

Annex

# Official Journal

## of the

### European Communities

No 251  
February 1980

English edition

## Debates of the European Parliament

1979-1980 Session

Report of Proceedings

from 11 to 15 February 1980

Europe House, Strasbourg

### Contents

<b>Monday, 11 february 1980</b> . . . . .	1
Resumption, p. 2 — Membership of Parliament, p. 2 — Credentials p. 2 — Statements by the President in Washington, p. 2 — Committees, p. 4 — Petitions, p. 4 — Documents, p. 5 — Texts of treaties, p. 9 — Authorization of reports, p. 9 — Reference to committee, p. 10 — Order of business, p. 10 — Speaking-time, p. 15 — Conduct of plenary sittings, p. 17 — Tabling of amendments, p. 17 — Procedure without report, p. 18 — Procedure, p. 18 — Radioactive waste, p. 19 — Action taken on Parliament's opinions, p. 22 — Question Time, p. 22 — Next sitting, p. 35 — Annex, p. 36.	
<b>Tuesday, 12 february 1980</b> . . . . .	50
Minutes, p. 51 — Documents, p. 51 — Urgent procedure, p. 51 — Welcome, p. 51 — Agricultural prices, p. 51 — XIIIth General Report and work programme for 1980, p. 59 — Shipbuilding and textile industries, p. 65 — Urgent procedure, p. 84 — Shipbuilding and textile industries (contd), p. 84 — Welcome, p. 99 — Oils, fats and proteins, p. 101 — Drug abuse — Public health policy, p. 113 — Agenda, p. 118 — Next sitting, p. 118.	
<b>Wednesday, 13 february 1980</b> . . . . .	119
Minutes, p. 120 — Documents, p. 120 — Agenda, p. 121 — Urgent procedure, p. 121 — Urgent procedure, p. 122 — Decision on early vote, p. 122 — Energy policy, p. 124 — Question Time, p. 157 — Committees, p. 169 — Urgent procedure, p. 169 — Italian Presidency — British share of the Community budget, p. 170 — Provisional Twelfths, p. 187 — Next sitting, p. 188 — Annex, p. 189.	

(Continued overleaf)

NOTE TO READER

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

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

Contents (continued)

<b>Thursday, 14 february 1980</b> . . . . .	193
Minutes, p. 195 — Urgent procedure, p. 195 — Decision on early vote, p. 204 — Agenda, p. 205 — 1980 general budget, p. 205 — Drug abuse — Public health policy (contd), p. 211 — Votes, p. 219 — Special part-session, p. 235 — Drug abuse — Public health policy (contd), p. 235 — Community transit, p. 242 — Agenda, p. 246 — XIIIth General Report and work programme for 1980 (contd) — EEC-Yugoslavia relations, p. 246 — Committees, p. 283 — Next sitting, p. 283.	
<b>Friday, 15 february 1980</b> . . . . .	285
Minutes, p. 287 — Documents, p. 287 — Reference to committee, p. 287 — Authorization of reports, p. 288 — Agenda, p. 288 — Procedure without report, p. 289 — Arrest of Sakharov — Olympic Games, p. 290 — Agenda, p. 305 — Aid to Réunion — Provisional Twelfths, p. 306 — Agricultural products from ACP or OCT, p. 309 — James David Mange, p. 310 — Guatemala, p. 311 — Cambodia, p. 311 — Agenda, p. 319 — Committees, p. 320 — Votes, p. 320 — Sugar for UNRWA, p. 320 — Regional development measures, p. 321 — Transboundary air pollution, p. 323 — Exposure to harmful substances at work, p. 324 — Common customs tariff, p. 325 — Modernization of farms, p. 327 — Next part-session, p. 327 — Minutes, p. 327 — Adjournment, p. 327.	

*Resolutions adopted at sittings of 11 to 15 February 1980 appear in the Official Journal of the European Communities C 59 of 10 March 1980.*

## SITTING OF MONDAY, 11 FEBRUARY 1980

## Contents

1. Resumption of the session . . . . .	2		
2. Membership of Parliament . . . . .	2		
3. Verification of credentials . . . . .	2		
4. Statements made in Washington by the President of the European Parliament:			
<i>Mr Sarre; Mr Pannella; Mr Bangemann; Mr Klepsch; Mr Estier; Mr Poniatowski; Mrs Gredal; Mr von der Vring</i> . . . . .	2		
5. Membership of Committees . . . . .	4		
6. Petitions . . . . .	4		
7. Documents received . . . . .	5		
8. Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council . . . . .	9		
9. Authorization of reports . . . . .	9		
10. Reference to Committee . . . . .	10		
11. Order of business:			
<i>Mr Battersby; Mr Pannella; Mr Patterson; Mr Klepsch; Mr Rogers; Mr Pannella; Mr Ferri; Mr Gillot; Mr Glinne; Mr Moorhouse; Mr Bangemann; Mr Ferri</i> . . . . .	10		
12. Speaking-time:			
<i>Mr Pannella; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr De Goede; Mr Marshall; Mr Linde; Mr Coppieters</i> . . . . .	15		
13. Conduct of plenary sittings . . . . .	17		
14. Time-limit for tabling amendments . . . . .	17		
15. Procedure without report . . . . .	18		
16. Procedural questions			
<i>Mr Galland; Mr Pannella;</i> . . . . .	18		
17. Second five-year programme on radioactive waste (Doc. 1-576/79) (vote contd):			
<i>Explanations of vote: Mrs Weber, rapporteur; Mr Collins, chairman of the</i>			
<i>Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection; Mr Gendebien; Mr Coppieters; Mr Veronesi; Mr Welsh; Mr Pannella</i> . . . . .		19	
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .		21	
<i>Point of order: Mr Rogers</i> . . . . .		21	
18. Action taken by the Commission on Parliament's opinions:			
<i>Lord O'Hagan; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Harris; Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission</i>			
19. Question-Time (Doc. 1-738/79)			
<i>Questions to the Commission:</i>			
<i>Question No 1a, by Mr Moreland: Commission President's lecture:</i>			
<i>Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission; Mr Moreland; Mr Jenkins</i> . . . . .		22	
<i>Question No 3, by Mr Pininfarina: Aid from the Italian state to partly state-owned industries in the clothing sector:</i>			
<i>Mr Vouel, Member of the Commission; Mr Pininfarina; Mr Vouel; Mr Welsh; Mr Vouel; Mr Turner; Mr Vouel; Mr Poncelet; Mr Vouel</i> . . . . .		23	
<i>Question No 5, by Mr Berkhouwer: Trade negotiations between the EEC and the USSR:</i>			
<i>Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Berkhouwer; Mr Haferkamp; Mr Radoux; Mr Haferkamp</i> . . . .		24	
<i>Question No 6, by Lord O'Hagan: Cider tax:</i>			
<i>Mr Burke, Member of the Commission; Lord O'Hagan; Mr Burke; Mr Marshall; Mr Burke; Mr Cottrell; Mr Burke</i> . . . .		24	
<i>Question No 7, by Mr O'Connell: Directorate-General for Consumer Affairs:</i>			
<i>Mr Jenkins; Mr O'Connell; Mr Jenkins</i> . .		25	
<i>Question No 8, by Mr Turner: Failure to fulfil an obligation under the EEC Treaty:</i>			

<i>Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Turner; Mr Gundelach; Mr Boyes; Mr Gundelach; Mr Pranchère; Mr Gundelach; Mr Purvis; Mr Gundelach; Mr Delatte; Mr Gundelach; Mr d'Ormesson; Mr Gundelach . . . . .</i>	26	<i>Community and the Member States, and No 21, by Mr Purvis: Distribution of Community aid to Kampuchea:</i>	
<i>Question No 9, by Mrs von Alemann: Elimination of pollution at Seveso:</i>		<i>Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission; Mr Purvis; Mr Cheysson; Mr Prag; Mr Cheysson; Mr Lomas; Mr Cheysson; Sir Fred Warner; Mr Cheysson . . . . .</i>	32
<i>Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Sherlock; Mr Natali . . . . .</i>	29	<i>Question No 15, by Mr Baudis: Using dipped headlights in towns:</i>	
<i>Question No 10, by Mrs Ewing: Spain's entry to the EEC and fishing problems:</i>		<i>Mr Burke; Mr Baudis; Mr Burke; Mr Moreland; Mr Burke . . . . .</i>	33
<i>Mr Gundelach; Mrs Ewing; Mr Gundelach; Mr Provan; Mr Gundelach; Mr Maffre-Baugé; Mr Gundelach; Mr Kirk; Mr Gundelach . . . . .</i>	29	<i>Question No 16, by Mrs Squarcialupi: Implementation of the Community directive on teaching the children of migrant workers their mother tongue:</i>	
<i>Question No 11, by Mr Collins: Classical swine-fever and UK pig-farming:</i>		<i>Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Brunner; Mrs Cluyd; Mr Brunner; Mr Seal; Mr Brunner . . . . .</i>	34
<i>Mr Gundelach; Mr Collins; Mr Gundelach; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Gundelach; Mrs Buchan . . . . .</i>	31	<i>Point of order: Mr Seal . . . . .</i>	35
<i>Questions No 14, by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti: Position of Cambodian refugees in a number of camps and aid from the</i>		<i>Mr Welsh; Mr Brunner . . . . .</i>	35
		<i>Point of order: Mr Radoux . . . . .</i>	35
		<i>20. Agenda for the next sitting . . . . .</i>	35
		<i>Annex . . . . .</i>	36

IN THE CHAIR : MRS VEIL

*President*

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

**President.** — The sitting is open.

1. *Resumption of the session*

**President.** — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 18 January 1980.

2. *Membership of Parliament*

**President.** — I have been informed by the German Bundestag that on 18 January 1980, Mr Gautier was appointed Member of the European Parliament to replace Mr Hauenschild, who had resigned.

3. *Verification of credentials*

— At its meeting of 1 February 1980, the Bureau verified the credentials of Mr Gautier and of Mr Mihr, whose election had already been announced.

Pursuant to Rule 3 (1) of the Rules of Procedure the Bureau confirmed that the appointments comply with the provisions of the Treaties. It therefore proposes that the House ratify the appointments.

Are there any objections?

The appointments are ratified.

4. *Statements made in Washington by the President of the European Parliament*

**President.** — I call Mr Sarre.

**Mr Sarre.** — (F) Madam President, I wish to say a few words about your recent visit to the United States at the head of a delegation from this Parliament.

Madam President, I remember that in your inaugural speech you said: 'In the true spirit of democracy, I shall endeavour to be the President of the entire Assembly'.

Now it seems to me that in your statement on the Olympic Games in your capacity as leader of the European parliamentary delegation to the United States, you appeared to be the representative of one part of this Assembly. You exceeded your terms of reference. Contrary to your claim, this Assembly has never spoken out clearly in favour of a boycott. You gave an exaggerated interpretation of Parliament's resolution — that is my first point.

Then too it seems to me that the substance and form of this matter cannot be separated. You expressed your views in Washington. But is it the role of the President of the European Parliament to take part in Jimmy Carter's election campaign? How do you interpret the independence of Europe, madam? Do you think that the voice of Europe can be equated with the voice of America? That is my second point.

**Sarre**

Finally, Madam, I am sure it is not your intention to court disaster. Unfortunately you have joined in a climate of cold war which is harmful to detente, peace and the freedoms which you claim to defend. That is my third point.

Madam President, as a representative of France and a socialist, I felt obliged to make these observations at the opening of this part-session.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* Madam President, I wish to speak in the same capacity as Mr Sarre, if you will allow me to do so, but I shall be even more concise in my remarks.

I realize that it may seem unfortunate for the President of the European Parliament to advance — although, if I understand rightly, you stressed that you were speaking in a personal capacity — an interpretation which some Members feel went too far. But I have learned from the press that this was your own interpretation.

Madam President, if we belonged to a Parliament with the backing of a centuries-old tradition, in which the rules were vigorously defended from day to day, I should understand Mr Sarre's sensitivity. But in a situation in which the rules are violated — as we shall see in a minute — I can only denounce the attitude of the socialist group (to say nothing of the Band of Four) which supports such violations. Madam President, I put on record my full solidarity with you because it is impossible to be the President of a Parliament which is willing every day to violate its own rules and gag minorities. I can therefore only denounce the demagogic sensitivity to which Mr Sarre bore witness.

**President.** — I call Mr Bangemann.

**Mr Bangemann.** — *(D)* Madam President, let me stress that I was a member of the delegation to the United States and present in Washington; I consider it important to speak from personal experience and with a full knowledge of the circumstances which was lacking from the criticisms we have just heard.

The observations made just now by your socialist colleague are diametrically opposed to the statement made by the chairman of the Socialist Group at the last Bureau meeting. Since you could not say so yourself, I want to inform the House that the Chairman of the Socialist Group spoke out energetically and firmly in support of the position adopted by the President in Washington.

*(Applause from some benches on the right)*

She was doing no more than explain the decisions that we had ourselves taken in this Chamber. The President did not go one inch further than the decisions reached already in this House on the Olympic Games.

*(Applause from some benches on the right)*

I might add that the decision, which was not taken by a majority of the votes cast, gave the European Parliament, its President and the whole delegation an unusually good introduction to the talks with the United States Congress. We had a very good position representing the majority but without the support of all the groups in the House. However, once the position was arrived at we should not destroy it of our own accord. This House has a common position; let us not bring it into discredit after the event. I wanted to make that point to the colleagues who have criticized something that they read in a newspaper instead of concerning themselves with the true state of affairs — which would be far preferable.

*(Applause from some benches on the right)*

**President.** — I call Mr Klepsch.

**Mr Klepsch.** — *(D)* Madam President, after Mr Bangemann's remarks I shall be very brief. I merely want to confirm that you presented in the correct light the decisions taken by this House.

I want to add one thing. I do not entirely understand the attitude of our socialist colleague since Mrs van den Heuvel made the following statement in the Political Affairs Committee for which we were all grateful to her: 'We took a majority decision and we voted at the time for a different resolution but I want to make it plain that the Socialist Group now subscribes to the common position adopted by the European Parliament. 'We welcomed those remarks and were grateful to Mrs van den Heuvel for making them to the Political Affairs Committee. That was before we went to Washington. I am therefore all the more surprised at the criticism now being voiced from the back benches of the Socialist Group since at the time we had the impression that Mrs van den Heuvel was speaking on behalf of that group.

**President.** — I call Mr Estier.

**Mr Estier.** — *(F)* Madam President, I want to make an observation following on from the statements by Mr Bangemann and Mr Klepsch. I too asked myself certain questions about the nature of the statements which you made in Washington on the boycott of the Olympic Games. You were reported as saying that you were referring to a resolution voted by a majority in Parliament, although another minority resolution did not want the games to be boycotted. My question, especially after the statement by Mr Bangemann, is this: what exactly was the purport of the resolution on the Olympic Games voted by a majority of Members of this Parliament. I put this question because I had occasion, during a radio broadcast in France to raise the point with one of our colleagues who voted in favour of the resolution, Mr Michel Poni-

**Estier**

atowski. He said (and the transcript of the broadcast is there to prove it) that the resolution in no way implied a boycott of the games. He went on to say that he was against such a boycott. I should therefore like to know whether the January resolution implied a boycott or not. We cannot all be right, I think we should avoid a great deal of misunderstanding if the precise significance of the text voted by a majority of this House in January could be clarified.

**President.** — I call Mr Poniatowski.

**Mr Poniatowski.** — (F) I would simply remind Mr Estier that the position of the Liberal and Democratic Group when this matter was raised was as follows: we shall vote in favour of any motion condemning the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan and we were prepared to endorse the Socialist motion which was very close to our own. However, the Socialist Group was not prepared to compromise. And I said to you, Mr Estier, that it was not a boycott of the games or any other particular measure which was important. The important thing was that a majority of this House clearly and firmly condemned the Russian occupation of Afghanistan. That was the important point and you know it.

**President.** — I should like to draw Mr Estier's attention to a fact which, I believe, will dispense us from having to interpret the resolution adopted. I did not interpret this resolution, I simply read it out in its exact wording, which I had taken with me, whilst pointing out, firstly, that it had been adopted by a narrow majority; secondly that, there had been another resolution which simply condemned the intervention in Afghanistan without calling for any sanctions to be applied; and, lastly, that a small section of the Assembly had not supported any of the motions and had even refused to participate in the vote.

I also informed my interlocutors that if the motion for a resolution calling on the Commission to envisage economic sanctions and to deliberate on the appropriateness of participating in the Olympic Games had been adopted, it was, as Mr Poniatowski has just pointed out, in order that a resolution might be adopted and that in reality the Parliament was more or less equally divided.

I therefore feel that I remained extremely true to the facts and, if anything, expressed a more moderate position than that of Parliament. I note, moreover, that the chairman of the parliamentary delegation, who was present at the talks and is now present in the chamber, seconds my remarks in this respect.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

Moreover, when asked for my opinion, I said that in my view the matter could not be abstracted from its political context: indeed the very fact that a new

motion for a resolution on the Olympic Games has been submitted to Parliament will bear me out here. I was asked what were my personal feelings on this matter and I replied that in view of the situation — which moreover was not final — it would not be appropriate to participate in the Games.

Those are precisely the positions I adopted. In each instance, I stressed the fact that the majority in favour of sanctions — without suggesting that it would be a matter of boycotting the Olympic Games — had been extremely small.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

I call Mrs Gredal.

**Mrs Gredal.** — (DK) Madam President, I do not wish to prolong the debate, but I do wish to stress that I fully agree with what you said in your statement. In your speech to Congress you accurately made known to the USA what took place in Parliament. So I can only say that I fully agree with what you said.

**President.** — I call Mr von der Vring.

**Mr von der Vring.** — (D) Madam President, it would be a misunderstanding if the impression were given here that Mr Sarre put his objections on behalf of the Socialist Group.

#### 5. Membership of committees

**President.** — I have received from the Liberal and Democratic Group a request to appoint Mr Bange-mann member of the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport to replace Mrs von Alemann.

I have received from the Socialist Group a request to appoint Mr Gautier member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Are there any objections?

These appointments are ratified.

#### 6. Petitions

**President.** — I have received:

- a petition from Amnesty International, Italian Section, Varese Group, on Raul Gambaro Nunez, Uruguayan political prisoner
- a petition from four employees of the Centre for Educational and Career Guidance, Cosenza, on vocational training in Italy
- a petition from Mr Emilio Mansera Conde on racial discrimination practised by Castile.
- a petition from the Foundation 'Mondiaal Alternatief Holland and the Foundation 'Het Vogeljaar' on European action against the export of pesticides whose use is banned within the European Community
- a petition from the people of Strabane, Northern Ireland, on a world relief campaign.

**President**

These petitions have been given numbers 44 to 48/79 and have been entered in the register provided for in Rule 48 (2) of the Rules of Procedure. Pursuant to paragraph 3 of that same Rule, they have been referred to the committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

Furthermore, at its meeting of 22 and 23 January 1980, the Political Affairs Committee examined petitions Nos. 12/76, 9/78, 27/78, 23/78 and 26/78 which had been referred to it by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

The first three petitions have been filed without further action since the Political Affairs Committee is currently in the process of drawing up a report on the violation of human rights in Chile.

Petition No 23/78 has also had been filed without further action since the Political Affairs Committee has decided to draw up a report on human rights in the Soviet Union.

Petition No 26/78 has been filed without further action since the Political Affairs Committee has decided to draw up a report on the violation of human rights in different parts of the world.

*7. Documents received*

**President.** — I have received :

(a) the Council, requests for an opinion on :

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 337/79 on the common organization of the market in wine (Doc. 1-691/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets for an opinion ;

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2579/79 opening, allocating and providing for the administration of Community tariff quotas for certain wines having a registered designation of origin, falling within subheading ex 22.05 C of the Common Customs Tariff, originating in Tunisia (1979/80) (Doc. 1-692/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on External Economic Relations as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Development and Cooperation for opinions ;

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1119/78 laying down special measures for peas and field beans used in the feeding of animals (Doc. 1-693/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets for an opinion ;

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a directive concerning the harmonization of income taxation provisions with respect to freedom of movement of workers within the Community (Doc. 1-694/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs for an opinion ;

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a directive amending for the second time Directive 75/726/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States concerning fruit juices and certain similar products (Doc. 1-695/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Agriculture for an opinion ;

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 805/68 on the common organization of the market in beef and veal (Doc. 1-696/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets for an opinion ;

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2925/78 with regard to the period of suspension of application of the prices condition to which import into the Community of certain types of citrus fruit originating in Spain is subject (Doc. 1-697/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on External Economic Relations as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Budgets for opinions ;

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a decision on the association of the overseas countries and territories with the European Economic Community (Doc. 1-700/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Development and Cooperation as the committee responsible and to the Committee on External Economic Relations, the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs for opinions ;

- proposals from the Commission to the Council for :

I a decision concluding the Convention between the European Economic Community and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA) on aid to refugees in the countries of the Near East

II a regulation on the supply of sugar to UNRWA as food aid

(Doc. 1-720/79)

**President**

which have been referred to the Committee on Development and Cooperation as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Agriculture for opinions ;

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to rear-view mirrors for two- or three-wheeled motor vehicles (Doc. 1-703/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Transport and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection for opinions ;

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation amending Regulations (EEC) Nos 3081/78, 3082/78 and 3083/78 opening, allocating and providing for the administration of Community tariff quotas for certain wines falling within subheading ex 22.05 C of the Common Customs Tariff, originating in Portugal (1979/80) (Doc. 1-708/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on External Economic Relations as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Agriculture for an opinion ;

- proposals from the Commission to the Council on :

- I a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States on the fuel consumption of motor vehicles
- II a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States on the power of motor vehicles

(Doc. 1-710/79)

which have been referred to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs ;

- proposals from the Commission to the Council for :

- I a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States on roll-over protection devices on construction vehicles
- II a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States on protection devices to guard against objects falling from construction vehicles

(Doc. 1-711/79)

which have been referred to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs as the committee responsible, and to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection for an opinion ;

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1081/77 temporarily suspending purchasing subsidies for dairy cows and heifers intended for milk production (Doc. 1-712/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture ;

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a directive amending Directive 77/99/EEC with regard to the medical examination of persons employed in the production of meat products (Doc. 1-721/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection ;

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a directive amending Directive 71/118/EEC as regards medical examination of personnel engaged in the production of poultrymeat (Doc. 1-722/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection ;

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation (EEC) concerning allocation and control of certain catch quotas for vessels flying the flag of a Member State and fishing the Regulatory Area defined in the NAFO Convention (Doc. 1/727/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture ;

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation concerning the application of Decision 1/80 of the ACP-EEC Committee of Ambassadors applying transitional measures until the entry into force of the Second Convention of Lomé (Doc. 1-728/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Development and Cooperation ;

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation concerning, for certain fish stocks occurring in the Community fishing zone, the fixing for 1980 of the total allowable catches and the means of making the catches together with the share available to the Community (Doc. 1-729/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture ;

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a directive on the Community value added tax and excise duty procedure applicable to the stores of vessels, aircraft and international trains (Doc. 1-739/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs ;

- proposals from the Commission to the Council for a directive amending for the fourth time Council Directive 76/769/EEC on the approximation of the laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States relating to restrictions on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations (Doc. 1-740/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection ;

- proposals from the Commission to the Council for ;

**President**

I a draft Council directive on statistical returns in respect of carriage of goods by inland waterways, as part of regional statistics ;

II a draft Council directive on statistical returns in respect of carriage of goods by rail, as part of regional statistics

(Doc. 1-743/79)

which have been referred to the Committee on Transport as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets for an opinion ;

— proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation (EEC) relating to the zootechnical standards applicable to breeding animals of the porcine species (Doc. 1-745/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture ;

(b) from the committees, the following reports :

