with the Commission concerns not the substance of the matter but where the emphasis should lie. During the discussions in the Committee on Transport the Commission's representatives also said — and

it is to be found in black and white in the proposal — that, where special circumstances and specific needs require, the Member States and railway undertakings should themselves decide what measures should be taken to improve the financial situation of the railways.

The Commission also feels that the final decision on the transport of passengers should be left to the Member States, whereas, if the Commission's proposals are accepted, the principles of the provision of a commercial service should govern the transport of goods. The Council of Transport Ministers has also said that it does not want a fixed regulation or excessive interference with national powers.

I should like to refer explicitly to one point made in the motion for a resolution. It concerns the desirability or even the need for the more integral planning of the common transport policy. A genuine improvement in the situation of the railways will require transport planning guidelines which will make clear the important role to be played by rail transport within the Community's transport system. The Commission is therefore requested to submit as soon as possible a concrete proposal for the development of long-term planning. This suggestion by the Committee on Transport also corresponds very closely to the idea put forward by the Italian Transport Minister on several occasions.

We have to decide today or tomorrow on a proposal that has many technical aspects but primarily concerns a matter that has major economic and social implications. In the final analysis, the question is whether we are going to retain a good and efficient railway system in the Community and improve it, whether we are going to offer people who rely on public transport a high-quality service, whether we are going to exploit the advantages of rail transport, whether we are going to try to improve the financial situation of the railway and also contribute to the harmonization of the conditions of competition among the various transport sectors.

In the opinion of the Committee on Transport, this can be done, and we therefore expect this report to help the Council of Transport Ministers and, indeed, the national parliaments to accept the Commission's proposals.

(Applause)

Mr Topmann (S). — *(DE)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Socialist Group has repeatedly been pointing out for many years that in the interests of a rational European transport policy we must enable the railways of the Member States to carry out their future tasks and give them a more central place than before in a common transport policy. My group therefore welcomes the fact that the Commission proposal we

Topmann

are discussing and voting on today and the Visser report adopted by the Committee on Transport have endorsed most of our demands.

What is the principle here? We must ensure that the policy lines chosen enable the Member States' railways to move away from the siding and back onto the main line again. Firstly, this means that the longstanding disadvantages in competition *vis-à-vis* their competitors on the roads and waterways are removed as soon as possible. That means that the financial responsibility to maintain and develop the railway network — i.e. the rail transport routes — is taken over by the Member States as an original state task. To offset this, use costs are to be imposed on the railways, like those which the Member States also require from their competitors on the roads and waterways.

Since the railways in the Member States have not been neatly tailored to today's needs over the past decades, we must ensure that when the Member States take over financial responsibility for railway infrastructure they also focus their transport investment policy on the railways. A cost benefit analysis based on actual transport criteria, which should include transport safety, a low level of damage to the environment, rational use of energy and limited requirement of land, must — unlike in the past — serve as the guideline of the Member States' political action.

Furthermore, the railway undertakings must also become more competitive again in that area in which they have to provide a public service to improve the welfare of the citizens, not for reason of their own profitability but on the instructions of the Member States or other providers of capital.

In summary, our request is the following: the Member States, i.e. those who order the service, must bear the costs which arise out of their policies and which cannot be covered by the railways' tariffs or special tariffs. Unlike in the past, this should be regulated by precise agreements which, in our view, must be based primarily on the public services required of the railways. The same procedure must also apply to passenger and to goods traffic.

The Council of Ministers, which hitherto has achieved nothing in nearly every area of a common European transport policy, should start afresh here, especially against the background of the forthcoming judgment of the European Court of Justice in the proceedings for failure to act, and translate the proposals of the Commission and the European Parliament into action as soon as possible.

Mr Cornelissen (PPE). — (NL) Mr President, in its programme for 1985 the Commission calls for more open and efficient management in transport. This is, of course, extremely important for employment in the Community. The proposals we are discussing today

are commensurate with this approach. However, they will not in themselves produce the required conditions of competition between transport by road, rail and inland waterway, and they are therefore of limited significance. They do not offer a solution to the real problems. Mr President, amendments which improve the present situation will naturally have our support.

