

Annex

Official Journal of the European Communities

No 2-323

LIBRARY

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