- report by Mr Fuchs, on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 211/79) on the energy objectives of the Community for 1990 and convergence of policies of the Member States, and on nuclear energy and energy policy (Doc. 1-704/79) ;
- report by Mr Filippi, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-392/79) for a decision introducing special aid for small and medium-sized industrial enterprises in Portugal (Doc., 1-706/79) ;
- report by Mr Cronin, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-451/79) for regulations instituting specific Community regional development projects under Article 13 of the ERDF Regulation (Doc. 1-715/79) ;
- report by Miss Quin, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-449/79) for a regulation on the charging by the Community of a fee for permits authorizing a vessel flying the flag of a Member State of the Community to fish for salmon in the Swedish fishing zone (Doc. 1-717/79) ;
- report by Mr Seeler, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on relations between the European Community and the ASEAN States and on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation concluding the cooperation agreement between the European Economic Community and Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand, member countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (Doc. 1-718/79) ;
- report by Mr Barbarella, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities (Doc. 1-628/79) for a directive amending Directive 72/159/EEC on the modernization of farms (Doc. 1-719/79) ;

— report by Mr Ligios, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-573/79) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 1035/72 on the common organization of the market in fruit and vegetables (Doc. 1-720/79) ;

— report by Mr Antoniozzi, on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee, on the political situation in Nicaragua (Doc. 1-723/79) ;

— report by Mr Schwartzberg, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on restrictions of competition in the field of air transport (Doc. 1-724/79) ;

— report by Mr Gillot, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, on the need for and definition of a common position by the Member States of the Community at the Third United Nations Conference (9th Session) on the Law of the Sea and on participation by the Community as such in the agreements to be concluded at the end of the Conference proceedings (Doc. 1-725/79) ;

— report by Mr Kellett-Bowman, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on the discharge to be granted to the Administrative Board of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions in respect of the implementation of its appropriations for the financial years 1976, 1977 and 1978 and the comments accompanying this decision (Doc. 1-726/79)

— report by Mr Poncelet, on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 110/79) for a decision adopting a second research and development programme of the European Economic Community in the field of textile and clothing (indirect action) (Doc., 1-730/79) ;

— report by Mr Buchou, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-274/79) for a regulation fixing the quantities of basic products considered to have been used in the manufacture of goods covered by Regulation (EEC) No (Doc. 1-731/79) ;

— report by Mr Sable, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for :

I the arrangements applicable to agricultural products and certain goods resulting from the processing of agricultural products originating from the African, Caribbean and Pacific States or from overseas countries and territories (Doc. 1-637/79)

II a regulation concerning the application of Decision 1/80 of the ACP-EEC Committee of Ambassadors applying transitional measures until the entry into force of the Second Convention of Lomé (Doc. 1-728/79)

(Doc. 1-732/79) ;

## President

- report by Mr Seal, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-642/79) for a regulation extending the arrangements applicable to trade with the Republic of Cyprus beyond the date of expiry of the first stage of the Association Agreement (Doc. 1-733/79);
- report by Mr Wawrzik, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on food aid to Cambodia and the South-East Asian refugees (Doc. 1-734/79);
- report by Mr B. Nielsen, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on :

I a proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council amending the proposal for a regulation (EEC) laying down the catch quotas allocated for 1979 to vessels flying the flag of Member States of the Community in respect of certain fish stocks occurring both in the waters falling under the sovereignty or jurisdiction of these Member States and in the waters falling under the sovereignty or jurisdiction of Norway

II a proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a regulation providing for technical adjustments to Regulation (EEC) No 587/79 laying down for 1979 certain measures of conservation and management of fish stocks, applicable to vessels flying the flag of Norway

III a statement from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council concerning the fixing for 1979 of the total amount of catches authorized for certain fish stocks occurring in the fishing zone of the Community

(Doc. 1-735/79);

### (c) the following oral questions with debate :

- by Mr Maffre-Bauge, Mr Martin, Mr Pranchère, Mrs de March, Mrs Poirier, Mrs Le Roux, Mr Fernandez and Mr Wurtz, to the Commission on wine-growing in France and the impact of imports from Italy on the production and marketing of wine in France (Doc. 1-698/79);
- by Mr Linkohr, Mrs Roudy, Mr Adam, Mrs Fuillet, Mr Griffiths, Mr Linde, Mrs Lizin, Mr Muntingh, Mr Percheron, Mr Rogers, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, Mr Schmid, Mrs Charzat and Mrs Weber, to the Commission on the safety of pressurized water reactors (PWR) (Doc. 1-699/79);
- by Mrs Schleicher, Mr Albers, Mr Ghergo, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mrs Maij-Weggen, Mr Verroken, Mr Estgen, Mr Michel, Mr Mertens and Mr Nordlohne, to the Commission on public health policy in the EEC (Doc. 1-701/79);

### (d) for Question Time on 11 and 13 February 1980, oral questions pursuant to Rule 47A of the Rules of Procedure by :

- Mr Almirante, Mr Moreland, Mr Ansquer, Mr Pininfarina, Mr Beumer and Mr Penders, Mr Berkhouwer, Lord O'Hagan, Mr O'Connell, Mr Turner, Mrs von Alemann, Mrs Ewing, Mr Collins, Mr Van Aerssen, Mr Spinelli, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Baudis, Mrs Squarcialupi, Mr Provan, Mr Remilly, Mr Gillot, Mr

Poncelet, Mr Purvis, Mr Kavanagh, Mrs Clwyd, Sir John Stewart-Clark, Mr Maher, Mr Estgen, Mr Muntingh, Mr Harris, Mr Barbagli, Mr Welsh, Mr O'Donnell, Mr Deleau, Mrs Desmond, Mr Schmid, Mr Cronin, Mr Leonardi, Mr Debre, Mr Bersani, Mr Beumer, Mr Gouthier, Mr Irmer, Mrs Castle, Mr Radoux, Mr Seeler, Mr Megahy, Mrs Lizin, Mrs Clwyd, Mr Sieglerschmidt, Mr Buchou, Mrs Dienesch, Lord Douro, Mr Battersby, Mr Turner, Mr Colla, Mrs Ewing, Mr Poncelet, Mr Ansquer, Mrs Chouraqui, Mrs Lizin, Mr Kavanagh, Mr Fellermaier, Mr Radoux, Mr Paisley, Mr Colla, Mrs Ewing, Mr van Aerssen, Mr Megahy, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, Mr Vayssade, Mr Glinne, Mr Sieglerschmidt and Mr Fergusson;

### (e) the following motions for resolutions :

- by Mrs Van den Heuvel, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the voting procedure in plenary sittings (Doc. 1-688/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions ;

- by Mr Chambeiron, Mr Baillet, Mrs De March, Mr Ansart, Mr Wurtz, Mr Damette, Mr Denis and Mrs Hoffmann, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the banning of Maître Borker from appearing in court (Doc. 1-689/79)

which has been referred to the Legal Affairs Committee as the committee responsible, and to the Political Affairs Committee for an opinion ;

- by Mr Capanna and Mrs Castellina, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the embargo imposed by the United States Government on cereal supplies to the Soviet Union (Doc. 1-690/79)

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee as the committee responsible, and to the Committee on External Economic Relations and the Committee on Development and Cooperation for opinions ;

- by Mr Klepsch, Mr Vergeer, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Diligent, Mr Ryan, Mr Fuchs and Mr Herman, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group) pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the release of the Russian physicist Yuri Orlov, co-founder of the group monitoring the application in the USSR of the Final Act of Helsinki (Doc. 1-707/79)

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee ;

- motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Bocklet, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Pötterling, Mr Sälzer, Mr von Wogau, Mr Fuchs, Mr I. Friedrich, Mr Lega, Mr Penders, Mrs Maij-Weggen, Mr McCartin, Mr Fischbach, Mr Estgen, Mr Pfennig and Mr van Aerssen, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group), pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on promoting youth exchanges and setting up a European Youth Foundation of the European Communities (Doc. 1-714/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport as the committee responsible, and to the Committee on Budgets for an opinion ;

**President**

- motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Gendebien, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the setting up of four new nuclear power stations at Chooz (Givet) in the immediate vicinity of the French-Belgian border and on the need to avoid siting power stations in the Community's frontier regions (Doc. 1-736/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Energy and Research ;

- motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Beumer, Mrs Van den Heuvel, Mr Klepsch, Mr Majonica, Mr Verroken, Mr Fischbach, Mr Geurtsen and Mrs Dekker, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on fixed prices for books (Doc. 1-744/79),

which has been referred to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport for its opinion ;

- motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Tyrrell and Mr Kirk, on behalf of the European Democratic Group, pursuant to Rules 25 and 54 of the Rules of Procedure, on the amendment of the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament (Doc. 1-746/79),

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee as the committee responsible, and to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions for an opinion ;

- motion for a resolution tabled by Mr O'Leary, Mr Kavanagh, Mrs Desmond and Mr O'Connell, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on Community action in favour of peat (Doc. 1-747/79),

which has been referred to the Committee on Energy and Research ;

(f) from the Commission :

on 29 January 1980

- opinion on the proposal for the transfer of appropriations No 1/80 between chapters within Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities for the financial year 1980 (Doc. 1-709/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

- the Thirteenth General Report on the activities of the European Communities in 1979 : Report on the agricultural situation in the Community (Doc. 1-648/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture ;

(g) from the Council :

- a decision of 5 February 1980 authorizing certain expenditure in favour of Afghan refugees (Doc. 1-741/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets as the committee responsible, and to the Committee on Development and Cooperation for an opinion ;

- a decision of 5 February 1980 authorizing certain provisional twelfths for 1980 (Doc. 1-742/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets.

**8. Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council**

**President.** — I have received from the Council certified true copies of the following documents :

- agreement in the form of an exchange of letters extending the trade agreement between the European Economic Community and the Argentine Republic ;
- agreement in the form of an exchange of letters between the European Economic Community and the Republic of India on the guaranteed prices for cane sugar for 1979/1980 ;
- agreement in the form of an exchange of letters between the European Economic Community and Turkey fixing the additional amount to be deducted from the levy on imports into the Community of untreated olive oil, originating in Turkey, for the period from 1 November 1979 to 31 October 1980 ;
- act of notification of the approval by the Community of the supplementary protocol to the agreement between the European Economic Community and the Portuguese Republic ;
- act of notification of the approval by the Community of the agreement on fisheries between the European Economic Community and the government of Canada and of the agreement in the form of an exchange of letters concerning that agreement ;
- act of notification of the approval by the Community of the agreement between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Guatemala on trade in textile products ;
- act of notification of the approval by the Community of the agreement between the European Economic Community and Indonesia on trade in textile products ;
- act of notification of the approval by the Community of the agreement between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Peru on trade in textile products ;
- act of notification of the approval by the Community of the agreement between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Singapore on trade in textile products.

These documents will be deposited in the archives of the European Parliament.

**9. Authorization of reports**

**President.** — Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Rules of Procedure, I have authorized various committees to draw up reports :

- *the Committee on External Economic Relations* :
  - a report on the Community's anti-dumping policies,
  - a report on the EECs relations with the state-trading countries and, possibly, with the countries of Eastern Europe,
  - a report on the renewal of the cooperation agreement relating to trade between the EEC and India

## President

- *the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment* ;
  - a report on the communications from the Commission on part-time apprenticeships for young people
  - a report on the Commission's memorandum on worker participation in capital formation
- *the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning* :
  - a report on the decline of regional economies in Europe, particularly in rural areas
  - the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection have been asked for opinions
- *the Committee on Transport* :
  - a report on the memorandum on transport infrastructures
  - the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning have been asked for an opinion
- *the ad hoc committee on Women's Rights* :
  - a report on measures to be taken under the treaties with regard to women's affairs.

### 10. Reference to Committee

**President.** — The enlarged Bureau has decided to refer the motion for a resolution on interference by the Greek government (Doc. 1-521/79) to the Legal Affairs Committee and not, as had been previously decided, to the Committee on Budgets.

The Committee on Development and Cooperation has, at its own request and pursuant to Rule 38(3) of the Rules of Procedure, been authorized to deliver an opinion on relations between the Community and the ASEAN, a subject on which the Committee on External Economic relations has been authorized to draw up a report.

### 11. Order of business

**President.** — The next item is the order of business. At its meeting of 17 January 1980, the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda for the part-session and this has been distributed (PE 62.564/rev.).

The following reports, not having been adopted in committee, have therefore been withdrawn from the draft agenda :

- No 189, report by Mrs Maij-Weggen on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection concerning the colouring matters authorized for use in foodstuffs intended for human consumption, scheduled for Thursday 14 February 1980 ;
- No 195, report by Mr Battersby on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture concerning the management of fishery resources in the 200 nautical mile zone off the coast of the French department of Guyana, scheduled for Friday 15 February 1980.

I call Mr Battersby.

**Mr Battersby.** — Madam President, with regard to item 195, the withdrawal of the report on fishing in

Community waters off Guyana was requested not because we were not ready to present the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture, and not because the matter had not been analyzed in depth by the rapporteur, but for a reason of considerable gravity and importance to this chamber. Once again the Council has treated Parliament with contempt. The Council approved the Regulation, which was basically a continuation of the 1978 and 1979 Regulations on shrimp fishing in Community waters, without awaiting the opinion of this House. The request for our opinion was forwarded by Mr Hummel to the presidency on 3 December. The Council published the Regulation on 20 December. I am even tempted to believe that the Regulation was in the press before the request for our opinion was sent to us. The Council's constant lack of respect for this elected body must cease and, if necessary, pressure will have to be applied through the Court to bring some order and respect for Parliament and its opinions into our Institutional relations.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the right)*

**President.** — Note has been taken of your statement, Mr Battersby, and the matter will be referred to the Legal Affairs Committee, which has already had occasion to deal with matters of this nature.

Item No 198 — the report by Mr Sutra, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on liqueur wines — scheduled for Friday 15 February 1980, has also been withdrawn.

Furthermore, the report by Mr Ligios, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the common organization of the market in fruit and vegetables, scheduled under No 200 for Friday 15 February, has become a report with debate.

I have received three proposed amendments to the draft agenda, pursuant to Rule 12 (2) of the Rules of Procedure :

- the Committee on Budgets has requested the inclusion in the agenda of Tuesday 12 February of a report by Mr Dankert and a report by Mr R. Jackson on the provisional twelfth.

By agreement with the chairmen of the political groups, I propose to place these reports at the end of the agenda for Tuesday 12 February.

Are there any comments ?

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* Madam President, as I said at the meeting to which you referred, the fact that Members will only have a few seconds to speak in the debate on Tuesday gives rise to serious doubts in our minds about the possibility of having a debate at all. I therefore feel that a very bad choice has been made first of the day on which to consider this very important topic and, second, of the way in which the debate is to be conducted.

**President.** — This matter was discussed at length this morning with the chairmen of the political groups, but unfortunately we were unable to find a more suitable date. We all greatly regret not being able to devote more time to important debates but we have no alternative for the moment. As I shall point out later, the enlarged Bureau is to devote an entire day in the near future to studying ways of improving the working of our Assembly in general so as to be able to devote more time to the more important debates.

Are there any other comments?

The proposed amendment is adopted.

The Committee on External Economic Relations has requested the inclusion in the agenda of a report by Mr Seal on trade with Cyprus (Doc. 1-733/79).

The chairmen of the political groups, whom I consulted this morning, expressed a negative opinion with regard to this proposed amendment.

I put the request to the vote.

The proposed amendment is rejected.

Lastly, Mr Patterson and 9 other signatories have tabled a proposed modification to the draft agenda seeking to have Question Time on Wednesday, 13 February, held from 3 to 4.30 p.m. and not from 5.30 to 7 p.m.

I call Mr Patterson.

**Mr Patterson.** — Madam President, I should like to comment on the purpose of this amendment to the agenda. It is a matter which many people feel very strongly about, namely that we must make absolutely certain that Question Time with the Council takes place during this part-session.

One of the most important functions of this Parliament is to question the Council on its activities, something which, I think, Mr Battersby's speech a moment ago emphasized. The national parliaments cannot do this. They can only question individual ministers. This House is the only parliament that can question the Council as a collective body and as a Community Institution. It is for this reason that the cancellation of questions to the Council at two successive part-sessions is a matter of very grave concern. It is not an exaggeration to say that in this area Parliament has been failing in its democratic duty. In January, many of us raised the matter of the cancellation of Question Time in December, and we were given an assurance that in January Question Time would take place as planned. However, it did not. Now, there are two solutions to this, Madam President. On the order paper for Wednesday we have 'Question Time, 5.30'. And if it could be absolutely certain, if we were given a categorical assurance, that whatever business the House was discussing at 5.30 on Wednesday it would cease and

Question Time would then take place, as is the case in most national parliaments, that would be satisfactory. But, failing that, there is only one other solution, which is that Question Time should be moved to take place immediately after the lunch break on Wednesday. This has been the practice of this House in the past. We cannot risk the credibility of this Parliament by putting Question Time with the Council in jeopardy for a third successive time. And unless you can give an absolute categorical assurance that Question Time with the Council will take place at 5.30 on Wednesday, I shall have to press for a vote on this matter.

*(Applause from certain quarters)*

**President.** — I call Mr Klepsch.

**Mr Klepsch.** — *(D)* Madam President, I think enough provision has already been made on our agenda to ensure that we shall not be faced with the occurrence which Mr Patterson fears. No votes are down for Wednesday at 3 p.m. and speaking time has been fixed for the other items so that I can see no risk to Question Time. I would therefore ask Mr Patterson not to put his motion to the vote; measures have after all already been taken to ensure that we do not get held up by long votes at 3 p.m. as happened last time; no votes are down for Wednesday.

**President.** — I call Mr Rogers.

**Mr Rogers.** — Madam President, having unfortunately been in the chair on the occasions Mr Patterson referred to, I would support his request. I think, that with the best will in the world, it has proved impossible to hold Question Time halfway through a voting session since if the President suspends the business, objections are raised by political group chairmen. I think it would be wise to start precisely at 3 o'clock, thus setting aside a specific amount of time. I therefore cannot see any possible reason for not going along with Mr Patterson's very very reasonable request.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the right)*

**President.** — I put the request to the vote.

The modification is adopted.

On Wednesday, Question Time will therefore be held from 3 to 4.30 p.m.

*(Applause from the European Democratic Group)*

One of the items already on the agenda for Thursday is the oral question with debate by Mr Maffre-Bauge and on others on wine-growing (Doc. 1-698/79). At the request of the Socialist Group and in agreement with the other Group Chairmen, I propose that Parliament consider together with this question the oral question with debate by Mr Sutra and others on a similar subject, on the understanding that the two

**President**

questions will be taken in a joint debate and that Mr Sutra's speaking time will be taken out of the speaking time allotted to the Socialist Group.

Are there any objections?

That is decided.

I have received a number of requests for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure. By agreement with the Political Group Chairmen, I propose pursuant to Rule 12 of the Rules of Procedure that the following motions for resolutions be put on the agenda as the first item for joint debate on Friday, 15 February:

- the motion for a resolution by Lady Elles, Lord Douro, Mr Fergusson, Mr C. Jackson, Mrs Lenz, Mr Schall, Mr Prag, Mr Macario, Sir Fred Warner, Mr Penders, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Lord Bethell, Mr Scott-Hopkins, Mr Damseaux, Mr Nothomb, Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Blumenfeld, Mr von Hassel, Mr Habsburg, Mr Goppel, Mr Moorhouse, Mr Moreland on the Olympic Games in Moscow (Doc. 1-716/79)
- the motion for a resolution by Mr Ripa di Meana, Mr Pelikan, Mr Glinne, Mr Dido, Mr Zagari, Mr Estier, Mr Jaquet, Mrs Roudy, Mr Delors, Mr Schwartzberg, Mr Oehler, Mr Colla, Mr Ferri, Mr Cohen, Mr Enright, Mr Radoux, Mrs van den Heuvel, Mr Walter, Mr Vetter, Mr Seefeld, Mr Albers, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, Mr van Minnen, Mr Linkohr, Mr Peters, Mr Schmid, Mr Arndt, Mr Fellermaier, on sanctions imposed on Professor Sakharov, holder of the Nobel Peace Prize (Doc. 1-749/79)
- the motion for a resolution by Mr Alber, Mr Penders, Mr Diligent, Mr Michel, Mr Klepsch, Mr Pottering, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Simonnet, Mr Habsburg, Mrs Walz, Mr Moreau, Mr Beumer, Mr Henskens, Mr Aigner, Mr d'Ormesson, Mr Malangre, Mr Jonker, Mr Dalsass, Mr Estgen, Mr De Keersmacker, and Mr Herman on the sanctions imposed on Mr Andréi Sakharov (Doc. 1-753/79/rev.).

Are there any objections?

That is decided.

I propose to place the following items on the agenda for Friday, 15 February as a joint debate:

- the motion for a resolution by Mr Debré, Mr Gendebien, Mrs Spaak, Mr Ansquer, Mr Buchou, Mr Chirac, Mrs Chouraqui, Mr Deleau, Mr Druon, Mrs Dienesch, Mr Gillot, Mr Labbe, Mr Messmer, Mr Poncelet, Mr Remilly, Mrs Weiss, Mr de la Malène, Mr Cronin, Mr Davern, Mr Flanagan, Mr Lalor, Mr Nyborg, Mrs Ewing and Miss de Valera on aid to the disaster-stricken overseas department of Reunion (Doc. 1-713/79)
- the motion for a resolution by Mr Verges, Mr Gremetz, Mr Piquet, Mr Woltjer, Mr Denis, Mr Poniatowski, Mr Cohen, Mr Lomas, Mr Fich, Mr Lezzi, Mr Kuhn, Mr Schmitt, Mr Pearce, Mr Simmons, Mr Sable, Mr Moreau, Mr Ferrero, Mr Jaquet, Mr Estier, Mrs Focke, Mr Poirier, on emergency aid and planned and coordinated aid from the EEC for the island of Reunion devastated by Hurricane Hyacinth (Doc. 1-751/79)

Are there any objections?

That is decided.

I propose to place on the agenda for Thursday, 14 February for joint debate with the statement by Mr Jenkins:

- the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Radoux, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations and presented by Sir Fred Catherwood, Mr Radoux, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, Mr van Aerssen, Mr Seal, Mr Almirante, Mr Cohen, Mr Filippi, Mr Irmer, Mr Jonker, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Mrs Lenz, Mrs Macciocchi, Mr Martinet, Mr Pannella, Mrs Poirier, Mr Prout, Mr Schmitt, Mr Seeler, Sir John Stewart-Clark, Mr Welsh on relations between the EEC and Yugoslavia (Doc. 1-737/79)

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Madam President, may I stress that this amounts to a negative response to the committee's request. The request was for an urgent debate on the precise point of the EEC-Yugoslavia accords, but we are now deciding on whether to place that discussion in the context of a debate organized in such a way that we shall have only a few seconds to comment on Mr Jenkins's declaration.

Madam President, very often when it is claimed that a topic is going to be discussed — let us be quite clear about this — that is no more than a pretext to avoid discussion and to vote in the interests of a majority which is not, let me repeat, a majority of the right or centre, such as those which claim to govern our Parliament, but a majority of circumstance as we would say in Italy, or a majority which in France has aptly been termed that of the band of four.

*(Laughter)*

*I protest because this is a non-debate — a non-debate on Mr Jenkins' statement and a non-debate on Yugoslavia.*

**President.** — Mr Pannella, we have already discussed this matter. We regret that such little time is available for so many questions. The only way to ensure discussion of this point was to incorporate it into another debate and we are obliged to limit the time allotted to the different questions. We shall have an opportunity to discuss the organization of our work on 21 February. For this part-session, we have not been able to find a better solution.

Are there any comments?

That is decided.

Pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, I have received a request for urgent debate tabled by Mr Ferri, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, seeking to include in the agenda for this part-session a report by Mr Gillot on the third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea (Doc. 1-725/79).

By agreement with the chairmen of the political groups, I propose that this report be placed on the agenda for Friday, 15 February.

**President**

I call Mr Ferri.

**Mr Ferri.** — *(I)* Madam President, thank you for accepting our request and proposing the entry of Mr Gillot's report on our agenda. Since you have told us that Mrs Majj-Weggen's report has been removed from the agenda may I specifically ask for Mr Gillot's report to replace it on Thursday's agenda because the rapporteur, Mr Gillot, has commitments which prevent him from being here on Friday. It is important for him to be present because a debate must be held on such an important matter as this.

**President.** — I call Mr Gillot.

**Mr Gillot.** — *(F)* Madam President, may I first of all say that whatever difficulties I may have in being here on Friday to present my report I shall find a way round them.