We do not think this can be said of the proposal that governments should not be permitted to require the railway undertakings to take rationalization measures. This is unfortunately unavoidable in many Member States. It is not a pleasant task for elected politicians, but we shall not, of course, solve this problem by sticking our heads in the financial sand either. It will be conducive to healthy competition among the various transport sectors if they all have to bear equal shares of infrastructural costs. We would welcome it if governments' financial responsibility was also extended to include the installation and maintenance of infrastructure. A Dutch study has shown that there are now major differences in the imputation of infrastructural costs.

It should be added that the external social costs borne by the three transport sectors are certainly not the same. We need only think of transport safety, the effect on the environment, viability, energy consumption and employment. I need only refer to acid rain and the serious air pollution in the Ruhr district this winter. The most difficult question is how the Commission intends to take these social questions into consideration. What are the Commission's views on the idea that a calculation should be made of all the costs and benefits of the various means of transport in Europe? The social aspects would therefore have to be included too. This calculation could then be used to establish the criteria needed to govern new investment.

Like the Commission, we attach importance to the development of the infrastructure. We are in favour of the improvement of the infrastructure for lorries at frontiers, but we should also like to see the Commission submitting proposals for the elimination of the bottlenecks that affect rail and inland waterway traffic at frontiers. Recently high-speed rail links have attracted a great deal of interest. The use of advanced and new technologies in transport may greatly improve communications in Europe. This is also important where employment and industrial policy are concerned. According to press reports, President Mitterrand and Federal Chancellor Kohl have said they want a high-speed rail link between Paris and Cologne via Brussels. That would be a good thing. It would open the way for the Dutch railway system, for example, to be linked to the high-speed network. But there is one important requirement, Mr President: it must be a European system . . .

President. — Mr Cornelissen, I am very sorry, but you have exceeded your speaking-time and we want to finish this debate this evening.

Mr Newton Dunn (ED). — Mr President, I would like to start by welcoming the Commissioner to his first transport debate in this Parliament.

I would like to say that my group supports the Commission's proposals, but with two provisos that we are not so happy about. The first one — and this is why we have tabled Amendment No 13 — is the proposal by the Commission that there should be compulsory separation of responsibility between the ownership of the railway infrastructure and the responsibility for providing train services. We do not believe that they should necessarily be separated like that compulsorily.

The example that we look at is Amtrak in the USA, which is hardly an example of great success and does not inspire us with confidence to follow in that same direction. That is why we have tabled Amendment No 13 which changes the compulsion of the word 'shall' in the Commission's proposal to 'may', which makes it an option.

We believe that separation makes it less likely that innovative ideas for infrastructure will appear if it is the State that has responsibility for infrastructure. I give you an example: in the UK rural railway lines in some cases now have lowcost radio signals, which is an innovation we do not think the State would have introduced had it had the responsibility itself.

Secondly, road transport entails very great social costs which the Commission has not taken into account. For example, there are something like 50 000 road fatalities each year in the Community and they have an enormous cost which the Commission has not taken into account in its calculations: the cost of road services, hospitals and medical services, insurance premiums and so on. They ought to be taken into account if we are going to have a genuine basis of comparison between different modes of transportation. Of course, pollution costs are also a factor, a very great factor, in road transport but not in railways.

Finally, I would like to congratulate the rapporteur on a very balanced report. I apologize that my group has brought in a number of amendments but he does appreciate, I am sure, that occasionally there are extra opinions from my group which come in after the committee meeting.

Mr Adamou (COM). — (GR) Mr President, the Community has not had, and still does not have any planned and programmed policy on transport. Whatever is done from time to time in that sector is *ad hoc*, and is not aimed at promoting reliable, convenient and cheap transport of passengers and goods to the benefit of the Community as a whole. Its sole aim is to secure and increase the profits of the megalithic companies that dominate the transport sector.