Quite apart from that personal angle, which is not something to be discussed here, I would join Mr Ferri in asking for this important topic not to be entered at the end of the part-session under conditions which will not permit a genuine debate whereas the subject is one which needs full consideration by the House. The questions which are to be looked into early in March at the third UN Conference on the Law of the Sea are of vital importance to the Community and its Member States. I therefore impress upon you the need to give more prominence to this debate and, like Mr Ferri, I hope it will be possible to hold it on Thursday.

**President.** — I call Mr Glinne.,

**Mr Glinne.** — Madam President, I wish to support the proposal which you made just now on behalf of the group chairmen, without for a moment overlooking the great importance of the problems posed for all of us by the UN Conference on the Law of the Sea.

Everyone in this House knows that the conference will last for many months. Having regard to our heavy agenda for this part-session, I therefore feel that as a provisional measure it would be useful to grant Mr Gillot five minutes' speaking-time to explain to us the unanimous view of the Legal Affairs Committee on this subject.

**President.** — I call Mr Moorhouse.

**Mr Moorhouse.** — Madam President, I fully appreciate the reasons put forward in support of urgent procedure for the motion for a resolution. But I would point out that the Conference on the Law of the Sea has been sitting for the past seven years. I therefore think that we need to get this whole matter into some sort of proportion and perspective. It is true that the next meeting opens on, I think, 3 March, and we in the Committee on Transport have found ourselves in

some difficulty in that the draft opinion was presented to the Committee only a few days ago, so that we had next to no time in which to consider the details of this highly complex issue.

It was only with some difficulty that we were able, and after 4 hours of debate, to reach unanimity on the terms of the resolution, which had to be considerably amended. So in agreeing — and I speak here personally, rather than on behalf of my Group — to urgency, I would point out that the we have been suddenly faced, at very short notice, with a very complex issue.

**President.** — If after their deliberations, the chairmen of the political groups decided to choose Friday, then it was because they felt that Friday was no less important than any other day. Moreover, a number of other important debates have been reserved for Friday, the Sakharov affair for example. Furthermore, the agenda for Thursday is already so full that a number of items scheduled for that day may well also have to be taken on Friday morning. It was really very difficult to choose any other time.

I call Mr Bangemann.

**Mr Bangemann.** — *(D)* Madam President, you are quite right. May I ask you to remind the other group chairmen and myself to communicate our decision to our respective groups?

**President.** — I therefore propose that this item be placed on the agenda for Friday morning.

Are there any objections?

That is decided.

I call Mr Ferri.

**Mr Ferri.** — *(I)* Madam President, I apologize for speaking at this stage after the vote has been taken but I had already asked to do so earlier.

May I ask you at least to enter this report as the first item of the sitting on Friday: I think you have the authority to comply with this request.

*(Exclamations on some benches)*

**President.** — Mr Ferri, this morning the chairmen of the political groups all insisted that the Sakharov affair be debated first thing on Friday morning. We can hardly alter this arrangement but we will endeavour to take account of your suggestion and to hold the debate as early as possible on Friday morning.

At the meeting held with the chairmen of the political groups this morning, four requests for urgent debate were withdrawn:

- the motion for a resolution by Mrs Weber, Mr Glinne, Mr Key, Mr Enright, Mr Linkohr, Mr Peters, Mr Schieler, Mrs Salisch, Mr Walter, Mr Muntingh, Mr Seefeld, Mr Abens, Mrs Vayssade, Mrs Fuillet, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, Mr Collins, Mr Megahy, Mr Sieglerschmidt, Mrs Herklotz, Mrs Cresson, Mr Schmitt, Mr Schmid, Mrs Buchan, Mrs Clwyd, Mrs

## President

Hoff and Mr Groes, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the consultation procedure in respect of the construction of new power stations in frontier areas within the Community (Doc. 1-705/79), which will be mentioned during the Energy Debate.

- the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Sarre, Mr Josselin, Mr Dido, Mrs Lizin, Mr van Minnen, Mr Balfe, Mrs van den Heuvel, Mr Schmid, Mr Seefeld, Mr Lomas, Mr Schwartzberg, Mr Oehler, Mr Albers, Mr von der Vring, Mr Linde, Mr Gautier, Mr Muntingh, Mr Rogers, Mr Caborn, Mr Seal, Mrs Krouwel-Vlam, Mrs Viehoff, Mr Cohen, Mr Woltjer, Mrs Roudy, Mr Dankert, Mrs Moreau, Mr Jacquet and Mr Estier, on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the sentence of death passed on James David Mange (Doc. 1-748/79)
- the motion for a resolution announced by the Liberal and Democratic Group on the budgetization of the EDF
- the motion for a resolution announced by the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) on the Arab boycott.

Finally, I have received from the Council two requests for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, concerning :

- a proposal for a regulation on the Lomé Convention (Doc. 1-728/79) (since this subject was dealt with in the Sablé report (Doc. 1-633/79) entered on the agenda for 15 February, there was no need to decide on this request for urgent debate);
- a proposal for a regulation on certain fish stocks (Doc. 1-729/79).

The chairmen of the political groups are not in favour of urgent debate on this subject.

The vote on this request will be held at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

The order of business would therefore be as follows :

*This afternoon until 8 p.m.:*

- Procedure without report
- vote on the whole motion for a resolution contained in the report by Mrs Weber on a five-year programme on radioactive waste
- Commission statement on the action taken by it on the opinions and proposals of Parliament
- Question Time (Questions to the Commission — 1½ hours)
- Commission statement on agricultural prices

Tuesday, 12 February 1980

*9 a.m. until 1 p.m. and 3 p.m. to 7 p.m.:*

- Decision on urgency of one proposal for a regulation
- Introduction of the 13th General Report and the Commission's work programme
- Joint debate on the Nicolson and Forster report on the shipbuilding and textile industries and an oral question to the Commission on the same subject

- Oral question with debate to the Commission on oils, fats and proteins
- Joint debate on two oral questions to the Commission, the first on drug abuse and the second on public health policy in the EEC
- Von Wogau report on Community transit
- Joint debate on the Dankert report and the R. Jackson report on provisional twelfth

*3 p.m.:*

— *Voting-time*

*Wednesday, 13 February 1980*

*9 a.m. until 1 p.m. and 3 p.m. until 7 p.m.:*

- Joint debate on the Fuchs report, an oral question to the Council and two oral questions to the Commission on energy policy<sup>1</sup>
- Joint debate on the statement on the work programme of the Italian presidency (continuation) and on an oral question to the Council on the British share of the Community budget

*3 to 4.30 p.m.:*

- Question Time (questions to the Council and Foreign Ministers).

*Thursday, 14 February 1980*

*10 a.m. to 1 p.m., 3 p.m. to 8 p.m. and 9 p.m. to midnight:*

- *Statement by the Commission on the general budget of the Communities for 1980*
- Joint debate on the presentation of the 13th General Report and the work programme of the Commission and on the motion for a resolution by Mr Radoux and others on Yugoslavia
- Cronin report on the ERDF
- Squarcialupi report on transboundary air pollution
- Sherlock report on harmful exposure at work
- Catherwood report on the Common Customs Tariff
- Filippi report on SMUs in Portugal
- Joint debate on two oral questions to the Commission on the wine sector

*3 p.m.:*

— *Voting-time*

*Friday, 15 February 1980*

*9 a.m.:*

- Procedure without report
- Possibly, continuation of Thursday's agenda

*10.30 a.m.:*

- *Voting time*
- Joint debate on the Elles *et al*, motion for a resolution on the Olympic Games and the Ripa di Meana and Alber motions for resolutions on the sanctions against Sakharov
- Gillot report on the Law of the Sea
- Seeler report on EEC-ASEAN relations

<sup>1</sup> The vote will be taken on Thursday, 14 February.

**President**

- Joint debate on the Helms report, Quin report and B. Nielsen report on fisheries (the Battersby report on the same subject having been withdrawn)
- Buchou report on basic products
- Ligios report on fruit and vegetables
- Sable report on milk fats
- Sable report on agricultural products originating in the ACP countries or overseas countries and territories
- Joint debate on motions for resolutions by Mr Debre and others, and Mr Verges and others on aid for Réunion
- Barbarella report on the modernization of farms (without debate)

*End of sitting*: Voting-time.

Are there any objections?

The order of the business is agreed.

### 12. *Speaking-time*

**President.**— Since there is a very heavy agenda for this part-session, the Bureau has been obliged to organize the debates and allocate speaking-time as indicated in the draft agenda which has been distributed. Despite the alterations made the overall speaking-time remains unchanged except in the case of additions to the agenda, where the rapporteur or author of a motion for a resolution will naturally each be allowed ten minutes.

The allocation of speaking-time for the sittings from Tuesday, 12 to Thursday, 14 February is consequently as follows:

— Sitting of Tuesday, 12 February (overall speaking-time):

Mr Jenkins :	45 minutes
Authors and rapporteurs :	60 minutes
	(10 minutes each)
Commission (not including Mr Jenkins, statement):	45 minutes in total
Members : 300 minutes, allocated as follows :	
Socialist Group :	74 minutes
Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) :	70 minutes
European Democratic Group :	44 minutes
Communist and Allies Group :	32 minutes
Liberal and Democratic Group :	30 minutes
Group of European Progressive Democrats :	19 minutes
Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members :	11 minutes
Non-attached Members :	20 minutes
Total :	7 ½ hours

— Sitting of Wednesday, 13 February :

Joint debate on energy policy :	
Rapporteurs and authors :	40 minutes
	(10 minutes each)

Council :	40 minutes
	in total
Commission :	40 minutes
	in total
Members : 120 minutes, allocated as follows :	
Socialist Group :	25 minutes
Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) :	24 minutes
European Democratic Group :	16 minutes
Communist and Allies Group :	13 minutes
Liberal and Democratic Group :	12 minutes
Group of European Progressive Democrats :	9 minutes
Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members :	7 minutes
Non-attached Members :	14 minutes
Total :	4 hours

Joint debate on the programme of the Italian presidency and on a solution to the British contribution to the budget :

Council :	20 minutes
Author of the question :	10 minutes
Members : 85 minutes, allocated as follows :	
Socialist Group :	10 minutes
Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) :	10 minutes
European Democratic Group :	10 minutes
Communist and Allies Group :	15 minutes
Liberal and Democratic Group :	10 minutes
Group of European Progressive Democrats :	10 minutes
Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members :	10 minutes
Non-attached Members :	10 minutes
Total :	1 hour 55 minutes

— Sitting of Thursday, 14 February :

Joint debate on the introduction of the 13th General Report by the Commission and on the motion for a resolution by Mr Radoux and others on Yugoslavia :

Mr Jenkins :	15 minutes
Mr Radoux :	10 minutes
Members : 300 minutes, allocated as follows :	
Socialist Group :	74 minutes
Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) :	70 minutes
European Democratic Group :	44 minutes
Communist and Allies Group :	32 minutes
Liberal and Democratic Group :	30 minutes
Group of European Progressive Democrats :	19 minutes
Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members :	11 minutes
Non-attached Members :	20 minutes
Total :	5 hours 25 minutes

## President

Other items (overall speaking-time) :	
Authors and rapporteurs :	70 minutes
	(10 minutes each)
Commission :	30 minutes
	in total
Members : 90 minutes allocated as follows :	
Socialist Group :	20 minutes
Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) :	19 minutes
European Democratic Group :	13 minutes
Communist and Allies Group :	10 minutes
Liberal and Democratic Group :	9 minutes
Group of European Progressive Democrats	6 minutes
Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members :	5 minutes
Non-attached Members :	8 minutes
	-----
Total :	3 hours 10 minutes

Since Friday's sitting will begin with the items relating to the Olympic Games and Mr Sakharov, the sitting will probably continue until approximately 2 p.m.

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Panella.** — (I) Madam President, believe me, I am very sorry to have to return once again to this problem. I have the impression that a number of colleagues share my sorrow. Your arguments are sufficiently well-known, Madam President, and continue to confirm that pending the 'conclave' to which you have referred, we are acting in violation of the Rules of Procedure; I should like to ask my colleagues how it is possible for a Member of Parliament — be he in the minority or in the majority — to agree to violations of the Rules.

In particular, Madam President, I would point out that it is inadmissible under the Rules to invoke Rule 28 for an entire part-session and not just for the debate on one item. Madam President, I did my sums after our meeting this morning. Let me recapitulate very briefly the decisions which you are asking us to take. Madam President, on Friday morning the Technical Coordination Group would have a total of 33 seconds for each item on the agenda. I mean the whole group and not each member: if each of us were to speak we should have three seconds. It is not acceptable or correct for a Parliament to adopt such a proposal, it is not acceptable to suggest that an entire political group should have thirty-three seconds to put its views on a single agenda item. That is an offence to Parliament. It is an attempt by the majority to suggest that a debate is taking place when the intention is merely to rubber-stamp a vote. The group chairmen might just as well stay at home and indicate on the telephone how they propose to vote.

On Tuesday our group will have a total speaking-time for each agenda item — on drugs, on the Commission's general report, on Yugoslavia and on all the

other important items before us — of one minute and thirty seconds. That seems to me unworthy of a Parliament. I would merely propose that we should not be deluded by your arguments. You claim that we have too many items to discuss to adopt a different procedure. But, Madam President, under the Rules you may also propose application of Rule 28: when you do so, you are in effect serving the majority of this Parliament because if you refused to invoke Rule 28 you would not be covering the interests of the majority against the rights of the whole Parliament: this is an extremely serious and inadmissible matter. You have referred to the conclave. We already know that at the conclave you will be seeking to gag us by depriving us of the right to make statements of voting intentions. In conclusion — although I could make many other points — let me stress how unacceptable it is to deprive members of the right to submit amendments: I should like you to explain the reasons for this proposal. You are now seeking to deprive us of the right to table amendments! We shall have neither the right to speak nor the right to move amendments... Maybe this is a sausage factory but it is certainly not a Parliament in which debates are held and democratic decisions taken.

**President.** — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — Madam President, we have discussed this *ad nauseam*. If we are going to get through our business there is no other way of doing it. I wonder how much time has been wasted on points of order such as the one we have just heard. It must clearly amount to an awful lot.

(Applause from certain quarters)

**President.** — I call Mr De Goede.

**Mr De Goede.** — (NL) Madam President, may I make two suggestions regarding speaking-time on Wednesday afternoon? The agenda reads *continuation* of the debate with the Italian President on the declaration made by him at a previous sitting. My first suggestion is that you should use the speakers' list from the last occasion; 24 names had been put down. Only three of them spoke, and I cannot see why you should now draw up a new list. That would be highly inefficient, since Members have to put their names down again. That is my first suggestion.

My second suggestion concerns speaking-time. I do not wish to formally request a change in your proposal but would point out that three groups already spoke last time but are to have more speaking time on this occasion. I do not wish to object to that, but I do object to the fact that the groups which did not get a chance to speak last time will have less speaking time on this occasion — I find that unacceptable. My second suggestion, Madam President, is therefore that you should allow a few more minutes each to the four

## De Goede

last groups, the Liberal Group, the Group of European Progressive Democrats and the Technical Coordination Group and non-attached Members. The allocation of speaking-time would not have to be formally changed, but you could tell the President of the Wednesday afternoon sitting that it is reasonable for the four last-named groups to be given rather more speaking-time, because that had been agreed on the previous occasion.

**President.** — The suggestions you have just made will be considered in a constructive light, Mr De Goede.

I call Mr Marshall.

**Mr Marshall.** — Madam President, I find Mr Pannella's suggestion that he has been given inadequate speaking-time rather laughable. For someone whose sole objective is destroying the work of this House, he has been given a very great deal of time to speak. In fact, his group and the non-attached Members frequently seem to get a much fairer crack of the whip than some of us in larger groups, who find it very difficult to intervene in debates at all.

**President.** — I call Mr Linde.

**Mr Linde.** — (*D*) I wish to draw the attention of Mr Pannella once again — or, if he is not listening, to put this on record — the fact that his criticisms of other groups are perfectly inappropriate. His group is far better off and a member of his group has more time than a member of any other; if you add up the speaking time for Friday, you will find that a socialist has the theoretical possibility of speaking for 2 seconds while a member of Mr Pannella's group can speak for fifteen times that. This is where the injustice lies.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — I call Mr Coppieters.

**Mr Coppieters.** — (*NL*) Madam President, I just want to make a factual observation on the tabling of amendments. If the general speaking time for an important report includes the time allowed to move amendments, that means that in certain cases there will either be no opportunity to say anything about the general content of the report or no opportunity to comment on specific amendments. For the energy debate on Wednesday I have for example put down several amendments to the Fuchs report. If the short period of time allocated to me includes time to move amendments, it will not really be possible for those amendments to be considered by Parliament — although I am sure you will all agree that it is a fundamental duty of every Member to move amendments when he feels that appropriate.

**President.** — Mr Coppieters, as I pointed out a short while ago to Mr Pannella and to the entire Assembly, these matters will be discussed at meeting of the enlarged Bureau. As far as the allocation of speaking-time for the debates is concerned, the Bureau — apart from the comments made by Mr Pannella — was quasi-unanimous in deciding to organize the debates in this manner. Otherwise, we would have to sit 24 hours a day.

Speaking-time for the Friday sitting has therefore been allocated as follows :

Rapporteurs :	50 minutes (5 minutes each)
Commission :	40 minutes
Members : 150 minutes allocated as follows :	
Socialist Group :	37 minutes
Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group) :	35 minutes
European Democratic Group :	22 minutes
Communist and Allies Group :	16 minutes
Liberal and Democratic Group :	15 minutes
Group of the European Progressive Democrats :	9 minutes
Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members :	6 minutes
Non-attached Members :	10 minutes
Total	4 hours

As a general measure, I propose that the items which cannot be dealt with before 8 p.m. today, be held over until the sitting on Tuesday, 12 February, those that cannot be dealt with during the sitting on Tuesday, 12 February, until the sitting on Thursday, 14 February, and those that cannot be dealt with on Thursday, 14 February, until the sitting on Friday, 15 February.

Are there any comments ?

That is agreed.

### 13. *Conduct of plenary sittings*

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, the agenda for this part-session, like the agenda for the last part-session, moreover, is a very full one. As I mentioned a short while ago, by agreement with the chairmen of the political groups, the enlarged Bureau has decided to devote 21 February to a special meeting to consider the problems associated with the conduct of Parliament's plenary sittings. I hope that pending the results of this work, all Members of Parliament will lend their support to the presidency in its efforts to make the work of the present part-session run as smoothly as possible.

### 14. *Time-limit for tabling amendments*

**President.** — I propose that Parliament fix the following deadlines for tabling amendments :

**President**

- 7 p.m. today, 11 February for the items on the agendas of 12 and 13 February
- 6 p.m. on Tuesday, 12 February for the items on the agenda of 14 February
- 6 p.m. on Wednesday, 13 February for the items on the agenda of 15 February.

Are there any objections ?

That is agreed.

### 15. Procedure without report

**President.** — Pursuant to Rule 27A (5) of the Rules of Procedure, the following Commission proposals have been placed on the agenda for today's sitting for consultation without report :

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 2579/79 opening, allocating and providing for the administration of Community tariff quotas for certain wines having a registered designation of origin falling within subheading ex 22.05C of the Common Customs Tariff, originating in Tunisia (1979/1980) (Doc. 1-692/79),

which has been referred to the Committee on External Economic Relations as the Committee responsible and to the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on Development and Cooperation for opinions :

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 805/68 on the common organization of the market in beef and veal (Doc. 1-696/79),

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Budgets for an opinion ;

- proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation amending Regulations (EEC) Nos 3081/78, 3082/78 and 3083/78 opening, allocating and providing for the administration of Community tariff quotas for certain wines falling within subheading ex 22.05 C of the Common Customs Tariff, originating in Portugal (1979/80) (Doc. 1-708/79),

which has been referred to the Committee on External Economic Relations as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Agriculture for an opinion. Unless any Member asks leave in writing to speak on these proposals or amendments that were tabled to them before the opening of the sitting of Friday, 15 February 1980, I shall declare the proposals to be approved.

### 16. Procedural questions

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

**Mr Galland.** — (*F*) Madam President, I should have spoken earlier on in the debate, but I asked to do so and did not catch your eye.

It seems to me that we experienced a highly anomalous situation during the last part-session. Mr Coppeters tabled a motion for a resolution with a request for urgent debate on Corsica. Two speakers opposed urgent consideration and only two speakers intervened in the debate. Mrs Scrivener was opposed to an urgent discussion — you can read what she said in the report of proceedings — on the grounds that Parliament had no competence in this matter. Mr Arndt also opposed urgent consideration and requested reference to committee. Because the Assembly was almost unanimous in its opposition to an urgent debate, Mr Dankert who was in the chair asked for reference to committee.

However, Madam President, under the terms of Rule 25 to which Mr Dankert referred, reference to committee is possible only if the motion for a resolution relates to a topic falling within the sphere of competence of the Communities. That is precisely the point which Mrs Scrivener was disputing. I therefore believe that a second vote should have been taken, because I am convinced that there was a majority in the House at the time who felt that this was not a matter for the Communities, that Parliament should not consider the subject at all and that the motion accordingly not be referred to committee.

To simplify matters — and I do not want to take too much of the House's time — I think it would be desirable to refer the matter to the Bureau to obtain its opinion because I think my own interpretation is correct and that a vote should be taken on this specific point in order to ascertain whether Parliament considers itself competent or not to refer the matter to committee. I do not think this point has been cleared up.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (*F*) Madam President, I have waited to speak on the subject of world hunger because I had thought that Mr Poniatowski, the committee chairman, or Mr Ferrero, the rapporteur, would be intervening on this matter. We are faced with a very serious situation.

You confirmed yet again today, Madam President, that a working party on world hunger was not entitled to the services of interpreters to facilitate its work.

I wish it to be made perfectly clear that the political groups which had claimed to be showing the utmost seriousness in this matter, did not appoint their general rapporteur until after 10 December : since then they have been particularly slow to give their support to the work of the committee ; there have been innumerable obstacles and today we are having to cancel the meeting of the working party on hunger.

## Pannella

We were told that a serious approach involved proceeding rapidly. Madam President, we are now wasting time. The Committee on Development and Cooperation and its working party are not receiving the technical facilities necessary for them to work. Parliament had decided to hold a debate on world hunger in February and certain assurances were given. Now we are told that the debate will be held in April. Madam President, the fact of the matter is that this Parliament does not wish to debate the subject of hunger because it does not wish to discuss disarmament. The heart is not in it and the unanimity is only artificial. I denounce the fact that obstacles are placed every day in the way of the work of our committee. I should also be very pleased to learn whether I am alone in feeling concern on this matter.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, the matter you have raised is a problem concerning the organization of meetings of committees or working parties during part-sessions.

The enlarged Bureau decided not to authorize meetings of committees or working parties during part-sessions except in urgent cases, a decision which is, moreover, in keeping with the Rules of Procedure. This matter will therefore be considered again, possibly by the Bureau, but it does not belong here.

As for the matter raised by Mr Galland, this is an important problem concerning the application of the Rules of Procedure; it will be submitted to the enlarged Bureau.

### 17. *Second five-year programme on radioactive waste* (vote cont'd)

**President.** — The next item, pursuant to Rule 33 (3) of the Rules of Procedure, is the vote on the whole of the motion for a resolution contained in the Weber report on the second five-year programme, on radioactive waste management and storage (Doc. 1-576/79). However, before proceeding to the vote, the floor is open for explanations of vote.

I call Mrs Weber.

**Mrs Weber, rapporteur.** — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, let me stress that we are not dealing today with the issue of our support or otherwise for nuclear energy, but merely discharging the responsibility given to us by our citizens to take care of their security and protect them against undesirable phenomena. In the present state of utilization of nuclear energy, storage of waste presents a serious problem. The report addresses itself to that problem and I believe that we must think again on the way the voting went at our last part-session and decide whether we are living up to our responsibilities.

I believe that a number of questionable decisions were taken at the January part-session; they were doubtful

despite the fact that a remarkable unanimity prevailed from the extreme left to the extreme right of this House, with the exception of the Socialist Group and a few christian-democrats and liberals.

I want to touch on four points which seem to me particularly important as the basis for my decision. Unless we are prepared to consider alternative scenarios we must doubt the success of alternative sources of energy or the effectiveness of energy-saving measures. Or do you perhaps believe that national decisions such as that taken by Denmark not to use nuclear energy will have no impact on the quantity of radioactive waste? Or else do you believe that appeals to conserve energy will prove unsuccessful in the next few years?