With particular reference to the matters we are debating today, namely railways, could be made the larg-

est-scale means of transport for both people and goods. They provide greater comfort and safety than other means of transport. They use energy more rationally, and do not pollute the environment. Yet, owing to the competition from the unprogrammed development and general exploitation of other means of transport, the railways have been forced into over-indebtedness, underutilisation and stagnation. Now, instead of offering solutions, the Commission's proposals are in practice likely to lead to even greater mismanagement of the transport sector. In our view, only by being brought into the public sector, and not by privatisation can rail transport be rescued from its crisis and allowed to develop.

As for the railways in my own country, the situation is really lamentable. Ninety-six per cent of the network consists of a single two-way line. The entire rolling stock is more than 90 years old. There are few rail links between ports and industry, and those that exist at all are used by industrialists as a lever to obtain more favourable prices from other means of transport. Thus, the part played in transport by the Greek railways has decreased from 50% in 1950, to 5% at present. Sixty per cent of the rolling stock and locomotives lie idle. There is a shortage of trained personnel, and the 14 000 railway workers are facing severe problems to do with their working conditions, wages and pensions.

In our opinion, without serious state investment and support the Greek railways will continue to stagnate.

Mr Wijsenbeek (L). — (NL) Mr President, I should like to begin by saying that I came here by train today and that this is the only way to travel for a Member of Parliament who wants to read all the documents that are pushed in front of him for a week like this and to prepare a speech as well. My compliments to the German Federal Railways.

My compliments too to the rapporteur, who has had the difficult task of steering a course between the Scylla of efficiency and the Charybdis of the obligation to provide a transport service. Unlike the new British APT trains, which lean on the bends, I believe Mr Visser has travelled along the left side of the rails. And why is this, Mr President? Because, unlike the Commission, which has said that we must at last do something about improving the situation, Mr Visser has served up yet more of the same thing in his report, which will mean yet more losses being incurred.

Mr President, this European Parliament will not be doing its job properly if we do not once again protect the taxpayer against the Moloch of the state railway companies, the trade unions and passengers' pressure groups, all of whom want to go on increasing the losses.

I appreciate that pressure from the ÖTV, the Union of Public Service and Transport Workers, has to some

Wijsenbeek

extent prevented Mr Cornelissen from tabling any amendments, but I must tell the rapporteur that, despite my original resistance in committee, this has forced me to table amendments. If he does not understand the reason, I am quite willing to explain them. Mr President, Article 92 of the EEC Treaty does not single out the railways as companies which must continue to be subsidized by the state.

This means that the ban on government assistance set out in Article 93 also applies to the railways, many of which are limited liability companies. I simply cannot find any mention of this in Mr Visser's report or in the Commission's proposals. I therefore have no alternative but to try to rectify this omission with an amendment. If the rapporteur is not prepared to accept these amendments, I do not know what will happen. But I hope I can at least count on Mr Cornelissen's support.

Mr President, I should just like to say two more things. Something I sorely miss in the report is a reference to . . .

President. — Mr Wijsenbeek, your speaking time is over. I am afraid your two things will have to wait.

Mr Stevenson (S). — Mr President, this situation goes back a long time. We are talking about a Council decision of 1965 which attempted to bring about some 'improvement in the situation regarding railway undertakings'. There are many of us — and I am sure this applies in the Committee on Transport — who are sceptical as to whether this latest effort will lead to anything effective. Nevertheless, we accept that it is an attempt to coordinate the present situation with regard to those financial relations. I think that some points are worthy of particular note.

The first one is that, despite the proposed changes in dealing with revenue support — that is a change from public liability to a contractual situation — and the proposed conditions for the change, the report clearly recognizes the principle of deficit subsidy. I think that is important. In other words, the free market, unbridled competition, is not the way forward. It is certainly not the way forward for public transport as a whole and it is certainly not the way forward for the provision of railway services for the people in the Community. It does not matter what people say about the Treaty because the Treaty has been in operation for getting on for three decades now. The practice that has stood the test and has been accepted by people is that to make the profit motive the overriding concern in the operation of public transport will lead to a ruinous situation.