My second point is that unless you are prepared to examine acceptance conditions you cannot really claim to be ascertaining whether the population approves the decisions taken by politicians in the energy sector and under what conditions acceptance by the population is in fact possible.

I believe that any of us who spoke about gaining popular support in our election programmes should give more thought to this matter and demand effective studies.

Now for my third point: anyone who considers the possible risks of proliferation of radioactive material in the developing countries to be so slight as to warrant no investigation in an overall programme, must surely be disregarding the extremely difficult political situation in which such a lack of study may well place us.

However, there is one point which I consider most important of all: Our citizens want to know what price they will have to pay for new technologies in social as well as financial terms. We must all know what consequences protective and monitoring measures entailed by such technologies will have for the development of our liberal freedoms and democratic principles. It is not enough merely to bear in mind this aspect of the programme, as Mr Ippolito would have us do in his motion. This House was able to gain a majority — under the conditions to which I referred earlier — for a motion which considered certain limitations of basic rights in the undertakings concerned to be possible and justified; the question then arises as to where such limitations begin and end. Do they end with the construction workers, cleaning ladies, security personnel and wives, families or even friends and neighbours? Does the risk exist only in nuclear power stations or does it also apply to nuclear waste, during processing, decommissioning and transport? If we simply appeal to human reason and do not take a reasoned decision, debates and further discussion will be essentially meaningless. To quote the words of Mrs Walz, the vote on this matter is not concerned solely with assessing energy policy

**Weber**

from the environmental angle because in that case no single power station would be built any longer, but with protecting the population against damage to health and freedom and safeguarding the environment. The report now before us in the form in which the vote is to be taken, is no longer the report drawn up by the Committee on the Environment and the rapporteur; in the interests of protecting the population, I would urge you to vote against the report as it now stands.

*(Applause on certain benches)*

**President.** — I call Mr Collins.

**Mr Collins, Chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.** — I want to express sympathy for the point of view expressed by Mrs Weber. I don't want to deal with the content of the report so much as with the procedures that surrounded its eventual destruction at the last part-session. The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, the committee responsible for this report, duly produced the report after a great deal of discussion and a great deal of soul-searching and after having been given something approaching an opinion from the Committee on Energy and Research. That is where the difficulty arises, because the kind of opinion that we received from the Committee on Energy and Research was, to say the least, rather less profound than it was lengthy: it covered about three-quarters of a sheet of paper, Madam President. And therefore it was a matter of some surprise to me when the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Research, acting in her capacity as a member of the Christian-Democratic Group, supported a whole series of amendments that ran counter to the kind of consultation that took place before the report was actually produced. Now, I think that consultation between committees is important, but only if the energy, industry and integrity of the people involved is sufficiently high. In future, I hope that where more than one committee is involved in producing a report, the right of individuals to be present during the discussion in the committee will be taken up. That was not taken up and so we got ourselves into the unedifying business of having a report actually opposed in this Chamber by one of the people who helped to produce it. This therefore is no longer the report produced by Mrs Weber at the time. It is no longer the report produced by the consultative procedure in the committee, and therefore I cannot support it.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the left)*

**President.** — I call Mr Gendebien.

**Mr Gendebien.** — *(F)* I have read the remarkable report by Mrs Weber and consider that it is a well-balanced text. It does not speak out formally for or against nuclear energy but takes broad account of the interests of the population and of the demands of all

who are sensitive to the needs of public health, the environment and freedom. It seems to me that after adopting a number of amendments last month, Parliament completely changed the nature of Mrs Weber's report. Consequently I think it would be wise to refer the text back to committee.

I would also like to point out that the amendments which were adopted show a high degree of convergence. We are often told that there is a lack of convergence in Europe, but we have witnessed a very real convergence between the supporters of the nuclear lobby ranging from the right wing representing industrial interests to the communist party! That point needed to be made.

At all events, unless the report is referred back to committee, I shall vote against it for the reasons I have explained.

**President.** — I call Mr Coppieters.

**Mr Coppieters.** — *(NL)* Madam President, the report as amended represents a lost opportunity since Mrs Weber's report had provided a real chance for wise decision-making. I shall therefore also vote against, but I want to highlight the strange spectacle we have experienced here through the fact that certain major groups have placed members who take a keen interest in defence of the environment in the Committee only to go back on their position later through amendments in the plenary sitting. I consider that this attitude deserves criticism because what has happened to the Weber report is an indication of the real forces lined up behind certain aspects of nuclear energy — forces which represent nothing short of a lobby.

*(Applause on some benches on the left)*

**President.** — I call Mr Veronesi.

**Mr Veronesi.** — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pity that in a Kafkaesque attitude of the utmost confusion we should have produced a resolution which certainly does not reflect the wishes of Parliament. We had insisted on the need for the rapporteur to ask for her report and resolution to be referred back to committee. Our request was accepted late in the day when formal considerations made it impossible to entertain. We had worked — and I refute all the insinuations of a tacit agreement between the groups — in the spirit of an overall framework which cannot be escaped; we were not facing these problems for the first time since we had dealt with all their different aspects many times in the past. Reports on alternative sources of energy are now ready for debate; as to the aspect of energy saving, a socialist colleague has been appointed rapporteur and we are not considering it for the first time; our socialist colleague lends his support to compulsory measures of rigid control which conflict with your liberalist positions. We have stressed the need for practical information measures, even if we are convinced

**Veronesi**

that they will not be sufficient and that more stringent measures will be necessary. We therefore have a whole series of provisions and this particular report deals with only one aspect; it is an aspect, however, which you yourselves believed to be urgent since in the first paragraph of the resolution you stressed the need for urgent research. We agree: scientific research is essential to deal with a problem which already exists and cannot be left in abeyance but must be dealt with as rapidly as possible. Those are the reasons for which we voted in favour of the programme but — let me stress the difference — in favour of the programme presented by the Commission.

We thought the resolution rather imprecise on some points and tried to remedy this; we rejected a number of amendments submitted by other Members and tried to make our own position clear. However, some Members had second thoughts too late when they asked for the document to be sent back to committee. I think that Parliament was wrong to refuse this measure, and we are now faced with the absurd situation that those selfsame Members who supported the need for research are now against it.

**President.** — I call Mr Welsh.

**Mr Welsh.** — I wish to explain, Madam President, why I propose to vote for the Weber Report in its amended form. With great respect to both of them, I do not think that the rapporteur and the chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection have represented the facts with perfect accuracy, because the simple fact is that the rapporteur, as she knows very well, took advantage of this report to produce a highly loaded political document, which contained a very clear ecological point of view. She must have known that this did not reflect the wishes of the majority of this House. When it was discussed in committee, all these amendments were put and they were discussed at great length and with some care. But unfortunately Madam President, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection as it voted did not represent the wishes of the majority of the House either. So please let us not be taken in by these questions of people having been abused or not understood. I think they understood perfectly well what they were doing. We certainly knew what we were doing when we proposed the amendments, and we would encourage the House to vote for the amended Weber Report.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the right)*

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* Madam President, once again we find ourselves obliged, as Mr Coppeters pointed out, to observe an unfortunate situation. What happens only too often in this House? We saw it just now in

connection with world hunger: the political groups appointed to the Committee on Development and Cooperation a number of colleagues who are sensitive to the problem; they set to work and set up working parties in an attempt to achieve results; but then the political group chairmen sabotage in plenary sitting the positions adopted by their colleagues in committee.

This happens time and time again. The groups have appointed in this particular instance to the committees those of their members who are the most interested in the technical aspect of the problem; they have voted as the rapporteur pointed out and then in plenary sitting amendments are approved which go against the positions adopted previously by the group representatives. That is the logic of this Parliament. Just as I do not believe for a moment that all the problems we have had with the Rules of Procedure which prevent us from speaking are due only to chance, so too I believe that these facts are political and not due to chance either.

In reality the technicians or experts do not have the courage to support certain points of view which they do support in plenary sitting, disregarding the position they themselves adopted in committee.

To protest against that political attitude, I wish to state that I support Mrs Weber's position and I regret, Madam President, that we find ourselves all too often in a situation where the work done in committee is rejected in plenary sitting by the groups who set the tone.

**President.** — I put the motion for a resolution to the vote. Since the result of the vote by show of hands was doubtful, I shall take a fresh vote by sitting and standing.

The resolution is adopted.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

I call Mr Rogers on a point of order.

**Mr Rogers.** — Madam President, when you take a vote by sitting and standing, there are so many people in the hemicycle who are not Members of Parliament, it is virtually impossible to take a proper count. I had the same problem the last time I attempted to take such a vote. I am not suggesting you take the vote again, as I presume that there was a large enough majority to carry it, but I do think that the hemicycle ought to be cleared before a vote by sitting and standing is taken.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — Mr Rogers, there was a large majority of people standing, but your observation was justified. I hope that it will soon be possible to implement the proposals made by the Quaestors concerning control over entry to the Chamber.

**President**18. *Action taken by the Commission on Parliament's opinions*

**President.** — The next item is the statement by the Commission on action taken by it on the opinions and proposals of the European Parliament.<sup>1</sup>

I call Lord O'Hagan.

**Lord O'Hagan.** — I have already made my investigations and found that the Commission is not as sinful as I thought.

**President.** — I call Mr Tyrrell.

**Mr Tyrrell.** — Madam President, you will recall that at the last part-session Parliament requested the Commission to review immediately all the economic, commercial, credit and financial relations between the USSR and the European Community, specifically in the field of high technology, agricultural products and anti-dumping practices, and to report to the Council of Ministers. Now, in the report that the Commission has laid before us today, dealing with the action it has taken on opinions expressed by us at the last part-session, there is no reference to that vital clause. I would ask whether the Commission did in fact act on our request to review those matters and, if so, whether there is a reason why it has not included such action on our request in its report.

**President.** — I call Mr Harris.

**Mr Harris.** — Further to the point raised by my honourable friend, could we ask the President of the Commission exactly what is the position over the sale of butter to the USSR, because some of us — many of us — found his answer to the Political Affairs Committee equivocal to say the least, and we would ask him in particular if there is any truth in the story about butter sales that appeared in the 'Daily Telegraph' today, namely that it is all right for the Community to sell packaged butter to the USSR, but not bulk supplies of butter since if that is the situation again many of us would find it completely unacceptable. So could the President of the Commission give us a report, perhaps orally, on these vitally important matters?

**President.** — I call Mr Jenkins.

**Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission.** — Madam President, I endeavoured to give the Committee on Political Affairs at some length — and was then open for questioning for over an hour-and-a-half afterwards — a detailed exposition of the situation on all these matters. I do not think it is conducive to the sensible conduct of business to be asked detailed questions without notice outside the hour of Question Time in this way. Anything which is put to the Commission in

a proper way will be carefully and precisely answered, but speaking from many years of parliamentary experience I do not think it is sensible that we should try and conduct our business in this way.

## IN THE CHAIR: MR DE FERRANTI

*Vice-President*19. *Question Time*

**President.** — The next item is Question Time (Doc. 1-738/79). We begin with questions to the Commission.

Question No 1 will not be called, since its subject is already on the order-paper for this part-session, but the author will have the right to speak first in Tuesday's debate on the same subject.

Question No 1 a, by Mr Moreland (H-344/79):

Did the Commission President speak in a personal capacity or on behalf of the Commission when he recently lectured in the UK ('Dimbleby'-lecture), and if he spoke in a personal capacity will he state if he discussed the contents of his lecture with the college of Commissioners beforehand?

**Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission.** — I spoke in a personal capacity, as I made clear at the time, so the question of consultation with colleagues did not therefore arise.

**Mr Moreland.** — Can the President of the Commission assure us that in future, when a Commissioner is given the opportunity of TV time at a peak hour in any Member State, he will use it to promote the Community, and not his own future national political interests? We of course realize that a little job-hunting, if I may say so, may go on over the next year, but can he give us the assurance that the whole working effort of the Commission will be to further the interests of the Community over the next year — although, if I may say so in a personal capacity, we wish them well in a year's time?

**Mr Jenkins.** — The Commission, of course, does and will devote its effort to promoting the interests of the Community, and if I were to add up the number of occasions on which I have addressed and endeavoured to persuade the British public on Community issues over the past three years, they would come to a very large total indeed. However, this lecture has a particular place: I was not invited to give it or to talk about such subjects in an official capacity, it was a purely personal lecture, and although clearly people can agree or disagree with it, I have not received any protest — and that of the honourable Member is extremely mild — from either side of politics in the United Kingdom that I should not have used this opportunity to give some thoughts based on reflections after a long period in politics.

<sup>1</sup> See Annex

**President.** — Question No 2, by Mr Ansquer, has been postponed until the next part-session. Question No 3, by Mr Pininfarina (H-386/79):

Does not the Commission think that a speedy response to the action brought last May by the European Clothing Manufacturers' Association against the Italian Government for violation of Articles 90, 92 and 93 of the Treaty of Rome might help to bring some clarity into an area where irregular competition mechanisms have blocked possibilities of action and in certain cases have threatened the continued existence of healthy and productive enterprises without affording any advantages in the matter of prices policy or of employment policy?

**Mr Vouel, Member of the Commission.** — (F) Mr President, the action brought in May 1979 by the European Clothing Manufacturers' Association in respect of violation of the rules on competition contained in the Treaty has been the subject of an initial investigation by the Commission. The association concerned has been informed that the share of the market held by public undertakings in this sector is not such as to confer on them a dominant position so that the conditions for application of Article 86 do not apply. As to the aid aspect, the Commission has contacted the Italian authorities to obtain details of the nature, scale and effect of the public intervention in Italy in favour of this particular sub-sector; it requires that information to assess the situation in respect of Article 92 *et seq.* The Commission shares the Honourable Member's concern about the need to find the speediest possible response to the complaints referred to it. In the case in point, it has not failed to remind the Italian authorities on several occasions of the need to provide an early answer to its questions. The information requested is complex but the Commission hopes that it will be provided shortly.

**Mr Pininfarina.** — (I) Does the Commission realize that by furnishing such a general answer it is evading a fundamental right and duty enshrined in the Treaty to guarantee, regardless of the scale of the phenomenon, free competition between undertakings?

**Mr Vouel.** — (F) The complaint put to the Commission comprised two main aspects: firstly it sought to determine whether the companies in question held a dominant position on the Italian and European markets. I have given the Commission's answer on that. My answer was not general but dealt with the substance of this particular point.

The second aspect of the complaint related to a possible infringement of Article 92 of the Treaty. I answered on this that the Commission is awaiting information from the Italian Government to enable it to reply. Here again, my answer was not general but specific.

**Mr Welsh.** — While thanking the Commissioner for his answer, I think he must fully accept that it is quite unsatisfactory. I would like to help him with this, so can we ask the Commissioner to say whether or not he thinks that the Italian Government is in fact blocking this investigation and to comment on the fact that they have sent several requests to the Italian Government to state its position and it has so far not done so? Would the Commissioner therefore give us an assurance that for the reputation of his department, this fiddling while Rome burns will cease, and if the Italian Government fails to give an adequate answer by 31 March, he will implement the necessary legal processes under the Treaty to compel it to do so?

**Mr Vouel.** — (F) I do not intend to put an ultimatum to the Italian Government on this matter. The information we have asked that Government to provide is highly specific and requires a very complex answer. That may well take time.

**Mr Turner.** — May I say there is very great disquiet in certain parts of the common market about this problem, and I think it is most important that you should very quickly put the public's mind at rest. I do not know how you can do this unless you have made sure that you have heard all representations from those concerned, but I would like to know whether there is any further help that you, as the Commission, need in your battle to try and make sure there is no unfairness in this trade.

**Mr Vouel.** — (F) The Commission has all the necessary means to obtain the information which it needs.

**Mr Poncelet.** — Following on from that question, I want to put a supplementary question. In doing so I shall refer to a motion of solidarity drafted by Italian private industrialists and endorsed by all the industries in the Community countries. Is it true, Commissioner, that the Commission has only recently given its support through Community funds — the Regional or Social Fund — to certain Italian regions which specialize in textiles and evidently group together undertakings — I refer specifically to the motion of solidarity — which are recognized as unreliable and unprofitable? And is the Commission aware — this is the most important point to which I would call the Assembly's attention — of the differences between wages for men and women workers which the Italian public authorities are apparently encouraging through different tax treatment of social charges? If so, can the Commission indicate its position before making the proposed funds available?

**Mr Vouel.** — (F) My answer will be threefold.

**Vouel**

There is at present no specific aid arrangement for the sector under discussion.

Secondly, as to the question of determining whether possible aid is compatible with the Treaty, I would remind you that this is the precise purpose of our representations to the Italian Government. Aid is in principle prohibited but for certain reasons, particularly of a regional nature, it may be accepted or declared compatible with the Treaty. We are examining this point at present.

As to the third question, I believe that throughout Europe and in all its Member States — as we have often heard in this House — there is discrimination between the earnings of men and women workers, but I do not think that this has any bearing on the specific question put to me.

**President.** — I think it would be of general advantage to Members if we were to proceed on the basis of a minimum number of supplementary questions and answers, since we should then be able to make some more progress with Question Time.

At its author's request, Question No 4, by Mr Penders and Mrs Beumer, has been withdrawn.

Question No 5, by Mr Berkhouwer (H-338/79):

What steps have been taken to ensure that the USSR gives diplomatic recognition to the Community in the trade negotiations between the two parties?

**Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (D) The Community is not conducting any trade negotiations with the Soviet Union. The Commission has therefore taken no steps on the lines indicated by the Honourable Member in his question. On the other hand, the Commission has for some time been engaged in negotiations with Comecon. Those negotiations do not, however, relate to trade relations with the Member States of that organization.

**Mr Berkhouwer.** — (NL) I should like to know from the Commissioner whether it would be possible to hold an exchange of views in a different context, perhaps in committee, on trade and economic relations between the Community and Comecon and on the matter of the general recognition of the Community as a specific entity. I am grateful to the Commissioner for his answer and would ask him whether he is ready to take part in such an exchange of views in the near future.

**Mr Haferkamp.** — (D) These matters are constantly under review in the responsible committee of this House. I am of course perfectly willing to provide supplementary answers and information on the progress of relations with Comecon itself and with its Member States.

**Mr Radoux.** — (F) Since Mr Berkhouwer's question referred to a particular country, can the Commission indicate whether it will adopt an identical position *vis-à-vis* another East European country as it has towards a country with which it is currently negotiating as regards the recognition necessary for negotiations to proceed?

**Mr Haferkamp.** — (D) The question of recognition referred to here has long played a part in relations between the Community and Comecon and its individual member countries. The Soviet Union has long since been exerting its influence to prevent recognition of the Community. As has frequently been stated in this House, we have repeatedly indicated that we are not concerned with formal recognition. We do not need to be recognized. We are a reality that exists. This reality has over the years come to be accepted by Comecon and its member countries otherwise there could be no negotiations. You are well aware that there are different degrees of recognition. We are holding special talks with some Comecon countries outside the context of negotiations with Comecon itself.

We have concluded special agreements with some of these countries, e.g., in the steel and textiles sectors. We have just initialled with one member country an agreement on the creation of a joint committee. These are practical steps which we are not taking with the aim of gaining diplomatic recognition but with a view to creating political and economic circumstances and introducing developments in the spirit of the Final Acts of Helsinki.

**President.** — Question No 6, by Lord O'Hagan (H-347/79):

Does the Commission plan to recommend a tax on cider?

**Mr Burke, Member of the Commission.** — The Commission does not plan to recommend a special tax on cider. However, as has been explained in answering the honourable Member's question H-95/79 on 25 October 1979, cider is one of the other fermented beverages of tariff heading 22.07 which would fall within the scope of proposed harmonized wine tax system when exceeding a given minimum alcoholic strength. It has been proposed to fix this limit of minimum alcoholic strength at 6% by volume.

**Lord O'Hagan.** — Is the Commission aware that answers do not improve by simple repetition? Is the Commission aware that to attack a particular regional speciality which is never exported — and indeed farm-

**Lord O'Hagan**

house cider could probably not travel without blowing up — (*Laughter*) is something that will bring the Community into even greater disrepute than it is already in the West Country, where the Commission has failed to do anything about the export of British lamb to France? Can the Commission therefore now reassure this House and cider drinkers in the West Country that a discriminatory tax will not be imposed on a beverage which is of purely regional and local interest and is not like a wine or spirit that is exported and distorts or destroys national markets of other Member States which apply punitive fiscal legislation in order to protect their own alcoholic drinks?

**Mr Burke.** — The proposed lower limit gives rise to difficulties in the United Kingdom but only in relation to a small proportion of total cider production there. It is understood that perhaps 90% or more of British cider production has an alcoholic strength of less than 6% and could even be brought below that figure without serious difficulty. Therefore the problem arises solely for cider produced by farmers the alcoholic strength of whose product is not subject to any precise control and is often above the 6% figure. I therefore emphasize to the House that this is a limited problem, particularly when we compare it with the extent of the issues involved in the harmonization of wine and alcoholic drinks. However, I would stress to the honourable Member that the Commission's proposals are by their nature pragmatic and that the Commission would certainly be prepared to consider alternative solutions which could lead to overall agreement. Now, I would add that when the Council discussed compromise proposals at its meeting in Luxembourg on 16 October, the question of cider was raised by the representative of one Member State. The Council has agreed that the compromise proposals will remain on the agenda and I can assure the honourable Members that the Commission will of course continue to make every possible effort towards finding an agreement on all the problems involved including that of farmhouse cider.

**Mr Marshall.** — I congratulate the Commission upon its more moderate approach to this matter. However, to say that the alcoholic strength of certain drink can be reduced without difficulty does not answer the question. The question is whether the consumer will find the reduced strength drink as acceptable as the present drink. Has the Commission considered this point? Furthermore, why should it attack a small industry composed of small production units when it is quite willing to allow other governments to discriminate against the Scotch whisky industry in a quite ridiculous way, and I include in that the Irish Government which discriminates against Scotch whisky in the timing of duty payments?

**Mr Burke.** — Having been told that our proposals in this area would lead to a revolution in the West Country similar to the Monmouth rebellion, I have taken note and have tried answering the question to meet the spirit of the questioners. I think it might be in the best interests of all if we could leave it at that. I have noted the points made.

**Mr Cottrell.** — I must apologize, Mr Burke because I represent yet another cider-making constituency, and the point I would put to you is this: are not your proposals in this area the unacceptable face of Community policy? The people who produce farmhouse cider are already being driven insane by daft, silly, dotty regulations. These people largely produce farmhouse cider as a hobby or for a few friends. Would it not be simpler to avoid all Community activity in this area?

**Mr Burke.** — I think that any further discussion of this problem would only add to the difficulties of the said farmers. I would suggest that, having given my answer, we now let the matter cool down and have a Council discussion on all those matters, which I hope, will enable pragmatic solutions to be found to all our problems.

**President.** — Question No 7, by Mr O'Connell (H-382/79):

Does the Commission envisage the creation of a Directorate-General specifically for consumer affairs?

**Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission.** — Mr President, the Commission attaches great importance to consumer affairs, which are dealt with by the Promotion of Consumer Interests Directorate in the Environment and Consumer Protection Service. But, particularly in view of the recommendation of the Spierenburg Report on the reduction of the number of Directorates-General, the Commission has no present plans to set up a new and separate one here.

**Mr O'Connell.** — Whether, in view of the fact that the staff of the Consumer Protection Service — which is itself a tiny subsidiary of the Directorate-General — comprises a mere 14 senior officials, in grades A and B, that despite the enormous increase in the work expected of this service over recent years, there has been no proportionate increase in staff and resources, that a growing number of contacts with consumer interest groups necessitates more staff, that the preliminary programme for consumers has yet to be implemented and a second consumer action programme will certainly fail unless consumer policy is given priority in terms of staff and resources, does the President of the Commission consider that a Directorate-General for Consumer Policy is necessary to cater for

**O'Connell**

this Second Action programme? Would he not consider taking another look at this whole situation in the light of the information I have given him?

**Mr Jenkins.** — I was certainly aware that the staff of this Directorate in the Environment and Consumer Protection Service is heavily pressed, and I would if I may, like to take the opportunity to pay tribute to the work that they have done with limited manpower resources. I would certainly like to see some increase in manpower resources here. But the honourable Member and the House know the difficulties we have in getting the necessary increases in the staff resources through the Budgetary Authority. And even if we were to get a significant increase, it would still be a relatively small group which, I must say frankly, would not be such as to justify the setting up of a separate Directorate-General. If I may make two points, first, it does not make good sense to ask an independent review body to look at our affairs and make recommendations, and then fly directly in the face of what they recommend and start setting up a multiplicity of new Directorates-General. Secondly, neither is it the case that the effectiveness of work done is a direct function of the number of people involved in doing it. We could do with some more people here. But do not let us exaggerate the situation by believing that there is need for a vast bureaucracy here, or that the key to success is always to call everything a Directorate-General.

**President.** — Question No 8, by Mr Turner (H-392/79):

What practical steps are open to the Commission to ensure that France, which has failed to fulfil an obligation under the EEC Treaty in that it has not adhered to the Order of the European Court of Justice of 25 September 1979, on sheepmeat, will be required to take the necessary measures to comply with the Order pursuant to Article 171 of the EEC Treaty?

**Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (DK) Mr President, cooperation in the European Community is based on strict compliance with Community law. The results achieved so far, not least as regards the development of intra-Community trade, are based on adherence to the provisions of the Treaty and the decisions of the Court of Justice. The basic assumption has been that mutual dependence and common interest and compliance with this law and the Court's decisions are of such obvious importance that the Treaty does not give the Commission or the Council the possibility of taking retributive measures, but simply lays down in Article 171 that the Member State has an indispensable duty to comply with the judgments of the Court. It will be extremely dangerous for Community cooperation if this basic principle is not adhered to in the future as in the past. Such compliance is of political significance. The Commission's means of ensuring that this funda-

mental legal principle — fundamental for the future of the Community — is respected consists in applying political pressure if Community laws or the judgments of the Court are not directly complied with. The Commission may also, of course, refer the matter to the Court, as has happened in this particular case concerning France's failure to comply with the Order on the free movement of sheepmeat in the Community. Thus, the Commission has taken both the political and the legal measures provided for in the Treaty and is convinced that all the Member States will realize that failure in future to respect the fundamental principle of obedience to the law will cause irremediable damage to Community cooperation.

**Mr Turner.** — I appreciate the very worried answer which the Commissioner has just given, and I do not want to inflame the position at all, but we are all very calmly concerned about the underlying legal issues of what he has just said. I do not know what Article 171 means, but I think he doesn't either, from what he has just said. May I say that the Council, whom I had asked last month what they could do, having previously asked the month before what you could do, replied in these words:

Under the terms of the first indent of Article 155 of the Treaty, it is up to the Commission, as guardian of the Treaty, to ensure that the provisions of the Treaty and the measures taken by the institutions pursuant thereto are applied.

Now I take that to mean that the Council believes that the Commission is the proper body to ensure that the institutions' measures — i.e., the judgment of the Court — are applied. They then went on to say, 'The second indent of Article 145 of the Treaty' — and that refers to the Council's rights and powers — 'does not confer any power on the Council', and they ended by saying, 'Any further questions dwelling on this point should be referred to the Commission as the guardian of the Treaty'.

So the whole problem comes back to the Commission, and I would very much urge the Commission to take note of Article 155, as does apparently the Council.

*(The President presses the speaker to put his question)*

I am now about to ask the question and it goes as follows. They can do one of three things and I want to know which they are going to do.

They can agree that they have the potential under Article 155, or they can say that they have not got any power under Article 155, or they can say what they will specifically do under Article 155 in this particular case. I would like them please to choose between those three possibilities and give me an answer.

**Mr Gundelach.** — (DK) I really think I have answered the question. It is the Commission's task to see that the provisions of the Treaty and the Court's rulings are obeyed. But the Treaty does not give the Commission the means of adopting retaliatory measures — there can be no doubt on that point. On the other hand, it is possible for the Commission — and the Commission has decided to use this possibility and has done so — to pursue the question further through the Court of Justice. In a further investigation by the Court the question of damage suffered by individual parties, whether public or private, can form part of the subject of the investigation, but it must be raised by the party concerned within the context of the issue raised by the Commission. The United Kingdom has notified the Commission of damage suffered and the Commission, when bringing its case before the Court, has submitted this statement on damage suffered to the Court. So even if retaliatory measures cannot be adopted, the Court in its deliberations and judgments can take account of the damage suffered and the Commission has taken the necessary measures for this within the limits laid down by the Treaty, making full use of the powers given it.

**Mr Boyes.** — Rather than make a long speech like Mr Turner I want to take issue with the suggestion that we are all concerned, and ask the Commissioner if he is aware that some Members of Parliament support the right of France to block the import of sheepmeat and are of the opinion that Member States should have the right to plan their economies free from EEC interference.

*(Protests from certain quarters of the European Democratic Group)*

**Mr Gundelach.** — (DK) Of course, I cannot accept that view, seeing that the Member States adopted an agreement in the form of a treaty and signed it and ratified it. So it must be respected by all parties.

*(Applause from the European Democratic Group)*

**Mr Pranchère.** — (F) On behalf of the French Communist Members, I wish to state that the debate on the problem of sheepmeat which has already been held in this House on our initiative, is not confined to the strictly juridical aspects. The provisions of the Rome Treaty concerning the earnings of farmers, their activities and guarantees for their further development, have been cast into disrepute by certain practices. Today, however, something far more serious is in the offing. The decisions proposed by the Commission are intended in effect to put an end to all intents and purposes to the production of sheepmeat in France as it exists today. This would have disastrous economic and social consequences for the life of our regions. We have therefore asked the French Government to go so far as to use its right of veto, as it is

entitled to do in order to put an end to an attack which we consider intolerable and inadmissible.

My question is as follows: does the Commission not think it high time to put an end to the plan for the phasing-out of sheepmeat production which, as Mr Gundelach recognized when he addressed the Committee on Agriculture in Brussels, would compel half the 150 000 French sheep-farmers to become unemployed and force the other half to convert to different activities? I would add that this would be done for the greater benefit of multinational sheep-importing combines.

**Mr Gundelach.** — (DK) The Commission has never at any time expressed the view that measures should not be taken to safeguard incomes and future production in the sheepmeat sector in France. Long before this case arose the Commission proposed to the Council a scheme for sheepmeat which would most certainly safeguard the incomes of French as well as other sheep-farmers. The Commission cannot accept responsibility for the Council's seven-year delay in dealing with this proposal, which has created the unfortunate situation which we find ourselves in today.

Furthermore I must point out that the European Court of Justice in its judgment of last September drew attention to a number of measures that can justifiably be taken by the French Government as interim measures, until the organization of the market has been carried out by the Community institutions, to ensure that the level of income of French farmers is maintained. And there is no question of attacking the social or financial standards of the French sheep-farmers; the idea is to solve these problems and the problems of free trade in the Community, in accordance with one of the Community's main principles, in such a way as to satisfy everyone. The means for doing this exist, but unfortunately the readiness to cooperate has so far been lacking.

**Mr Purvis.** — Might I ask the Commissioner to clarify a number of points? First, Mr Pranchère mentioned the right of the French Government, as I understood it, in effect to veto the Court of Justice's decision. Could he confirm that no Member State has the right to veto any Court of Justice decision and in particular this one?

Could he also clarify the course open to damaged parties under this situation? I understand that he feels himself impotent to do anything further. Is it therefore true to say that the only course open to damaged parties is to sue the French Government in the French Courts, or is there any other route open?

**Mr Gundelach.** — (DK) As I have already said, of course no Member State has the right of veto, and the party in question has not, indeed, sought to veto the

**Gundelach**

Court's decision. Generally speaking, few decisions taken by the Community institutions can be vetoed by individual Member States.

As regards the other question, the question of damage can be dealt with by the European Court of Justice and does not need to be dealt with exclusively by the French Courts. Moreover, it is possible for the Commission, as I said earlier, to include the question of damage in its plea and as a last resort to ask the Court to give an immediate ruling based on the criterion of damage. The procedure required for such a decision is, as I said before, implemented by the Commission. But it involves the European Court, not the French Courts. So there are certain courses open to the Commission if it wishes to take up the question of damage, using the procedure for an immediate ruling.

**President.** — This is a very important question and I would like to try and balance the supplementary questions around the House if I can. Can we therefore keep the questions — and, dare I suggest, the answers — short?

**Mr Delatte.** — (*F*) Mr President, as regards application of the decision taken by the Court of Justice, does the Commission intend to respect Article 43 which stipulates that in the case of a decision of this kind, account must be taken of the earnings of farmers in a particular region, given that the guaranteed level of earnings must be ensured by national decisions? Secondly, is there any intention of taking account of the damage done to employment, as provided for in Article 43?

**Mr Gundelach.** — (*DK*) The article referred to by the honourable Member cannot conceivably be used as an argument for taking measures to keep the incomes of French sheep-farmers at the international Community level, whether those measures are of a quantitative nature of in the form of a levy, unless it is a small levy of a temporary nature to alleviate the effects of the English deficiency payments system, which is not in operation at present.

The means which the Court of Justice has referred to and which therefore come within the scope of this article concern arrangements for the payment of premiums or an internal system of support financed by non-discriminatory taxes. There are various measures available under the provisions of the Treaty, but not in relation to this particular case. This is precisely the question on which the Court has given a decision. After the transitional period there can no longer be any restrictions on free trade within the Community in this or other products.

**Mr d'Ormesson.** — (*F*) I am astonished by this discussion. I say this in all frankness to the author of

the question: this is a false debate since the regulation does not exist.

How can accusations be levelled at France when it bears 80 % of the brunt of imports of British sheepmeat and did all it could in this area until the price of its own sheepmeat fell abnormally, to the detriment of French farmers' earnings? That is why I want to put another question to the Commission: does not the concept of preference take priority over that of fixing prices and determining financial solidarity? How can this discussion be opened before discussing the regulation on sheepmeat?

I want in this connexion to draw the Commission's attention to one point. I found this morning in my mail the draft of a regulation that the Commission has presented to us. You are proposing financial aid to fill the gap in the earnings of French sheep-farmers following the introduction of uniform prices. I would point out that this amounts to the introduction of deficiency payments, which France has always opposed. How can we fail to recognize that by proposing a premium to make good the difference between the true cost price and the selling price of a particular product, we are in effect putting an end to the second main feature of the common market, i.e., a uniform price which makes for a unified market?

**Mr Gundelach.** — (*DK*) I do not think the honourable Member has a complete copy of the Commission's proposal for an organization of the market in sheepmeat, but I shall gladly see that he gets one. Our proposal does, of course, include the payment of production premiums, which is natural enough in the case of a product for which the Community has and always will have a large import requirement and seeing that some of the difficulties can be attributed to the fact that production occurs in very poorly situated areas and that we have already used premiums as a means of solving income problems in a number of other sectors. But other market mechanisms, including public purchasing, are also included in the proposal. Voluntary agreements with third countries are also necessary to ensure that our markets are not flooded in future, which has never happened yet.

I should like to remind the honourable Members that there exists a Community preference for sheepmeat, agreed during the negotiations on enlargement and duly adopted by the governments of the Nine and their parliaments. This introduced a 20 % duty on imports of sheepmeat. We therefore propose that this should be reinforced by means of voluntary restraint agreements with all sheepmeat-exporting countries and we must be sure to be able to maintain this. I do not doubt that a satisfactory organization for sheepmeat can be achieved. That is not the problem. The problem is failure to take the definitive decision on such an organization, which is clearly both desirable

**Gundelach**

and feasible and which depends on and is a precondition for compliance with a Court judgment requiring that a basic Community principle be respected. This is what the discussion is about, not whether we should have an organization for sheepmeat or not. Nor even about the nature of such an organization. On this, at all events there is substantial, if not total, agreement. The point on which there is disagreement is that new organization cannot be introduced until the Court's Order, which was delivered over five months ago, is complied with.

**President.**— Question No 9, by Mrs von Alemann (H-395/79):

Does the Commission not feel that it would be advisable to keep a close watch on the current work on eliminating chemical pollution in those areas of Seveso affected by the accident at the ICMESA plant in 1976, one purpose being to draw conclusions from the incident in order to prevent a recurrence and to organize any future assistance as rapidly and effectively as possible?

**Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (I) From the very first day after the Seveso incident, the Commission has kept a close watch on the efforts of the Italian authorities to eliminate this serious pollution. The Commission has also conducted a number of study and research projects carried out by different Community bodies and intended to determine the extent of the contamination and the mobility of the dioxin in the soil, how far the dioxin becomes decomposed in the soil, and relating to health problems and investigations of the diseases connected with the exposure to the dioxin. Moreover, on 16 July 1979, the Commission sent a proposal for a directive to the Council on serious risks and accidents connected with certain industrial activities, with the aim of avoiding these accidents and limiting their consequences for man and for the environment.

The appropriate conclusions were drawn from the Seveso accident when this proposal was drawn up. The proposal is at present being considered by the European Parliament, which has been asked to give its opinion on it.

Finally, on the question of the organization of rapid and effective assistance in the future, the Commission must remember that this is a matter for the competent authorities in the Member States. However, in the proposal for a directive mentioned, we make provision for setting up a data bank which will be available to the Member States and will bring together the results of the experience acquired following these accidents.

**Mr Sherlock.** — In considering the near-diastrous effects at Seveso — most of which have not been quite as bad as originally feared, — have the previous United Kingdom papers on a very similar incident involving the escape of dioxin in a research institute

in the United Kingdom been considered, and has their likely extrapolation to the industrial scale of this type of production plant been taken into account.

**Mr Natali.** — (I) I should like to assure the honourable Member that the proposal for a directive which I have mentioned, and which we have presented, has taken account of a number of meetings we have had with the Member States, and I should also like to inform him that among the studies which we commissioned from various institutions, one was assigned to the University of Bristol, and was concerned precisely with the observations which have just been made.

**President.** — Question No 10, by Mrs Ewing (H-397/79):

In view of the Commission's recent attempts to speed up the negotiations on Spain's entry to the EEC, will the Commission give its view of the fishing problems which will arise from Spain's entry and its proposed solutions to such problems?

**Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (DK) Mr President, it will be a few months before a proposal for a negotiating brief on fishing in connection with Spain's entry is available, but the honourable Member and the House as a whole will be aware that in the so-called 'fresco' the Commission has given a general account of the Spanish fishing industry, including the problems that will arise on Spain's entry. For all these details I would therefore refer you to that document.

The problem, briefly, concerns Spain's very large fishing fleet, very large even compared with the big fleets of some of the Member States. This enormous fleet has generally been compelled to fish in third country waters, many of which have been closed. There is therefore a risk that the Spanish fleet will concentrate its activities in the North Sea in waters which are already severely burdened by present Community fishing.

There are two approaches which we can adopt. We have started on one already with the framework agreement and the talks relating to it which are held with Spain each year and are aimed at progressively reducing Spanish fishing in Community waters. In the agreements concluded at the negotiating level one week ago, Spanish licences, for example, are reduced from 200 per year, which was a reduction already, to about 168 in the current year. In other words, there is a movement towards a reduction of Spanish fishing in the North Sea and the North Atlantic. At the same time, we must try to support Spain in the transitional period in its attempts to retain or win fishing rights in other waters, for example the Moroccan or West

## Gundelach

African waters, to avoid this concentration in the North Sea.

**Mrs Ewing.** — I have to thank Mr Gundelach for a frank answer to what is a very grave problem, the problem of this enormous fleet, which in 1976 was 252 % of the size of the UK fleet. While we sympathize with Spain's attempts to curtail it by 6 000 vessels and 31 000 men — as the representative of a fishing community, I know what this means to such communities — and while we hope that Mr Gundelach's optimism with regard to the Spaniards finding other waters will prove justified, may I ask him what assurances I can take home to the Scottish fishing industry? Contributing as they do the lion's share from the whole of the EEC pond, when they already see communities at risk, some of them already dying, they want to know what will be the effect on this pond that they are already sharing. Is the Commissioner aware that on 2 February the crisis situation in the Scottish industry, among men of a very peaceable disposition, was such that 700 skippers met and again a blockade was mooted because they feel there is an air of unreality about the situation in this industry, about the lack of import controls, about the lack of coastal preference and about the ostrich-like attitude which they feel is being adopted towards Spain? Is this going to be another situation in which someone else gets in on this great area and then the Scots once again are going to be done down? This is a matter about which they feel very strongly Mr Commissioner, and I wonder what I can tell them when I go back to Scotland.

**Mr Gundelach.** — (DK) The simple answer is, yes, of course Spain's entry into the Community raises difficult problems in the fishing sector. Meanwhile, we can tell Europe's fishermen, who not only in Scotland, but also in other parts of the Community find themselves in an extremely difficult situation, because of the Council's failure to reach agreement on a fishing policy — a failure which is in process of being redressed — that in these circumstances it has been possible to agree with Spain on a further reduction of the already sharply reduced fishing by Spanish fleets in Community waters. In compensation, the Community must be prepared to help Spain to look for other alternative fishing grounds in other parts of the world. It must be made clear to the European fishing industry that definite limits have been set both on the number of licences and the amount of fish the Spanish fleet is allowed to catch and that such a reduction has already been made and will continue to be made in 1980 as compared with 1979.

**Mr Provan.** — Following on from that answer, in view of the fact that fish is being dumped on United Kingdom markets at prices below the market price, will the Commission investigate what support national

governments, in particular those of applicant countries, give to their own national fleets by way of assistance, so as to ensure that fish is not dumped across national borders in the Community at prices below the floor price for the species concerned?

**Mr Gundelach.** — (DK) Quite obviously it is essential to ascertain in the negotiations with Spain how much national assistance is given and what the policy is regarding control of the market in fish. It is also important, for the purpose of establishing a common fishing policy, to find out what forms of national assistance exist in the Community at present. Similarly, it is important to ascertain what catches are made by the Community and the conditions on which they are marketed within the Community. Some of our difficulties are, after all, of our own making and cannot be blamed on Spain or third countries. The reason is that a number of Member States are catching much more fish than they had said they would in the gentleman's agreements of last year.

**Mr Maffre-Baugé.** — (F) We are told that the Commission is continuing its efforts to speed up negotiations for the accession of Spain to the EEC. Is it fully aware of the negative consequences of this haste? For the dispute over fishing or the anxiety over fishing today join those over Roussillon salads and over fruit and vegetables and, tomorrow, that over wine. Can the Commission justify its attitude, which borders on excessive haste, as certain sectors of production are involved which at present are experiencing very great difficulty?

**Mr Gundelach.** — (DK) We seemed to be talking about fish, and now we have gone over to fruit and vegetables; any moment now we shall be talking of olive oil or something entirely different. Besides, I did not talk about speeding up the negotiations. I said that we should keep to the timetable fixed by the Community institutions and deal seriously with each individual problem, including fruit and vegetables, within the time allowed.

**Mr Kirk.** — (DK) I should like to ask Mr Gundelach a supplementary question — he has touched on the subject himself — namely, whether it would not be simpler to conduct the negotiations on Spain's entry if we in the Community had solved our internal fishing problems. Mr Gundelach has said as much; but the point of my question is, if it is accepted in the internal agreements between the Member States that the fishing rights and quotas should be allocated on the basis of traditional fishing patterns, there will be no limits to the changes that will occur in the existing arrangements when Spain is a member of the Community.

**Mr Gundelach.** — (DK) Any allocation of fishing quotas has got to be based on traditional patterns, but the Parliament will know that, in relation to third countries, the Community must — for very good reasons since it is treated in the same way by other third countries — apply the basic principle of reciprocity. In other words, we have allowed others to fish in our waters, within the limits permitted from the conservation angle, on condition that we can fish in their waters. But we have no tradition of fishing or fishing interests in Spanish waters. If an exception has been made in the case of Spain, a strictly limited exception, the reason is that Spain is hoping to join the Community and, once it is has joined, it will have certain rights under the common fishing policy. Some account must be taken of this fact during the run-up to Spain's membership, but it must be done in a way that is acceptable to the European fishing industry, which has had to see its fishing curtailed, at least for the time being.

**President.** — Question No 11 by Mr Collins (H-398/79) :

Is the Commission aware of the problems presented to British farming interests by the expiry on 31 December 1979 of derogations concerning the import of live pigs and fresh pigmeat, and will they indicate what action they propose to take to ensure the continued freedom in Britain from classical swine fever?

**Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (DK) Mr President, in the last session we had an extensive debate on classical swine fever and the Commission's measures for combating this disease and I do not think it would be profitable to take up Parliament's time to discuss these things again. I would merely draw the honourable Member's attention to what I said then, namely that the derogations which authorize the United Kingdom, Denmark and Ireland to retain their national rules on the prevention of classical swine fever have been provisionally extended until 30 June 1980. This gives us time to see what has happened in the meantime to the Commission's plan to eradicate the disease and introduce new rules to enable intra-Community trade to proceed without any risk of a spread of infection. So the position at present is that the national rules still apply.

**Mr Collins.** — I was going to say that I was glad to have the Commission's assurances, but I am not so sure now that I am glad, because I do not think they are assurances. I wonder if Mr Gundelach, in spite of his reluctance to discuss what was debated last month, would not agree that in order to reassure farmers whose whole future depends on continuing high standards of health and hygiene, it would not be better to extend the derogation indefinitely, but with periodic

review, until the other regulations are actually available. In other words, would it not be better to move from a position of certainty rather than to have fixed time limits at the end of which farmers would be in some degree of worry about whether or not the new provisions would be effective, whether they would come into force soon enough, or whatever. Can Mr Gundelach give me an assurance that the Commission's real concern is with the future health of the industry? Is that really at the heart of their policy?

**Mr Gundelach.** — (DK) I have nothing against spending the rest of Question Time on discussing this important, but technical problem. But I do not think it necessary, because there can be no doubt that the Commission considers it of primary importance to keep health standards at the highest possible level. I said that last session. It is also, as we have just been saying in connection with sheepmeat, of primary importance to ensure the free movement of goods; and if that is true of sheepmeat, it must also be true of pigmeat. If we put off solving the veterinary problems which have to be solved to an indefinite date, I am pretty sure that trade interests in the United Kingdom and Denmark will see that they are never solved.

**Mr Newton Dunn.** — I would like to ask the Commissioner on this particular subject whether he is familiar with Shakespeare and John of Gaunt's dying speech in which John of Gaunt describes the United Kingdom as 'this royal throne of kings, this sceptred isle, this earth of majesty, this seat of Mars', and then describes the English Channel as a moat around a house against 'infection and the hand of war'. Now, in Britain we have no swine fever, we have no Colorado beetle in potatoes and we have no rabies in our wild animals. Can the Commissioner assure me that we shall not have any of these continental diseases in our treasured island?

(Laughter)

**Mr Gundelach.** — I am sure you will not have them through any fault of ours. The country I know best — which has no sea between it and the continent of Europe — is not affected by any of these diseases either, so it can obviously be done without a wall of water.

(Applause — Laughter)

**Mrs Buchan.** — May we on this side of the House give Mr Gundelach an assurance that that kind of anti-European attitude is typical of the pro-marketeers and not the real Europeans, who are anti-common market?

(Loud laughter)

**President.** — Your remark is out of order.

**Mrs Buchan.** — That doesn't make it any the less true, Mr President!

**President.** — Since their authors are not present, questions Nos 12 and 13 will receive written answers.<sup>1</sup>

Questions No 14, by Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti (H-402/79):

Is the Commission aware of the very worrying situation of Cambodian refugees accommodated in the SAKEO and the 'REAHON' camp at Mana Mak Moon, where more than 235 000 people, including 120 000 children, of whom 4 700 are orphans, are living in inhuman conditions without sufficient food or medical attention?

Can the Commission state whether it is now in a position to provide, in cooperation with the Member States, the necessary emergency aid to these refugees, who are afflicted by hunger and illness?

and No 21, by Mr Purvis (H-419/79):

What proportion at the most recent suitable date of aid granted or paid for by the Community for Kampuchea has been distributed to the starving people in need of it; what proportion remains undistributed in store in Kampuchea; what proportion has still not reached Kampuchea; and what steps will the Commission take to ensure that the aid is distributed as rapidly as possible to those most in need of it?