The second point is that the responsibility for this provision will rightfully remain with the Member States. The Community will not be dictating what provision there ought to be. The proposed method of

contractual obligation in theory would, with progressive policies from Member States for protection and a commitment to improvement, provide, in my opinion, the best possibility for real infrastructure enlargement. In that sense we should welcome. Indeed, the public service obligations that have been referred to would become contractual. We can see — and I am sure the Commission recognizes this — little prospect of a financial balance being achieved. Again, allowance is made in the Commission proposals for the theory that aids can be and indeed should be granted indefinitely. In our opinion, that can provide stability on the basis of which progress can be made.

It is basically a good report by Mr Visser, which reflects the concerns that most of us hold, except those in this particular building who think that the answer to progressive and integrated transport can be provided by privatization and deregulation. We have heard some of it from the speakers today and we certainly have seen some of it reflected in these unfortunate belated amendments that we have now got in front of us. The report does clearly indicate that it cannot be a purely commercial activity, that regions must not be further disadvantaged by further reductions in service and that rail must be recognized as an important part of transport systems.

Mr Clinton Davis, Member of the Commission. — Mr President, the report of the Committee on Transport gives rise to a number of comments that I would like to make. The first comment is to pay a tribute to Mr Visser for the skill with which he has conducted his work and, indeed, for the remarks that he made at the beginning of the debate. On the whole, we believe that the approach of the committee has been extremely positive.

Where the amendments suggested by the Visser report are concerned, I think that we could accept these without major difficulties as far as the two main points are concerned — that is to say, the date of implementation by Member States, which Parliament wants to fix — or which the committee wishes to fix — at two years after adoption by the Council, and the introduction of a trial period for the transformation of public-service obligations into contractual arrangements.

I have some hesitation, however, about accepting the changes in the preamble insofar as they no longer correspond to amendments to the main text originally proposed in the Committee on Transport, but not accepted by that committee.

Before I come on to the detailed position about the amendments, just a few words, if I may, about one or two of the contributions that were made. Mr Cornelissen said that the proposals opened the way to more competition because they eliminate distortions. I am sorry, I may have got his note a little wrong. The fact is that the suggestion that he made is one which is per-

Davis

haps marginally wrong, but I do not need to go into it in any depth.

As far as Mr Wijsenbeek's points are concerned, I would say that Article 77 provides for aids for public-service obligations, a point which he evidently omitted.

As far as Mr Stevenson is concerned, I very much agree that service is a matter of key concern. Certainly, the Commission agrees with that. I would also accept that unbridled competition is not desirable. Of course, we also accept the point he makes that a contractual obligation does represent the way to provide the enlargement of the rail infrastructure.

I turn now to the specific amendments. As regards Amendment No 1, I do not think that this any longer corresponds to the main text, and I would like to express my preference for the original wording of the Commission's proposal: 'Coverage of infrastructure costs' instead of 'financial responsibility for maintenance and development'. The reason for that is that the railways have to bear, in the final recourse, the maintenance costs, which are included in the marginal cost of using the infrastructure. Certainly, I agree on the equal treatment of transport modes, which was, of course, in the Commission's text.

As to Amendment No 2, I think that this amendment is no longer in line with amendments to the main text originally proposed in the Committee on Transport but not retained by them.

As to Amendment No 3, we have no substantial objections to substituting the words 'customer authorities' for the words 'national, regional and local authorities', even if the term would be less precise than the original wording. Furthermore, we can go along with a three-year trial period in this field.

With regard to Amendment No 4, we have no objection to the implementation two years after adoption.

On Amendment No 5, the elimination of a distinction between freight and passenger traffic does seem consequent to the Commission and is in line with the proposal made.

We have no objections to Amendment No 6 and we can accept Amendment No 7.

On Amendment No 8, I think this does correspond to the final main text of the report and we could agree to it.

On Amendment No 9, we consider that unprofitable services might be replaced by road services. But I would like to remind the honourable Member of Regulation No 1191/69 where the Council makes provision to take into consideration the least cost for the Community, that is to say, social costs instead of managerial profitability.

Amendment No 10: the deletion of the phrase seems justified as the original amendments were not retained by the Transport Committee.