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (F) The total aid granted by the Community to the population of Cambodia has at present reached 31 million EUA or 25 % of the outlay necessary for six months.

In Thailand, where there are 143 000 refugees in four camps, we have distributed 18 million EUA through the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, UNICEF, the Red Cross and various non-governmental organizations. One can say that, overall, the plight of the refugees is attenuated by this aid, which is distributed in a completely normal way.

In replying to Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, I should like to say that there are 32 000 refugees in the Sakeo camp which is administered by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees, that great care is given to the children there and that reports indicate that the health situation is satisfactory.

Along the border itself, the situation is very different. There we have between 300 and 350 000 refugees who generally stay on the Cambodian side of the border and from 150 to 200 000 who go backwards and forwards across the border. There is therefore a total of close to 500 000 unfortunates who wonder across this border.

The situation there is very bad, and control of the distribution of the food and aid is very difficult. In the camps of Manamakmoun, which Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti has mentioned, it is not possible to know

exactly how many refugees there are or exactly what the conditions for distribution are like. There are about 70 000 refugees in this camp.

Finally, referring to Mr Purvis' question, the Commission of the Community has allocated 13 million EUA to Kampuchea, 3 million of which are for an air link. The remaining 10 million EUA, are for the use of 117 lorries, 20 all-purpose vehicles and 10 000 tonnes of essential products. Only 1 050 tonnes of these 10 000 tonnes had been distributed by 16 January 1980, 7 000 tonnes were in stock and the rest was being distributed. All this shows just how disastrous, hateful and open to criticism the situation was at that moment.

I should like to say, Mr President, that a certain improvement has been reported over the last few days and that 50 % of the stockpiles at kom pong Sonn have been used, as was not the case previous to this. In spite of this, I am still forced today to say that the provisions which arrive normally for the refugees in Thailand are very difficult to distribute along the border, because the situation is unstable and because the Cambodian authorities still create many difficulties with Kampuchea itself.

**Mr Purvis.** — Mr President, my question is particularly prompted by representations I have received from members of the Scottish Branch of the Save the Children Fund, who have worked very hard to support that organization's valuable but often obstructed efforts in Kampuchea. They are concerned only in providing for the essential food and medical needs of the Kampuchean, whether the aid comes from official sources or from charitable ones, and I think the people of Europe as a whole have shown enormous concern for this tragic situation. Can the Commission tell us whether it has received equivalent assurances to those reputedly received recently by Mr James Grant, the Executive Director of UNICEF, and the Red Cross from the Phnom Penh regime that it would cooperate in the relief effort and, if it has received such assurances, whether they also extend to aid originating in Europe and routed through European charities such as the Save the Children Fund, and whether, if it has received such assurances, it is satisfied that they will be translated into concrete action?

**Mr Cheysson.** — (F) As the Parliament knows, the Commission does not deal directly with the Cambodian authorities, whether they are Vietnamese or Cambodian, in fact whatever side they represent. Our work is carried out exclusively through non-governmental organizations and UNICEF. It is in this way that 1 050 tonnes had certainly been distributed by 16 January and 1 050 out of a total of 10 000 was very little indeed! I have to say that the best results were obtained by some relatively small non-governmental organizations, such as Troquer, People's Aid, Catholic Aid, the Oecumenical Council of Churches and OXFAM for a whole section of these operations.

<sup>1</sup>See Annex.

**Mr Prag.** — May I ask the Commissioner whether and by what means the Commission is conveying to the Vietnamese Government the disgust of people in the European Community at the use being made of hunger by that government — the Vietnamese Government — to keep the Kampuchean people under the heel of its puppets?

**Mr Cheysson.** — (*F*) The Commission obviously has no direct link with the Vietnamese Government. The governments of the Member States of the Communities have, on several occasions, indicated their anxiety to Hanoi; the same is true of the United Nations and the different non-governmental organizations with which we work. I should like to add that public debates, like those which have been held on many occasions in this Assembly, and speeches on radio and television, certainly have an impact in Vietnam. I believe that if there has been some improvement in recent weeks, this is in part because the Vietnamese authorities have come to understand that they are the object of universal censure.

Therefore, if this debate had been held three weeks ago, my reply to the honorable member's question would have been a very negative one, and I would have categorically denounced the obstacles encountered by the non-governmental organizations in Kampuchea. A certain improvement has been noted for about the last fortnight. The distribution of certain provisions and medicines is allowed, but the medical staff necessary have not so far been allowed in to use their skills.

**Mr Lomas.** — I wonder whether the Commissioner is aware that in contrast to what Mr Prag has stated, that very respected organization Oxfam has said through its spokesman, Mr Malcom Harper, that the delays in the distribution of food aid were in the main logistical problems such as the fact that a great number of the administrative officials responsible for distribution were untrained, many of the trained officials having been murdered under the Pol Pot regime, and that the organization has had the fullest possible cooperation from both the Phnom Penh Government and the Vietnamese authorities.

**Mr Cheysson.** — (*F*) On 16 January, which is the date of the last detailed report by OXFAM and other organizations, OXFAM had within Kampuchea itself about 450 tonnes of products which we had sent, and had only been able to distribute 50 tons, while the lorries, the means of distribution, stood outside in front of the stockpiles. It is true that there are very many administrative difficulties in Phnom Penh which even concern distributions within the town itself. When these build up to the situation which prevailed for three or four months, I cannot imagine that this was solely due to the inexperience of young officials. I note moreover that for the last fortnight, as

I have said, all of a sudden these officials seem to have become experienced, since now distribution is beginning to take place.

**Sir Fred Warner.** — What is implied by the word distribution? Are we talking about the handing over of supplies to local authorities or are we talking about detailed distribution to the population?

Secondly, could the Commissioner tell us in what area of Cambodia distribution is effective? Is this only in a small part of the territory or does he feel that supplies are now being widely distributed in the remoter areas?

**Mr Cheysson.** — (*F*) The reply to the first question is no. In no circumstances would we accept that provisions or other aid sent by us to Kampuchea should be distributed by the local authorities. They are distributed exclusively through non-governmental organizations and given directly to the beneficiaries.

On the second question, in Cambodia we must distinguish clearly between the border zone, where the situation is particularly unstable as I have said and where distribution can be made across the border (this zone where about 500 000 refugees are more or less vagrants) and the rest of the country where distribution has now begun in conditions which are almost satisfactory, mainly in the large towns and especially in and around Phnom Penh and Kom Pong Som, in and around the large port.

**President.** — Question No 15, by Mrs Baudis (H-405/79):

Given the different laws in the Member States on the use of dipped headlights by motor vehicles in built-up areas, is the Commission planning to carry out further studies and possibly consult local representatives, in preparation for the European Conference of Ministers of Transport, in order to ensure greater protection for pedestrians likely to be dazzled by vehicle headlights when it is raining?

**Mr Burke, Member of the Commission.** — In reply to the honourable Member's Question No 350/79, I stated that the Commission does not propose any initiative on the use of dipped headlights. In the context of its cooperation with the European Conference of Ministers of Transport, the Commission will ensure that attention is given in the work of this organization to the points mentioned by the honourable Member.

**Mr Baudis.** — (*F*) I must say that I do not find the Commissioner's reply satisfying since this is a complex matter. Four Community countries require the use of dipped headlights in built-up areas. Four others, on the other hand, do not require this and France will revise its position at the end of next month. Yes, Mr Commissioner, I expected a great deal from your reply, just as the pedestrian hopes that his way will be lighted, but that he will not be dazzled; I must say that I have been neither enlightened nor dazzled by your reply.

**Bandis**

Nevertheless, I hope that there has been some awareness of the problem. In this country, the mayors of all the large towns have decided that there was a danger, and I put the question to you: why is it that mayors, who are responsible for safety both on the public highway and concerning street-lighting, are not consulted on a matter where their personal responsibilities are involved? I should therefore, Mr Commissioner, like you to tell me: why is it that those in charge at a local level are not consulted, when the European Conference of Ministers of Transport is going to meet?

**Mr Burke.** — It is sometimes painful for people in my position to indicate that, because of lack of staff, certain aspects of the transport policy do not receive high priority. I am afraid that this is one of them; so I think honesty in this matter is desirable.

I do not by that mean to imply that the matter raised in the House by the honourable Member is not of considerable importance. Secondly, I would state that we do not wish to duplicate the work that is being carried out by the European Conference of the Ministers of Transport which includes other countries in addition to the Community Member States. I have taken careful note of what he has said, but I want to indicate that we do not give, owing to lack of staff, a very high priority to this aspect of the work. Finally, may I say that there is as yet no unanimity of view among safety experts in the Member States where the use of sidelights only is permitted.

**Mr Moreland.** — Could I ask the Commissioner to what extent he sees his role as transport Commissioner as involving the subject of built-up area traffic. Is it not more properly his role to deal with issues that are of a broader nature, such as the development of a common transport policy, the liberalization of road haulage, infrastructure proposals — broader issues than this rather detailed one which may, after all, give the Community the name of being too technical.

**Mr Burke.** — We do not exclude *a priori* any aspect of European transport from our deliberations. However, for the reasons given and indeed for other reasons, it is not always possible to give priority to all aspects of policy. For that reason we have, for the moment, left aside such areas as urban transport until we have the staff to deal with them. I generally share Mr Moreland's views concerning our activities.

**President.** — Question No 16, by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-406/79):

Can the Commission say what methods have been used in the Member States to teach the children of migrant workers the language of their country of origin, so that when the directive is implemented in 1981 those methods are chosen which have given the best results and which ensure that the directive is properly implemented?

**Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission.** — (D) We have provided support for a number of experimental projects in Member States to ensure that this directive is implemented expeditiously. We are gathering information from these projects. Initial results show, for example, that teaching in the native language as part of the normal curriculum should be encouraged. Furthermore, introductory teaching should be combined with normal teaching material as quickly as possible. Thirdly, it has been shown to be advantageous if the persons responsible for teaching the children about their cultural background do so where possible in the language of that country. These experimental projects are going to be analysed during the year. We hope that towards the end of the year we will be in a position to select one or other method from these experimental projects to facilitate implementation of this directive.

**Mrs Squarcialupi.** — (I) While waiting to learn about the trial schemes which are under way in the Member States, I should like to know what the Commission has done to put this directive into practice, as it is obliged to do.

We are told, for example, that in Luxembourg great difficulties have been and are still being encountered on the matter of finding premises where the lessons may be held, and we know that choices of this kind cannot be left until the very moment when the directives comes into force.

**Mr Brunner.** — (D) The Commission will be pleased to contact Member States again, pointing out the urgency of implementing this directive.

**Mrs Clwyd.** — Mr President, in view of the fact that redundant Welsh-speaking steel workers and miners will in the next few months be forced to migrate in their thousands because of the insane monetary policies of the UK Government, will the Commission ensure that facilities are made available in the Ruhr, or in whichever member country they have to migrate to, so that the language of their country of origin may be taught to their children.

(Applause from certain quarters on the left —  
Laughter from certain quarters on the right)

**Mr Brunner.** — (D) The directive on the children of migrant workers applies throughout the Community. There will not be discrimination with regard to the conclusions to be drawn from this directive.

**Mr Seal.** — Has the Commission any plans to extend this scheme to people who do not really qualify as migrant workers, such as Commonwealth citizens from Asia who live in parts of the UK? In other

**Seal**

words, does the Commission intend to extend it to languages other than the six official languages? It is necessary that the Commissioner give this some thought, because in many areas with large Asian populations the work that is being done and the experience that has been gained is being lost because of the cuts that the Tory government are making in local government spending.

**Mr Brunner.** — (*D*) When the directive was adopted, the Government of the United Kingdom considered it important that the directive should only apply to children of workers from the European Community. This is the basis of the directive, and thus it will remain.

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

**Mr Seal.** — Mr President, it seems to me that Members of this Parliament are wasting their time asking questions unless the Commission answers them and that was the worst non-answer I have ever come across.

**President.** — This is not strictly a point of order. The matter may be pursued further through all other channels open to Members of this House.

**Mr Welsh.**— May I once again offer my humble services to the Commission, and perhaps help them by asking them whether they do not consider that an appropriate answer to Mr Seals's question is that silly questions inevitably get silly answers?

*(Laughter)*

**Mr Brunner.** — (*D*) I think you would be asking me to be too modest if you expect me to say that I gave a silly answer. It cannot be put more clearly: at the wish of the then British Government the Labour Government, to be precise the directive was not extended to cover the children of Asian workers. Is the answer clear now?

**President.** — The first part of Question Time is closed.<sup>1</sup>

I call Mr Radoux on a point of order.

**Mr Radoux.** — (*F*) Mr President, the way in which our time has been used has not allowed us to look at the many questions concerning Turkey. Given that a delegation from that country has visited or will visit our Parliament, can I ask for the help of the presidency to ensure that at least one of the questions concerning Turkey comes before the Council on Wednesday?

**President.** — We take note of that, Mr Radoux.

*20. Agenda for the next sitting*

**President.** — The next sitting will take place tomorrow, 12 February 1980, with the following agenda:

- 9 a.m. until 1 p.m. and 3 p.m. to 7 p.m.:
- Decision on urgent procedure for a proposal for a regulation;
- Commission statement on agricultural prices;
- Introduction of the 13th General Report and the Commission's work programme;
- Joint debate on the Nicholson and Forster reports on the shipbuilding and textile industries and an oral question to the Commission on the same subject;
- Oral question, with debate, to the Commission on oils, fats and proteins;
- Joint debate on two oral questions to the Commission, the first on drug abuse and the second on public health policy in the EEC;
- Von Wogau report on Community transit;
- Joint debate on the Dankert report and the R. Jackson report on provisionsal twelfths;
- 3. p.m. : Voting-time.

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 20.10 p.m.)*

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

## ANNEX

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

1. At its January 1980 part-session, the European Parliament delivered 17 opinions in response to Council requests for consultation. In one case, the no-report procedure was used to deliver a favourable opinion on the :

Proposal concerning the processing of agricultural products originating in the ACP or OCT.

2. At the last part-session, Parliament discussed 11 reports and delivered favourable opinions on them :

- Report by Mr Combe on a directive on health problems affecting trade in fresh poultry meat,
- Report by Mrs Cresson on a regulation concerning classical swine-fever,
- Report by Mrs Cresson on a directive concerning certain derogations in connection with swine-fever,
- Report by Mr Nielsen on a directive concerning tuberculosis and brucellosis,
- Report by Mr Poniatowski on a regulation concerning arrangements for trade between Southern Rhodesia and the EEC,
- Report by Mr Almirante on two proposals concerning wine of fresh grapes and liqueur wine originating in Cyprus ;
- Report by Mrs Caretoni-Romagnoli on the CCT in respect of certain agricultural products originating in Turkey,
- Report by Mr Lemmer on a directive on procedures for the exportation of goods ;
- Report by Mr Seeler on the CCT in respect of certain types of fish,
- Report by Mrs Agnelli on imports of adult bovine animals from Yugoslavia,
- Report by Mr Giummarra on frozen beef and veal.

3. In five cases, the European Parliament proposed amendments to Commission proposals, three of these being accepted by the Commission :

- Report by Mr Lega on a regulation amending the Staff Regulation as regards family and social policy and the pension scheme,  
The Commission is preparing an amended proposal which takes account of some of the proposed amendments. The Council is to start considering it in the next few days ;
- Report by Mr Gherrgo on a five-year research plan on radiation protection.  
The Commission adopted an amended proposal following the opinion delivered by the Parliament, and has sent it to the Council and Parliament ;
- Report by Mr Combe on a proposal concerning cocoa and chocolate products intended for human consumption.  
An amended proposal which takes account of Parliament's opinion has been prepared and is to be sent to the Council and Parliament towards the end of the week.

4. In two cases, the Commission preferred to maintain its original proposals :

- Report by Mr Luster on a proposal concerning the trade arrangements applicable in respect of certain goods derived from processing agricultural products, and
- Report by Mr Lega on the amendment of the Staff Regulations as regards the adjustment of basic salaries.

5. At its January 1980 part-session, the European Parliament asked the Commission to grant

(a) aid to victims of the natural disasters which have affected the province of Messina.

On 23 January 1980, the Commission decided to grant emergency aid amounting to 800 000 EUA to those affected by storms and torrential rains in the Mezzogiorno. The present budget situation being what it is, with the month-by-month arrangements, the aid is to be paid out in three installments :

400 000 EUA in February 1980 ;  
 200 000 EUA in March 1980 ;  
 200 000 EUA in April 1980.

(b) financial aid and food for Afghan refugees

As promised at the part-session, the Commission has presented a proposal for a Community contribution to the UNHCR aid programme to the Council. This proposal covers :

- financial aid amounting to 10 million EUA, of which an initial 300 000 EUA instalment is to be paid out immediately ;
- food aid comprising, as requested by the UNHCR,
  - 12 000 tonnes of cereals,
  - 300 tonnes of powdered milk and
  - 1 000 tonnes of sugar,
 representing some 2 600 000 EUA in all.

The Council approved these Commission proposals at its meeting on 5 February. They have yet to be presented to the Parliament for consideration of their budgetary aspects.

(c) emergency aid for Mauritius, struck by the hurricane Claudette :

On 30 January 1980, the Commission decided to grant immediate aid amounting to 300 000 EUA to cover the most urgent needs, which would not preclude supplementary aid at a later date.

\*  
\*   \*  
\*

*Questions which could not be answered during Question time, with written answers*

*Question No 12, by Mr van Aerssen (H-399/79)*

Subject : The Community's energy supplies

In the light of the disappointing results of the meeting of OPEC countries in Caracas in December 1979, does the Commission think that the Community will have adequate supplies of crude oil throughout 1980, or does it feel that there will be an even more serious oil shortage, at least in the second half of 1980 (world production of less than 49 million barrels per day), and that the crisis mechanism for safeguarding the Community's energy supplies will in effect have to be brought into operation ?

*Answer*

At the European Council in Strasbourg in June 1979, the Community undertook to limit its oil imports to 472 million tonnes — the 1978 level — until 1985. Imports of this magnitude will easily cover the expected demand in 1980, and it is even possible that they will be below the target set in Strasbourg.

As the situation now stands, we expect world oil production in 1980 to be only slightly under last year's level (65 million barrels per day), which should be enough to cover the Community's import requirements.

We are therefore not contemplating bringing the crisis mechanism into operation, especially as the Community began 1980 with particularly high stocks (enough for about 120 days).

Although this is a welcome fact, we must bear in mind the uncertainty of oil stocks. There is still an urgent need for the Community and all the Member States considerably to increase energy-saving measures and the development of alternative sources.

\*  
\*   \*  
\*

*Question No 13, by Mr Spinelli (H-401/79)*

Subject : Application of the first Community directive on limited companies

Is the Commission aware of the question by Mr Minervini, member of the Italian Chamber of Deputies, asking the reasons for the wholly incorrect application of the first Community directive on limited companies? If so, can it state what action it intends to take to ensure proper application of the directive in Italy, and, if possible, can it state how the directive is applied in all the other Member States of the Community?

*Answer*

The Commission is aware of the question put to the Italian Government by Mr Minervini, Member of the Italian Chamber of Deputies, on the National Bulletin for limited companies (*Bollettino ufficiale delle Società per azioni e a responsabilità limitata* — BUSARL) created in Italy on the occasion of the incorporation into national law of the first directive on company law, which set up a uniform system for publicizing the most important acts relating to limited companies in the Member States.

In the case of Italy, Mr Minervini pointed out that the Bulletin mentioned is published at irregular intervals and that there is also a long delay between the official date of its publication and its actual publication.

The Commission has asked the Italian authorities for further information.

If the Commission can establish that a provision of a directive, despite being properly incorporated into national law, is in fact not systematically applied so that it loses its effect, it will not hesitate to take the action provided for in the Treaty.

\*  
\*       \*  
\*

*Question No 20, by Mr Poncelet (H-418/79): deferred*

\*  
\*       \*  
\*

*Question No 22, by Mr Kavanagh (H-420/79)*

Subject : Problems in the Community textile industry

In view of the considerable threat to the Community textile industry, especially carpets, posed by imports of artificially low-cost fibre from the USA, what protective action will the Commission propose pursuant to the Council's agreement last April to take such action, if the need arose?

*Answer*

1. After completing its research in close cooperation with the Member States and European manufacturers of synthetic fibres, in December the Commission entered into bilateral discussions with the United States authorities in an effort to find a solution to the problems posed by the rapid increase in imports of certain synthetic fibre products from the United States.

These discussions have helped to clarify the technical aspect of the situation but have not yet resulted in any common conclusions being reached on the problem.

The Commission remains deeply concerned about the competitive advantage which American exporters enjoy as a consequence of the American legislation fixing gas and oil prices below world market levels, and intends to persevere with these discussions.

2. The latest figures on synthetic fibres overall show that third countries accounted for 16 % of imports and the United States 6.9 % during the third quarter of 1979. This being so, the Commission feels that there is no need at present for the Community to introduce measures restricting imports of synthetic fibres into the Community as a whole.

However, in view of the considerable disparities in the development of the synthetic fibre market in different regions of the Community, the Commission does not rule out the possibility of specific measures where there is clear evidence that imports of particular products into a specific Community region are disturbing the market and that local manufacturers are suffering damage, and it has indicated its readiness to give very careful consideration to any requests from Member States for such measures.

The Commission has recently received a request from the British authorities for measures to be introduced under Regulation 926/79 to safeguard the United Kingdom market. The Commission will reply within the time-limit laid down by the regulation.

\*

\*      \*

*Question No 23, by Mrs Clwyd (H-421/79)*

Subject : Social Security Regulations

Is the Commission aware that under the Social Security Regulations of the European Communities—viz., Certificate of Entitlement to Benefits in kind during a stay in a Member State (E. 111, available in the UK) a wife can be covered as a dependent of her husband, but her husband may not be included as her dependant 'unless he is unable to support himself because of physical or mental disability', and can the Commission explain the unequal treatment of the sexes in the Regulation ?

*Answer*

The social security regulations applicable to wage earners and their families who move from one Community Member State to another are only intended to coordinate social security provisions in the Member States. In other words, the national regulations as such remain intact. The regulation in question contains provisions for the allocation of sickness benefits to members of the family of a worker temporarily resident in another Member State. In the case of such temporary residents, the concept of 'members of family' is determined by reference to the statutory provisions of the Member State in which the person concerned is resident ; in the case of a resident of the United Kingdom, the relevant provisions are therefore those of the United Kingdom. The consequences of the application of the statutory provisions applicable in the United Kingdom pursuant to this concept are indeed as described by the Honourable Member.

In conjunction with the directive on equal treatment for men and women in the area of social security, adopted by the Council on 19 December 1978, and having regard to the complexity of this whole matter, the Commission wrote in June 1979 to the Member States drawing attention to the need for gradual implementation during the six-year transitional period with a view to ensuring that all the necessary legislation is finalized by the end of that period. The responsible authorities in the United Kingdom were also notified of the problem raised by the author of the question. The United Kingdom responded that it was still too early to say how and when the necessary changes would be made.

The Commission intends to ask the Member States in the course of this year for information on the progress being made towards implementation of the Council directive. It appears that work on the adaptation of national statutory provisions is already under way in Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

Only recently, in January 1980, the Commission began to investigate, in cooperation with government experts, the problems arising in connection with the application of the same principle to occupational pension regulations.

\*

\*      \*

*Question No 24, by Sir John Stewart-Clark (H-442/79): deferred*

\*  
\*     \*

*Question No 25, by Mr Maber (H-423/79): deferred*

\*  
\*     \*

*Question No 26, by Mr Estgen (H-424/79)*

Subject : Year of the Child 1979

The United Nations declared 1979 'International Year of the Child' and appealed to all States to carry out specific actions in 1979 for the benefit of the child.

Can the Commission give details of the specific initiatives it undertook at Community level for the Year of the Child?

*Question No 33, by Mrs Desmond (H-439/79)*

Subject : Community response to the UN Year of the Child

Can the Commission give details of the response within the Community, in terms of legislation and other policies introduced, to the UN Year of the Child, and will it publish a separate chapter of its Report on the Social Situation for 1979 dealing with the subject?