As to Amendment No 11, we welcome the idea of coordination of investment plans between transport modes, and in this context I would remind the House of the master plan of the Italian Minister for Transport, Mr Signorile. However, I think that this proposal on railway improvement would not be the appropriate place to lay down the idea of coordination and I would recommend that it should not be accepted.

On Amendment No 12, again from Mr Wijsenbeek, we agree on the idea to be expressed, but in my view it is somewhat redundant to requirements. We would not suggest that it be incorporated.

I turn now to the amendments of Mr Newton-Dunn. May I thank him for the welcome that he gave me in this debate. Having said that, he will remember the phrase used by the actress, Jane Russell, that flattery gets you nowhere. In the main, I fear that I have to reject the amendments he is proposing. On No 13, the wording he proposes does not bring out the main idea that decisions on infrastructure investments must be taken by the State, save in cases where the railways are themselves deemed to be competent. Obviously, the State is not obliged to build a new line, but if a decision is taken in this respect it must normally be taken by the State and not by the railways. I would suggest, therefore, that his proposal should not be accepted.

As to No 14, this amendment would cut across the basic idea of the Commission's proposal, that is to say, that the State has to assume financial responsibility for railway infrastructure. I do not think the Commission could accept it. The Commission's representatives already explained in the Transport Committee that the word 'ownership' is misleading and should be deleted. Many railways are not owners but only managers of their infrastructure.

As far as No 15 is concerned, I would be able to accept this amendment even if it would be difficult to quantify the social cost of road transport. This was a point also made by Mr Cornelissen. The Commission is envisaging including these costs in its infrastructure costing system as soon as a valid base for their calculation can be found.

On No 16, I think we would prefer to accept the wording of the text without the words he suggests. In keeping with the times, it is obvious that infrastructure planning must fit in with the financial availabilities of the Member States and the priority needs of transport users.

I turn finally to Amendment No 17 by Mr Roux. Again I consider this proposal on railway improvement would not be the appropriate framework for suggesting a technical transport coordination committee. This

Davis

idea goes far beyond that. What I am prepared to do is to study the idea of enlarging the powers of the Directorate-General for Transport in this regard. However, I hope that the House will be aware that the problem is not so much institutional. It would as a matter of fact imply the transfer of important competences from Member States' governments to Community bodies. I do not think, therefore, that the amendment should be accepted.

On behalf of the Commission I wish to congratulate Parliament on the work that it has done and on the support that it provides for our proposal. As a matter of fact, we think that the improvement of the railway's situation, particularly its financial situation, is one of the key conditions of a more balanced Community transport policy. I share the view of the members of the Transport Committee in seeking to emphasize my intention to develop the Commission's railway policy in close collaboration with the railway undertakings of the Group of Ten as well as the trade unions. I conclude by expressing my intention to defend strongly the proposal when it is discussed by the Council. Several governments have already expressed reluctance

and objections to the proposal which we will have to overcome. Again, I thank you for backing the Commission in the efforts we are seeking to make.

President. — The debate is closed.

The vote will be taken at the next voting time.

May I thank all Parliament staff who have had to stay behind to see us through to the conclusion of this debate.

6. *Closure of the annual session*

President. — I declare the 1984-85 session of the European Parliament closed. Pursuant to the provisions of the Treaty, the European Parliament will meet tomorrow Tuesday, 12 March 1985 at 9 a.m.¹

(The sitting was closed at 8.10 p.m.)

¹ *Agenda for next sitting: see Minutes.*

**Salg og abonnement · Verkauf und Abonnement · Πωλήσεις και συνδρομές · Sales and subscriptions
Vente et abonnements · Vendita e abbonamenti · Verkoop en abonnementen**

BELGIQUE / BELGIË

Moniteur belge / Belgisch Staatsblad
Rue de Louvain 40-42 / Leuvensestraat 40-42
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel
Tél. 512 00 26
CCP/Postrekening 000-2005502-27

Sous-dépôts / Agentschappen:

**Librairie européenne /
Europese Boekhandel**

Rue de la Loi 244 / Wetstraat 244
1040 Bruxelles / 1040 Brussel

CREDOC

Rue de la Montagne 34 / Bergstraat 34
Bte 11 / Bus 11
1000 Bruxelles / 1000 Brussel

DANMARK

Schultz Forlag

Møntergade 21
1116 København K
Tlf: (01) 12 11 95
Girokonto 200 11 95

BR DEUTSCHLAND

Verlag Bundesanzeiger

Breite Straße
Postfach 10 80 06
5000 Köln 1
Tel. (02 21) 20 29-0
Fernschreiber:
ANZEIGER BONN 8 882 595

GREECE

G.C. Eleftheroudakis SA

International Bookstore
4 Nikis Street
Athens (126)
Tel. 322 63 23
Telex 219410 ELEF

Sub-agent for Northern Greece:

Molho's Bookstore

The Business Bookshop
10 Tsimiski Street
Thessaloniki
Tel. 275 271
Telex 412885 LIMO

FRANCE

**Service de vente en France des publications
des Communautés européennes**

Journal officiel

26, rue Desaix
75732 Paris Cedex 15
Tél. (1) 578 61 39

IRELAND

Government Publications Sales Office

Sun Alliance House
Molesworth Street
Dublin 2
Tel. 71 03 09

or by post

Stationery Office

St Martin's House
Waterloo Road
Dublin 4
Tel. 68 90 66

ITALIA

Licosa Spa

Via Lamarmora, 45
Casella postale 552
50 121 Firenze
Tel. 57 97 51
Telex 570466 LICOSA I
CCP 343 509

Subagente:

Libreria scientifica Lucio de Biasio - AEIOU

Via Meravigli, 16
20 123 Milano
Tel. 80 76 79

GRAND-DUCHÉ DE LUXEMBOURG

**Office des publications officielles
des Communautés européennes**

5, rue du Commerce
L-2985 Luxembourg
Tél. 49 00 81 - 49 01 91
Télex PUBOF - Lu 1322
CCP 19190-81
CC bancaire BIL 8-109/6003/200

Messageries Paul Kraus

11, rue Christophe Plantin
L-2339 Luxembourg
Tél. 48 21 31
Télex 2515
CCP 49242-63

NEDERLAND

Staatsdrukkerij- en uitgeverijbedrijf

Christoffel Plantijnstraat
Postbus 20014
2500 EA 's-Gravenhage
Tel. (070) 78 99 11

UNITED KINGDOM

HM Stationery Office

HMSO Publications Centre
51 Nine Elms Lane
London SW8 5DR
Tel. 01-211 3935

Sub-agent:

Alan Armstrong & Associates

European Bookshop
London Business School
Sussex Place
London NW1 4SA
Tel. 01-723 3902

ESPAÑA

Mundi-Prensa Libros, S.A.

Castelló 37
E-28001 Madrid
Tel. (91) 276 02 53 - 275 46 55
Telex 49370-MPLI-E

PORTUGAL

Livraria Bertrand, s.a.r.l.

Rua João de Deus
Venda Nova
Amadora
Tél. 97 45 71
Telex 12709-LITRAN-P

SCHWEIZ / SUISSE / SVIZZERA

Librairie Payot

6, rue Grenus
1211 Genève
Tél. 31 89 50
CCP 12-236

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

**European Community Information
Service**

2100 M Street, NW
Suite 707
Washington, DC 20037
Tel. (202) 862 9500

CANADA

Renouf Publishing Co., Ltd

61 Sparks Street (Mall)
Ottawa
Ontario K1P 5A6
Tel. Toll Free 1 (800) 267 4164
Ottawa Region (613) 238 8985-6

JAPAN

Kinokuniya Company Ltd

17-7 Shinjuku 3-Chome
Shinjuku-ku
Tokyo 160-91
Tel. (03) 354 0131

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprise:

- 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 Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

Price (excluding VAT) in Luxembourg:

Annual subscription 1984/1985 ECU 63.30 BFR 2 900 IRL 46 UKL 36.50 USD 55

Single issue price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

ECU 2.18 BFR 100 IRL 1.60 UKL 1.30 USD 2



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