*Answer to Questions Nos 26 and 33*

Certain of the Commission's activities are intended to benefit the children of immigrant workers and take the form of aid from the European Social Fund (which increased from 12 million EUA in 1978 to over 15 million EUA in 1979) and specific initiatives for the education of these children and special training and instruction for teachers. In addition, the education of handicapped children has been the subject of a number of activities, and in May 1979 the Commission held a conference devoted to an extensive study of pre-school education.

The Commission also carried out an opinion poll in the nine Member States entitled 'European Parents and their Children' the results of which are soon to appear.

With regard to the promotion of consumer interests, the Commission is preparing a draft directive on the safety of toys and is instigating studies concerning children and advertising. The Commission is also doing its utmost to discourage children from smoking.

Concerning financial and food aid to the Third World, the EDF has, within the framework of the Lomé Convention, financed many measures for the benefit of children — for example, maternity clinics and centres for mothers and children. The Community has granted extensive food aid to non-associated countries, consistently giving priority to mothers and children; in 1979, food aid to the value of 287 million EUA was given to the Third World. The Community also contributes indirectly through the funds it gives to non-governmental organizations; in this respect a great deal was done in 1979 to implement projects for the benefit of children.

Finally, the Commission has published a brochure entitled 'The Little Citizens of Europe' which contains a concise account of the measures it is taking for the benefit of children. This brochure has been widely circulated, and I would refer you to the Chapter concerning our efforts to discourage children from smoking.

\*  
\*     \*

*Question No 27, by Mr Muntingb (H-425/79)*

Subject : Natural disasters

In view of the frequency of natural disasters and the scale of their impact on the environment and population, what preventive action and emergency measures to be implemented in the event of such disasters does the Commission intend to take ?

*Answer*

As regards developing countries and other third countries, the Commission can implement the following measures :

1. Emergency aid in the form of cash payments to make good the immediate consequences of disasters.

Appropriations are available for this purpose :

- under Article 59 of the Lomé Convention : about 40m EUA a year ;
- under Article 950 of the budget for other developing and third countries : an appropriation of 3m EUA was entered in 1979 and increased to 42m EUA through successive transfers, to aid refugees in South-East Asia, the populations of Cambodia, and third countries affected by hurricanes David and Frederick.

2. Food aid for third developing countries and the ACP countries, which is generally covered by the reserves provided for in the annual programmes. The 1979 reserves provided for quantities worth 18m EUA at world prices (30m EUA at domestic prices). To sum up, after utilization of the reserves from earlier programmes and after transfers, a total of 36m EUA at world prices (54m EUA at domestic prices) was used in 1979.
3. As part of normal EDF aid, preventive or reconstruction measures may be decided on in the light of the priorities set by the ACP States. Similarly, in the case of the non-associated developing countries, it is planned to set aside a certain proportion of the annual appropriations for long-term reconstruction and/or preventive measures. In 1979, the amount used for this purpose was 11m EUA.

The Commission thus has a fairly wide range of means of intervening in disaster situations in developing and third countries. In view however, of the increasing number and scale of the disasters, the Commission considers that the appropriation of 3m EUA entered under Article 950 of the 1979 budget and adopted by the Council in the 1980 draft budget is totally inadequate. It therefore reserves the right to propose a substantial increase in Article 950 appropriations when it submits the preliminary draft budget for 1980.

\*  
\*   \*   \*

*Question No 28, by Mr Harris (H-430/79)*

Subject : Road-equivalent tariff for ferry services to Scotland's Western Isles

What is happening about the proposal that a road-equivalent tariff should be introduced for ferry services to Scotland's Western Isles, and has any consideration been given to the possibility of introducing such a subsidy for the Isles of Scilly ?

*Answer*

The Commission has not at any time considered, nor is it doing so now, a proposal on road-equivalent tariffs. As its answers to previous parliamentary questions have indicated, ferries are not considered to be part of the road infrastructure under the Common Transport Policy.

Ferry tariffs continue to be essentially matters for Member States, subject to general Treaty Rules.

\*  
\*   \*   \*

*Question No 29, by Mr Barbagli (H-431/79)*

Subject : Distillation of table wine

Further to the answer given on 14 January 1960 in Strasbourg on the subject of the exceptional grape harvest in Italy, France and Spain in the 1979-80 marketing year, can the Commission state whether it intends to facilitate the distillation of appropriate quantities of table wine in order to safeguard the balance of the wine market and the earnings of wine-growers ?

*Answer*

Having regard to the fact that the measures already taken to balance the market in table wine cannot by themselves be expected to safeguard prices, the Commission has proposed to the Council that there should be a 'special distillation' under Article 12 of the basic regulation. It is estimated that this will result in 6-8 m hectolitres of table wine being withdrawn from the market, thus reducing stocks to a more acceptable level.

\*  
\*       \*

*Question No 30, by Mr Welsh (H-432/79)*

Subject : Regulation of natural-gas prices in Holland

Will the Commission undertake to make representations to the Dutch Government concerning their policy of artificially regulating the price of natural gas to fruit, vegetable and flower producers in Holland, thus giving them an unfair competitive advantage *vis-à-vis* growers in other parts of the Community ?

*Answer*

In view of the problems created for a number of Member States by the Dutch natural-gas rates, the Commission has addressed a note to the Dutch Government requesting full clarification of the situation ; it has also asked for information about what measures the Dutch Government envisages taking to bring gas prices into line with prices for competing kinds of fuel in the Netherlands.

According to the information available to the Commission, gas prices were adjusted in October 1979 and the Dutch natural-gas distribution company GAS UNIE is at present negotiating new supply terms with horticulturists ; account is to be taken in these negotiations of trends in prices for competing kinds of fuel.

\*  
\*       \*

*Question No 31, by Mr O'Donnell (H-435/79)*

Subject : Milk and sugar sectors

Is the Commission aware that recent proposals for the milk and sugar sectors would have disastrous economic and social repercussions for Ireland and are giving rise to grave concern and anxiety, and, if so, has the Commission, as yet, made a full assessment of the implications of these proposals for Ireland and, if not, when is it proposing to do so ?

*Answer*

The Commission's proposals of last December and its price proposals which I shall have the opportunity of presenting to Parliament a little later in the day are the result of very careful deliberations.

The Commission is convinced that its proposals for the sugar sector will not have disastrous economic and social consequences for Ireland. The proposal treats Ireland in the same way as the other Member States. The new quota proposed for Ireland is 174 000 tonnes (164 000 tonnes A quota and 10 000 tonnes B quota) : this exceeds the actual Irish production figure for 1979-80, and corresponds to the average annual sugar production during the time of Ireland's membership of the Community.

As regards the Commission's proposals on the dairy sector, the Commission considers that the proposals are necessary to safeguard the future of the common agricultural policy. The main point of the Commission's proposal is the supplementary levy, which is based on the theory that producers who increase their production over the reference level should take responsibility for the resulting costs. The proposal does not therefore affect in any way the producer's position in respect of the reference production. The Commission's proposals contain exemption for smaller producers in more difficult areas, thus heading off any undesirable regional or social effects. As far as the proposals on the dairy sector are concerned, the Commission is therefore unable to share the Honourable Member's view.

\*  
\*       \*

*Question No 32, by Mr Deleau (H-436/79): deferred*

\*  
\*       \*

*Question No 33, by Mrs Desmond (H-439/79): See Question No 26*

\*  
\*       \*

*Question No 34, by Mr Schmid (H-441/79)*

Subject: Price of super-grade petrol and heating oil

On the basis of what information or calculations did a Member of the Commission state in an interview published in the *Bild-Zeitung* of 23 December 1979 that in the second half of 1980 the price of super-grade petrol could well rise to DM 1.30 and that of heating oil to DM 1.00 per litre?

*Answer*

Talks with oil-producing countries, the Commission's weekly analysis of the market supply situation, regular contacts with oil companies, trade in the Community and records of oil transactions give a clear picture well supported by figures. Thus it was clear shortly before the OPEC Conference in Caracas and even clearer afterwards that prices in the Federal Republic would have to rise.

Consumption was increasing in the Federal Republic. In 1979, primary energy consumption increased by 5.9%, while the increase in gross national product was in real terms only 4.4%.

The effect on prices was thus inevitable. The average price for crude oil rose from \$ 14.3 a barrel in the first quarter of 1979 to \$ 30 a barrel — i.e. by more than 100% — at the beginning of 1980.

A corresponding increase in consumer prices was thus to be expected. By now the price of super-grade petrol has risen to DM 1.19 (by about 25%) and of heating oil to DM 0.65 (by about 90%).

This trend thus confirms the accuracy of the predictions.

\*  
\*       \*

*Question No 35, by Mr Cronin (H-442/79)*

Subject: Regional Fund aid for construction of tunnel under the Lee Estuary at Blackrock Castle, Cork

As the development of industrial sites in the Cork Harbour region would be greatly assisted by the construction of a tunnel under the Lee Estuary at Blackrock Castle, does the Commission consider that such a project would be eligible for a grant from the EEC's Regional Fund?

*Answer*

Grants from the European Regional Development Fund are made by the Commission on a request by a Member State. No request for a grant has been received to date from the Irish Government in connection with the plan to build a tunnel under the Lee Estuary at Blackrock Castle.

The Commission is unable to deliver an opinion on the possible eligibility of a project without cognizance of its technical and economic aspects, its regional impact and other details which are usually provided by the Member State concerned.

\*  
\*     \*

*Question No 36, by Mr Leonardi (H-443/79)*

Subject: International monetary system

How does the Commission intend to guarantee that the Community participates fully and effectively in the elaboration of a new international monetary system, and what will it do to ensure that the Member States adopt a common position in any negotiations?

*Answer*

The matters raised in the honourable Member's question are regularly discussed by the appropriate Community bodies (Monetary Committee, Committee of Governors of the Central Banks, ECO/FIN Council), which strive to reach a common position. Consideration is currently being given, for instance, to the creation of a substitution account so that, in certain circumstances, dollar balances can be exchanged for credits in special drawing rights. The Commission is doing everything in its power to ensure that the objective mentioned by the honourable Member can be attained.

\*  
\*     \*

*Question No 37, by Mr Debré (H-444/79)*

Subject: Aid to the victims of the hurricane on Réunion

In view of the extensive damage caused by the hurricane which devastated the island of Réunion between 22 and 25 January 1980, does the Commission feel that it will be able to comply with a request from the French Government for a special grant?

*Answer*

The Commission responded immediately to the request for aid to the victims of the recent cyclone which devastated the island of Réunion. On 30 January, the Commission decided to make available a grant of 300 000 EUA in emergency aid, and in the light of a report by a team of Commission officials who were sent to Réunion to assess the damage, a further grant of EUA has now been approved. Furthermore, the utilization of Community financial instruments is being considered for structural action.

\*  
\*     \*

*Question No 38, by Mr Bersani (H-445/79)*

Subject: Conclusions of the recent CILSS summit

At the Inter-Governmental Committee on measures to combat drought in the Sahel (CILSS), which met at Ouagadougou in mid-January last, the leaders of that particularly vulnerable region again appealed to the international community for assistance in dealing with the serious food shortage and the need to strengthen the structures of the CILSS and intensify measures to prevent further extension of the desert.

Can the Commission give specific details of the outcome of this CILSS ministerial meeting, at which it was represented as an observer, and of the practical conclusions it has drawn with a view to future action in the region?

*Answer*

The Commission has always followed the work and meetings of the Inter-Governmental Committee on measures to combat drought in the Sahel (CILSS) very closely.

At its twelfth ministerial meeting, the CILSS adopted various resolutions and put forward recommendations in four main areas :

- an appeal to the international community to cover the total cereal deficit, estimated at 870 000 tonnes. The Commission, in close collaboration with the WFP and FAO, intends to grant considerable food aid to the CILSS countries (according to its proposals to the budgetary authorities, over 50 000 tonnes of cereals would be distributed by the Community to eight Sahel countries in 1980);
- the elaboration of food and cereals policies, a task encouraged and promoted by the Sahel Club, in which the Commission plays an active intervention rôle ;
- measures to combat desertification, which are still one of the Commission's main preoccupations and which each EDF intervention measure in the agricultural field is aimed at furthering ; the elaboration and implementation of a cereals policy is one such measure ;
- strengthening of the Sahel structures, particularly as regards planning and the specialized institutions of the CILSS, such as the agrometeorological centre in Niamey and the Sahel Institute at Bamako.

The Commission has already provided technical planning assistance and intends to grant financial aid to the abovementioned specialized institutions.

\*  
\*       \*  
\*

*Question No 39, by Mr Beumer (H-446/79)*

Subject : Deficit in United Kingdom trade in manufactured products with the rest of the Community

According to figures issued by the British Department of Trade, the deficit in the United Kingdom's trade in manufactured products with the rest of the Community in 1978 amounted to £1 615 million, whereas according to the Statistical Office of the European Communities the deficit was only £1 076 million. The latter figure is also based on figures obtained from British sources.

Would the Commission therefore indicate the correct figure ? Does it not feel that identical figures must be used to enable an accurate assessment to be made of the effects of Community membership ?

*Answer*

We suppose that the data furnished by the honourable Member are derived from an article published in *The Economist* on 5 January 1980. We have studied them closely, and the result of our investigations is that in two series of figures quoted in this article a direct comparison is not possible because of methodological differences.

Statistics relating to the Community's external trade have been harmonized on the basis of Council regulations and consequently are comparable as between Member States. Under these regulations, Member States retain the right to furnish additional data and to publish statistics drawn up in accordance with their own national requirements. Such statistics may show some differences when compared with those issued by the Community.

The Commission takes the view that analyses of the effects of Community membership on trade should be based on the harmonized data provided by the Community Statistical Office.

\*  
\*       \*  
\*

*Question No 40, by Mr Gouthier (H-448/79)*

Subject: Convergence and the British problem

Does not the Commission consider that the solution to the problem of the United Kingdom's contribution to the Community budget lies in a system of financial redistribution based on *per capita* gross national product and a transfer of financial responsibilities and commitments from national public expenditure to Community expenditure with strict control on Community agricultural spending?

*Answer*

Some aspects of the honourable Member's question are considered in the Commission's most recent communication on convergence and budgetary questions, which was sent to the Parliament on 5 February. The Commission looks to the Parliament for an early debate on this communication.

The Commission has already made it clear in its earlier communications that it considers contributions to the Community budget and receipts from it, to be an integral part of the range of benefits and costs of membership of the Community. The introduction of an automatic formula for receipts or expenditure related to GNP *per capita* would be harmful to the concept of Own Resources. The Commission considers that the budgetary problem of the United Kingdom can best be relieved in the short term by modifications to the financial mechanism and by action to increase expenditure on Community measures within the United Kingdom.

Parallel to these actions, which are of an essentially temporary nature, there must be a significant change in the structure of expenditure within the Community budget and the strictest possible control of agricultural expenditure consistent with our obligations under the common agricultural policy. The Commission's proposals of November 1979 to streamline expenditure, and on agricultural prices and connected measures for 1980—81, have been made with this objective in mind.

\*  
\*   \*   \*

*Question No 41, by Mr Irmer (H-450/79)*

Subject: Information on the non-toxicity of a medicinal product

Can the Commission provide the information necessary to allay fears about the marketing of DEBENDOX, the problem of which was recently raised by the Italian Government at Community level and the prescription of which has been suspended by the Italian General Medical Association?

*Answer*

The medicinal product containing Dicycloverine, which is marketed under the name of Debendox, is currently authorized in some Member States as an antispasmodic and antinauseant.

Representatives of national authorities responsible for authorizing medicinal products and Commission representatives have brought the matter up with the Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products.

According to information currently at the Commission's disposal, rumours that this product has a teratogenic effect (i.e. that is harmful to the foetus) have not been corroborated by studies recently conducted in the United Kingdom. The Member States concerned have not deemed it necessary to take any special measures as regards this medicinal product for the time being.

\*  
\*   \*   \*

*Question No 42, by Mrs Castle (H-452/79)*

Subject: Regional Fund

Under what circumstances may payments be made from the Regional Fund to assist industrial development in areas which are not receiving similar assistance from the national government concerned, and would the payment by a national government of aid towards the clearance of derelict land in regions requiring new industrial development attract matching aid from the Community from the Regional Fund?

*Answer*

As regards the quota section, i.e. 95 % of the European Regional Development Fund's resources shared out between the Member States on the basis of strict criteria, the Fund's present Regulation provides that the regions and areas eligible for aid shall be limited to those areas marked down for national regional aid by Member States.

As regards the non-quota section, which permits the financing of specific Community regional development actions, Article 3(2) of the ERDF Regulation provides that for such actions the Fund may grant aid to regions and areas which do not benefit from the national system of regional aids where the Member State concerned has taken or is taking steps to solve the problems which are the object of a Community action. In applying this provision, account should be taken of the comparative imbalances between the regions of the Community (Article 2(3) (b)). Finally, the Fund's participation in non-quota actions is subject to the provisions of Article 13 of the Regulation, which lays down, *inter alia*, that such actions must be linked to Community policies and to the provisions adopted by the Community in order to allow more appropriate account to be taken of their regional impact or to attenuate their regional consequences.

The clearance of derelict land can be financed under the quota section where projects satisfy criteria established in the various articles of Title II of the European Regional Development Fund Regulation.

Under the non-quota section, the clearance of derelict land may qualify for Community aid when such an operation is part of a specific action established under the terms of the criteria stipulated in Article 13 of the Fund Regulation. Until now operations of this kind have been envisaged in two proposals for regulations which the Commission has recently forwarded to the Council, regarding certain areas adversely affected by the restructuring of the iron and steel industry and of the ship-building industry.

\*

\* \* \*

*Question No 43, by Mr Radoux (H-456/79)*

Subject: Measures to aid Turkey

What short-term measures have already been taken by the Commission, or will be taken in the immediate future, in response to the current economic and financial situation in Turkey?

*Answer*

The Commission does not have the resources to take the measures referred to by the honourable Member.

However, in the light of its powers under the Association, it has submitted proposals to the Council following the requests made by Turkey when the Association was revived in 1978. In May 1979, the Community made an offer which included a financial proposal: it was willing to open negotiations for a fourth Financial Protocol to replace the present one when it expired on 31 December 1981; it was also willing to introduce a special measure, a grant of 75 m EUA to finance cooperation activities over two years. The cooperation activities it had in mind would supplement EIB intervention in Turkey at all stages so as to ensure more effective financing.

The Community's offer as a whole was rejected by the Turks and was not negotiated by the Association bodies, because in their opinion it did not constitute an acceptable basis for negotiation.

The Commission has also acted on its own initiative and instigated action by the Member States in international organizations in response to the economic difficulties currently prevailing in Turkey.

Mr Jenkins, President, and Mr Ortoli, Vice-President, have taken steps in the same direction so that the Member States can support Turkey's efforts towards economic recovery bilaterally in the OECD and the Turkish Consortium.

An Association Council meeting was held at ministerial level on 5 February 1980, when the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr Erkmen, outlined a programme for revitalizing the Association. This will be examined by the Association bodies so that a report can be made in April to the Association Council, which will draw the necessary conclusions.

In the weeks to come, therefore, the Commission will turn its attention to the proposals made by the Turkish authorities under the programme announced by Mr Erkmen, including the financial aspects.

\*  
\*       \*

*Question No 44, by Mr Seeler (H-457/79)*

Subject : EC-Turkey Financial Protocols

What is the current position concerning the implementation of the provision of aid to Turkey under the Third Financial Protocol and what progress has so far been made on drawing up the Fourth Financial Protocol and implementing the proposed Cooperation Fund?

*Answer*

The Third EEC-Turkey Protocol was signed in May 1977 and entered into force in April 1979. To avoid too long a gap between the second and third financial protocols, the Bank appraised some projects before the protocol came into force. It was possible, for instance, to take up some loans immediately in April 1979. At that stage, various major projects were financed by special loans under the protocol, for instance a thermal energy project at a hydroelectric power station and a project in the forestry industry sector.

In its offer of May 1979, the Community proposed to Turkey that preparations should be begun for negotiating the Fourth Financial Protocol, as it was important, in view of Turkey's external financing requirements, for a new protocol to take over as soon as possible after 31 October 1981, the date on which appropriations under the Third Protocol would expire.

It will be remembered that this offer was part of a package that the Turkish authorities refused to negotiate in the Association Council, as they did not consider it to be an acceptable basis for a negotiation. The proposed Cooperation Fund, consisting of grants worth 15 m u. a. to be taken up over two years, was also part of the package.

So far, no work has been started on either the Fourth Financial Protocol or the cooperation activities.

At the last ministerial meeting of the Association Council, held on 5 February 1980, Turkey reaffirmed its desire to withdraw its request for a suspension of commitments under the additional protocol and outlined a programme for revitalizing the Association. The programme will be the subject of discussions and negotiations in the Association bodies, which are to report to the Association Council in April so that it can draw the appropriate conclusions.

The Community has declared its willingness to begin joint consideration of the programme immediately and to reconsider with an open mind the position it adopted last May on the development of the Association in the light of the new information submitted by the Turkish Minister, Mr Erkmen, to the Association Council.

\*  
\*       \*

*Question No 45, by Mr Megahy (H-459/79)*

Subject : Opinion poll on Britain's membership of the EEC

What is the reaction of the Commission to the recent EEC public opinion poll which showed only 29 % of the British public as looking favourably on Britain's membership of the EEC?

*Answer*

The Commission naturally regrets that according to the twelfth Eurobarometer, taken last October, only 29 % of the United Kingdom population think that membership of the Community is positively a good thing. It is difficult, however, to draw any firm conclusions about the trend of public opinion in the UK from a single survey. For example, the same Eurobarometer reveals that 61 % of the United Kingdom population are in favour of unifying Western Europe and that 71 % consider that the movement towards European unification should be maintained at its present rate or be speeded up.

\*  
\*       \*  
\*

*Question No 46, by Mrs Lizin (H-462/79)*

Subject : Cracks in the nuclear power station at Tihange

The Belgian Minister of Labour and Employment, Mr De Wulf, who is responsible in this area, has admitted to the existence of cracks in the reactor vessel of the nuclear power-station at Tihange.

Does the Commission intend to look into power-plants matter and take steps to ascertain the degree of safety of his power station, as it is entitled to do under the Treaty provisions ?

*Answer*

The subject brought up by the honourable Member falls within the province of technical problems of nuclear safety, and the Treaty does not give the Commission any powers in this area ; it is the sole responsibility of the responsible national authorities.

Legislation and the authorization procedure for nuclear power-plants in Belgium give the Belgian Government the possibility of asking the Commission, in an advisory capacity, for a safety assessment of the nuclear power-station now under construction at Tihange. To this end, the Commission has convened a group of experts from different Community countries, who will in due course deliver an opinion on the problem raised by the honourable Member and on other safety aspects of the plant.

\*   \*   \*  
\*       \*  
\*

## SITTING OF TUESDAY, 12 FEBRUARY 1980

## Contents

<i>Mr Cottrell</i> . . . . .	51	8. Urgent procedure . . . . .	84
1. Approval of minutes . . . . .	51	9. Restructuring in the shipbuilding and textile industries (continuation):	
2. Documents received . . . . .	51	<i>Mr Bonde; Mr Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berleburg; Mrs Salisch</i> . . . . .	84
3. Decision on urgency . . . . .	51	Procedural motion: <i>Mr Prag</i> . . . . .	86
4. Welcome . . . . .	51	<i>Mr Beazley; Mrs Hoffman; Mr Remilly; Mr De Goede; Mr Seal; Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission; Mr Normanton; Mr Welsh; Mr Purvis; Mr Fich; Mr Almirante; Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission</i> . . . . .	86
5. Commission statement on agricultural prices:		Procedural motion: <i>Mrs Ewing</i> . . . . .	98
<i>Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Früh, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture; Mrs Castle; Mr Clinton; Mr Marshall; Mr Pranchère; Mr Delatte; Mr Davern; Mr Blaney; Mr Sutra; Mr Tolman</i> . . . . .	51	<i>Mr Davignon</i> . . . . .	98
Procedural motion: <i>Mrs Kellett-Bowman</i>	57	Procedural motions: <i>Mr De Goede; Mrs De March</i> . . . . .	98
<i>Mr Gundelach; Mr Delatte</i> . . . . .	57	<i>Mr Davignon</i> . . . . .	98
6. Activities of the Communities in 1979 (Thirteenth General Report) and Commission work programme for 1980 (Doc. 1-765/79):		Procedural motion: <i>Mrs De March</i> . . . . .	99
<i>Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission</i>	59	<i>Mr Davignon</i> . . . . .	99
7. Restructuring in the shipbuilding and textile industries — Joint debate on the report by Sir David Nicolson and Miss Forster on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs (Doc. 1-623/79) and an oral question, with debate, by Mr Carossino and others (Doc. 1-612/79)		Procedural motion: <i>Mr Simpson</i> . . . . .	99
<i>Sir David Nicolson, rapporteur</i> . . . . .	65	10. Welcome . . . . .	99
Procedural motion: <i>Mr Pannella</i> . . . . .	66	11. EEC policy on oils, fats and proteins — Oral question with debate by Mr Davern and Mr Buchou (Doc. 1-613/79):	
<i>Miss Forster, rapporteur</i> . . . . .	66	<i>Mr Davern, author of the question</i> . . . . .	100
Procedural motion: <i>Mr Pannella</i> . . . . .	68	<i>Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission; Mrs Cresson; Mr Tolman (EPP); Mr Curry (ED); Mr Pranchère; Mr Maher (L); Mr Blaney; Mr Diana; Mrs Barbarella; Mr De Keersmaecker; Mr Wettig; Mr Gundelach; Mr Buchou</i> . . . . .	101
<i>Mr Carossino, author of the question</i> . . . . .	68	12. Fight against drug abuse — Public health policy — Joint debate on two oral questions with debate by Mrs Squarcialupi and Mr Ceravolo (Doc. 1-647/79) and Mr Ghergo and others (Doc. 1-701/79):	
Procedural motions: <i>Mr Seal, Mr Pannella</i> . . . . .	70	<i>Mrs Squarcialupi, author of question (Doc. 1-647/79)</i> . . . . .	113
<i>Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission; Mr Almirante Mr Delors (S); Mr Barbi (EPP); Mrs Kellett-Bowman (ED); Mrs De March; Mr Damseaux (L); Mr Poncelet (EPD); Mr Pannella (I); Mr Petronio; Mr Spencer, draftsman of an opinion; Mr Caborn; Mr Ingo Friedrich; Mr John D. Taylor; Mr Leonardi; Mrs Ewing</i> . . . . .	70	<i>Mr Ghergo, author of question (Doc. 1-701/79)</i> . . . . .	114
		<i>Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission</i> . . . . .	116
		13. Order of business . . . . .	118
		<i>Mr Lange</i> . . . . .	118
		14. Agenda for next sitting . . . . .	118

## IN THE CHAIR : MRS VEIL

*President*

*(The sitting was opened at 9.00 a.m.)*

**President.** — The sitting is open.

I call Mr Cottrell.

**Mr Cottrell.** — Madam President, may I point out that a report published this morning in a local newspaper *Les Dernières Nouvelles Alsace*, seems to imply that an agreement exists between the French Government and the Luxembourg Government that Strasbourg shall henceforth be the seat of the European Parliament. I would not vouch for the accuracy of the report, but it does seem an insult to the dignity of this Parliament that such negotiations are taking place without reference to the Members of this House. I am not even sure that at this stage France should be considered as the State in which the Parliament should meet, since it has so far failed to observe Community legislation where the Community institutions are concerned.

**President.** — I shall simply reply that at present the Treaties designate Strasbourg as one of Parliament's places of work.

1. *Approval of minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

The minutes are adopted.

2. *Documents received*

**President.** — I have received the following documents :

- (a) from the Council a request for an opinion on the proposal from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for a multiannual Community programme of research and development in biomolecular engineering (indirect action 1981-1985) (Doc. 1-750/79)

which has been referred to the Committee on Energy and Research as the committee responsible, and to the Committee on Budgets, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs for opinions ;

- (b) from the committees, the following reports :

- report by Mr Enright, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the proposals from the Commission of the European Communities to the Council (Doc. 1-702/79) for :

I a decision concluding the Convention between the EEC and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA) on aid to refugees in the countries of the Near East

II a regulation on the supply of sugar to UNRWA as food aid (Doc. 1-754/79) ;

- report by Mr R. Jackson, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on application of Article 204 of the EEC Treaty and Article 8 of the Financial Regulation authorizing further provisional twelfths for Section II — Council and Section II — Annex : Economic and Social Committee of the general budget of the European Communities (Doc. 1-742/79) — (Doc. 1-755/79) ;

- report by Mr Dankert, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on application of Article 204 of the EEC Treaty and Article 8 of the Financial Regulation authorizing further provisional twelfths — Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities (Docs. 1-741/79 and 1-742/79) — (Doc. 1-756/79).

3. *Decision on urgency*

**President.** — The first item on the agenda is the decision on the urgency of a proposal for a regulation on certain fish stock (Doc. 1-729/79).

I stated yesterday that the chairmen of the political groups were not in favour of this request, which has just reached us.

I put the request for urgent debate to the vote.

The request is rejected.

4. *Welcome*

**President.** — On behalf of Parliament I welcome the delegation from the Grand National Assembly of Turkey to the Joint Parliamentary Committee of the EEC-Turkey Association, headed by its President, Mr Orhan Vural, who have just taken their seats in the official gallery.

Realizing as we do the importance of relations between Turkey and the Community, we are happy to welcome our colleagues from the Great National Assembly of Turkey and extend our good wishes for the successful outcome of the work of the Joint Parliamentary Committee.

*(Applause)*

5. *Commission statement on agricultural prices*

**President.** — The next item is the Commission statement on agricultural prices.

I call Mr Gundelach.

**Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission.** — Madam President, in presenting this price package,

## Gundelach

I would underline that the Commission is committed to a policy for more than one year. Therefore this price package cannot be considered in isolation. Indeed it is one element, one of the main elements, of a coherent strategy which the Commission has tried to develop over recent years. We have tried for nearly four years now, adapting ourselves to circumstances, to get the Common Agricultural Policy on a sound, stable basis for its own sake and for the sake of the Community. We have had successes: we have broken new ground in the field of structural policy with the Mediterranean package; we have put our international relations with the multinational trade negotiations on a sound and profitable basis for us; we have, with modest price increases in units of account, kept the prices of agricultural commodities produced in Europe below the index of consumer prices. But some fundamental objectives have not as yet been achieved — in particular, the management of structural surpluses and dealing with the existing differences in income in various regions of the Community. Let me one again run over our overall strategy:

- (1) high priority must be given to balancing the agricultural markets;
- (2) for products where production completely outruns the market outlets, the market forces must be allowed to act. This means that the producers themselves must carry the cost of increased production;
- (3) through a combined action of structural policy — the Mediterranean package I mentioned, to which comes our latest far-reaching structural proposals, and a moderate price policy we must meet the requirements of the Treaty concerning farmers' incomes.

The package now before you forms part of this strategy. In November, we added to our structural proposals the proposal for a better market equilibrium. All of these constraints form the basis for the present proposals for moderate price increases, and they must be seen in the context I have outlined. I wish to emphasize that it is not a change in the agricultural policy. The policy remains, but greater emphasis has been put on other elements of that policy. If no action is taken now, then the Commission, I must underline, will have to reconsider all of its proposals.

The Commission has had to develop its price proposals within a series of very tight constraints. Supply is running ahead of demand in some of our agricultural markets. Despite slight temporary improvements at the world level, we still face serious surpluses of milk and sugar. But budgetary uncertainties exist and extend beyond 1980. There is no prospect of increasing the Community's own budgetary resources in the near future. Therefore a real danger exists that the Community will run out of money within the next year. I personally accept that a dynamic Commu-

nity must one day have a new Financial Regulation, but it will not be based on the existence of an over-production of either butter or sugar.

All of these constraints, together with the need to fight inflation in the economy as a whole, point towards the continuation of a rigorous price policy in agriculture. They point especially towards the milk sector, which greedily swallows 43 % of all agricultural spending and which demands more and more each year.

Other constraints, however, point in the opposite direction. Real agricultural incomes have slipped back in the last 12 months, as cost increases accelerated. This is a serious development. We cannot afford to mortgage our overall agricultural capacity, especially in a situation of world tensions and decreasing economic activity in the Community and elsewhere. The availability of basic foodstuffs is also a security policy.

I attach significance, therefore, to the fact that while agricultural incomes have increased in absolute terms, they have fallen slightly in real terms in 1979 — the first time in recent years. The year 1980 will be even more difficult for agriculture, and indeed for the whole of the economy as well: we cannot forget the increasing number of unemployed in the Community.

You must bear in mind that the Common Agricultural Policy is one of the few developed common policies we have. It must deal not only with market and income problems; it is currently overloaded by regional development and social problems too. As other policies are not being developed sufficiently, our flanks are exposed. The agricultural world is in fear, as are other sectors of the economy, because of inflation and unemployment. The development of other Community policies is badly needed to re-establish faith in the Community.

We have had to reconcile the irreconcilable, and you will have to go through a similar process. If you look at the market situation alone, you will be forced to refuse price increases; if you look at the budget in isolation, you will even ask for a reduction in prices; but if you look in isolation at the income need of our 8 million farmers and their families, then you will be forced to ask for substantial price increases, as the European farmers' organization COPA has done.

Now I come to our proposal. I am convinced that the Commission has found a fair balance between these conflicting needs. We propose to increase prices by around 3 to 3.5 % for the majority of products where there is some justifiable margin for manoeuvre, but we have limited the increase to 1.5 % for products where there is clearly little margin for manoeuvre: we have limited it to 1.5 % for distributed milk, with 0 % for butter and 2.8 % for skimmed-milk powder, because each year we have 15 million tonnes of milk for which there is no market — just as there is no market

## Gundelach

for butter despite a strong export drive over the last years. We have limited it to 1.5 % for sugar, because our domestic production is 2.6 million tonnes greater than our domestic demand; and we have limited increases to 1.5 % for beef, because we have about 330 000 tonnes in intervention stores and we are making another proposal which will be more effective in raising specialist beef-producers' revenues.

The proposed price increases are well below inflation rates anywhere in the Community. The effect of this year's price proposal on consumers will be negligible — an increase of little more than 0.1 % on household expenditure in a full year. They also provide room to implement the Community's decision to dismantle monetary compensatory amounts, and we are proposing to reduce the German MCA by one point and the Benelux MCA by half a point. The income situation in the hard-currency countries, due to low price increases in previous years, makes what looks modest appear important.

The milk problem is as old as this Community. It is a real illness. In the past, we have tried to cure it with a variety of medicines costing more and more money. Today we must face up to the need for surgery.

We have studied all the possible remedies. We have looked at quotas, but we reject them. They will not solve the milk problem — look at sugar! They would also be a blow against all a common market should stand for — a free market with a safety-net.

We looked at the possibility of reducing prices. You know as well as I that a price decrease is neither socially nor politically acceptable — the moreso at a time when cost increases are accelerating and incomes are falling. The same is also true of a limitation of market support though intervention, which is just a price decrease by another name.

We have never found acceptance for a substantial increase in the linear co-responsibility levy. On the contrary two years ago at a time of increasing production, the existing levy of 1.5 % was decreased to 0.5 %. Any suggestion that it should be pushed up to the top of its range (4 %) is immediately killed by a coalition of those who demand exemptions and those who do not want to pay the levy at all.

All these remedies are unacceptable, but, as I said a moment ago, we must take action, we must face up to the need for surgery. The time for tinkering is over.

*(Applause from certain quarter of the European Democratic Group)*

If the Community agrees to go on paying what it now pays for the existing milk surplus, the additional cost of disposing of each additional litre of milk will be 84 % of the milk target price paid by us. We therefore propose a supplementary coresponsibility levy.

Producers will remain entirely free to make their own decisions, but we want to make sure that those who

increase their production pay the cost of its disposal — that and no more.

Let me repeat this. Our proposal is designed to meet three requirements:

1. Milk producers remain absolutely free to take their own production decisions. It is their choice and their choice alone.
2. If they decide to produce more, then they must accept entire responsibility for the disposal costs. Responsibility goes with decision. In other words, we want to apply to each dairy the rule that if there is no increase in milk output then there is no supplementary levy to pay.
3. The Community budget is completely insulated against any future increase in expenditure due to production increases. No matter how much production rises, there should be no need for supplementary funds. We have already with such a scheme accepted the financial responsibility for a very high level of production. If we don't stop further expenditure now, we shall continue to misuse resources to the detriment of other aspects of agricultural policy more important for the future and to the detriment of the development of other Community policies badly needed in our present economic situation.

I know there are 1.8 million milk producers in the Community. I also know that many of them are not among the better-off farmers. Let me emphasize, however, that they will not have to pay the supplementary levy if they do not increase their milk output — and most of them, to judge by our experience in 1979, will not do so.

But we are going further. We shall continue the existing non-marketing and reconversion premiums. We now also offer special incentives for those who stop milk production or specialize in beef without delivering milk. We are proposing a subsidy of 60 ECU on the first 15 cows in specialized beef herds.

Also important is our proposal to safeguard the income position of some of our poorest farmers. We want to exempt from the basic linear levy of 1.5 %, decided by the Council last year, not only the entire milk production of producers in mountain areas and in southern Italy but also the first 60 000 litres from producers in less favoured areas — areas already described in regulations of the Community. In this way, we exempt an additional 13 % of milk production and 19 % of milk producers, evenly distributed among all Community countries with the exception of two small northern countries and consequently with no element of discrimination within the bulk of Community countries.

The extra-expenditure resulting from these price proposals is only 202 million EUA. It must be seen alongside the Commission proposals of last November

**Gundelach**

which would result in savings of half a billion EUA. They must also be seen alongside measures the Commission has adopted during the last few months — another half a billion EUA. By balancing these savings and the additional expenditure resulting from our proposals, you will see two of our major achievements: first, we are saving more than 800 million EUA in comparison with the draft budget for 1980; and second, expenditure will be 14 m EUA less than the 1979 level of 10 384 m EUA.

Both of these achievements become the more remarkable when you consider that inflation is on average around 12 % and the average annual increase in the agricultural budget over the last few years has been around 16 %. It is a long way from 16 % to zero.

This is a serious moment. This is the first time that you, Members of the first directly-elected European Parliament, are being confronted with the annual price proposals, which must be seen against the background I have outlined today and which are, as I stated, intimately linked with the proposal for a better market equilibrium put forward last November. In the past, it has always been a divisive issue, and will undoubtedly be so again this year; but time for hesitation has run out. You asked for action in December. The Commission is proposing strong but fair action, and the Commission now looks to the European Parliament to take up again its responsibilities.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I remind the House of the so-called 'twenty minutes' procedure applicable at the end of statements of this sort: the chairmen of the committee may speak for five minutes after which there is a further 15 minutes during which Members may put short and concise questions.

I call Mr Früh to speak on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

**Mr Früh.** — *(D)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, deputizing as I am for the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Sir Henry Plumb, who is unfortunately unable to be present, it falls to me to comment on Mr Gundelach's statement. I should first like to thank him and express my appreciation for the way he and the Commission have dealt with this difficult task. He may rest assured that we of the Committee on Agriculture will be looking very closely at his statement in the next few days and weeks in an effort to achieve the best possible result for our overall economy, for producers and for consumers. It is, of course, impossible for me at this moment, so soon after you have spoken, to state the position of the Committee on Agriculture as a whole because it has not yet met, but I am sure I can already make a number of comments on its behalf at this stage.

I hope you will not take my first remark amiss: I feel we must find a way of putting the Commission's proposals and ideas before this directly-elected Parliament or to its committee before they are presented at a press conference, so that we hear the news first.

*(Applause)*

I realize, Mr Commissioner, how difficult that is when this Parliament sits only once a month, but we should together look for a way in committee so that we are able to coordinate our views here at the proper time. It would undoubtedly be a good thing if a large press conference took place now, after the statement you have made to inform Parliament.

My second point is that you, Mr Gundelach, will undoubtedly have noticed, like all the other authorities, that your proposals have caused a great deal of unrest among farmers and the organizations that represent them, because it was quite clear to them that the objective method we have been discussing for years produces a completely different figure, namely 7.9 %. This figure was also mentioned by the Commission, and it roughly corresponds to the ideas of the agricultural associations.

Instead, you are proposing, roughly speaking, 2.4 %. For some products it is undoubtedly more, less for others, but that is what it comes to in the end.

Now I know, as we all do, the problems of averages. But one thing is certain: these figures are very different, and that is what is causing the unrest in agriculture. To justify your figure, you refer — quite understandably — to the general economic situation, and there can be no doubt at all that agriculture should also make a contribution to the stabilization of the general situation. But something else is certain too: it is already doing this, and to an extent that has not yet been matched by any other sector of the economy, even though prices increased — again on average — by 7.5 % in 1978 and 12 % in 1979. Workers' incomes rose last year in real terms. But despite these increases incomes in agriculture fell by 1.5 to 2 %, as your report also states. In other words, now that we can look forward to an even sharper rise in costs and an even higher rate of inflation, agriculture is condemned to the role of keeping things cheap and not having its fair share of this increase in incomes. As you surely know, it is not producer prices that push up the inflation rate: these producer prices are joined by the registration of agricultural produce, processing and distribution. All these rising costs, which are added to producer prices, mean that ultimately the price to the producer becomes less and less of a determining factor in the price to the final consumer, and although this increase is taking place, its share in consumer spending is becoming smaller.

**Früh**

I should like to refer to another point, which is undoubtedly of general interest. This is the budgetary situation, and I will keep my comments brief. Mr Gundelach, we should beware — and I believe we all know this — of allowing ourselves to be tied down by the budget in such a way that we say nothing can be done, because the money is not available. You all know how dangerous an *impasse* we get into if we complain that agriculture swallows up 70 % of costs, while also realizing that it is the only common policy we have. So when we realize that six countries have become nine — soon there will be ten and in a few years twelve — and that all of them want to participate in the agricultural policy, and also that moves are afoot to organize new markets — for sheepmeat, alcohol and potatoes — then it is quite clear that this financial cover is becoming tight, and we should all as a matter of urgency join in calling for an appropriate increase in resources in the interests of European policy, and not only of the agricultural policy.

I do not intend to go into detail on the central theme of your statement, milk. This will be the most frequent subject of discussion — and I hope it will have positive results. Looking at the clock, I realize my time is already running out. I will therefore come to my concluding remarks.

I believe that this year we have a great duty, not only in the Committee on Agriculture, but also in the other committees and in this House, to find the right setting in European policy for the common agricultural policy, not forgetting that, on the one hand, we must not disappoint farmers because they should not be the only ones to suffer in this increasingly inflationary economy and, on the other hand, the world political situation must be borne in mind. It should not be possible to blackmail Europe with food supplies, and if we intend to carry on the fight to eliminate hunger in the world, we must also make steady progress with the agricultural policy and stop believing that it is linked solely to the budget and that the budget is the only yardstick against which it must be measured. Farmers' incomes are also an extremely important objective of this common agricultural policy.

**President.** — Since I have a large number of requests to speak I shall call one speaker from each group.

I call Mrs Castle.

**Mrs Castle.** — Madam President, whilst welcoming the Commissioner's strong desire to cut the cost of the Common Agricultural Policy, I would ask him this: is it not absurd to propose increases in the price of products which are in surplus production, notably skimmed milk — in other words increases for production which the market does not want — and then to

try to recoup some of the cost by putting a levy on producers? Does not this mean that the price to the consumer will go up anyway? In Britain for instance the consumer will pay £150 million more as a result of these proposed increases. Would it not be better to freeze the prices of products in surplus production and then help the incomes of those small farmers who need help in other and more direct ways?

**President.** — I call Mr Clinton.

**Mr Clinton.** — Madam President, the Commission will be aware that in certain regions of the Community farmers' incomes have dropped by as much as 20 %, and I fail to see anything in the price proposals that will compensate such farmers for their loss of income or that will ensure that they will not suffer a further loss of 20 % in the present year. Perhaps the Commissioner could give us some information on his plans for those particular regions.

**President.** — I call Mr Marshall.

**Mr Marshall.** — Madam President, whilst many of us would like to congratulate the Commissioner upon his diagnosis, we feel that the medicine he has prescribed is inadequate. Does he not realize that many of us regard the CAP as a terminal cancer which is threatening the lifeblood of this Community, and would he not agree that stronger action should be taken to deal with the problems of surpluses which cost this Community dear and prevent its expansion in other more realistic directions; and does he also not realize that many to whom the policy of selling subsidized butter to the USSR is complete anathema cannot see the logic of selling subsidized butter that is packed, whilst refusing to sell it while it is in bulk? Why should the consumers of the Community have to pay something like 80 pence for a pound of butter when they see the consumers of the USSR receiving a subsidy from the Community of 50 pence a pound?

**President.** — I call Mr Pranchère.

**Mr Pranchère.** — (*F*) Madam President, on behalf of the French Communist Members I should like to make a brief comment before asking a number of questions.

Firstly, the Commission's proposals are unacceptable: an average of 2.5 % against an inflation rate of 9 % in the EEC and 13 % in France. It is obvious how that will affect our agricultural industry. In 1980 farmers' incomes in France will continue to fall. This has been the trend since 1974, and the French Government obviously bears a great deal of responsibility for this. Discontent, anger, anxiety, such is the atmosphere in the countryside. I should like to draw Mr Gundelach's and the Assembly's attention to a number of points — many other problems might be discussed. One sector

**Pranchère**

has until now been spared, relatively speaking, but today the clouds heralding the storm are gathering: this is the beef and veal sector. The balance sheet for 1980 shows that at the end of the year there will be a theoretical surplus: imports and stocks of 650 000 tonnes against a deficit of 190 000 tonnes in the European Community. My question is, therefore, how will the beef and veal market develop? Are we not facing the risk of collapsing currencies and falling incomes?

Mr Gundelach, you have referred to the milk problem. I noted that once again you said nothing about the imports of 120 000 tonnes of butter from New Zealand, nothing about the problem of the substantial imports of vegetable fats, 46 % of which, I would remind the House, come from the United States. What are you going to do in this sector?

Two further brief questions: how many farms in the less favoured regions do you think will go into liquidation during 1980 and ensuing years as a result of the proposals you have made with regard both to prices and to penalties, particularly in the milk sector? Finally, do you intend to take a firm decision to abolish once and for all the monetary compensatory amounts, which represent a serious distortion of the rules of competition and Community preference in the EEC.

**President.** — I call Mr Delatte.

**Mr Delatte.** — (*F*) Madam President, I should like to ask the Commissioner if it is not inconsistent to say — as he himself has done — that the proposed price increases will have an infinitesimal effect on consumer prices, whereas producers' incomes are falling. In addition, the present situation shows how important it is for the European Community to have emergency food stocks, the need for these being all the more pressing as foodstuffs — as is becoming increasingly evident — represent strategic products. Can the Commission indicate what minimal level such stocks should assume?

As regards the 1.5 % co-responsibility levy, I should like to know what revenue it will produce. Does the Commission also agree to giving some thought to the introduction of a levy on imported vegetable fats?

Why is the Commission envisaging the reduction of sugar quotas while demand is increasing and stocks are falling — we hear this morning that another 830 000 tonnes of sugar has been sold from stock. Quota C sugar is paid for at the same price as quota B sugar and does not therefore cost the Community budget anything at all. We have a first-class sugar industry, and, in time, there will be potential markets to conquer. Why is the Commission envisaging a reduction in sugar production?

*(Applause from some members of the Liberal and Democratic Group)*

**President.** — I call Mr Davern.

**Mr Davern.** — Madam President, I should like to ask the Commission whether this does not, in fact, amount to that very super levy quota system against which the Vice-President has spoken so vehemently in the past. Does it not have the effect of cushioning the position of those producers who have already reached a high level of income to the detriment of those whose income is very low and indeed is far lower than the average industrial wage in the Community? Furthermore, in listening to the Commission's proposals I have not been able to note any proposal in the field of the vegetable fat and protein policy which, in its communication of November 1979, the Commission acknowledged as being the cause of the present difficulties.

**President.** — I call Mr Blaney.

**Mr Blaney.** — Madam President might I ask the Commissioner whether in fact he can see any future at all for the smaller farmers particularly in the milk sector, who are not yet developed or whether his super levy, as has already been said by Mr Davern, is merely a way of securing a very lucrative future for the large factory-type, highly developed milk producers to the detriment, and indeed complete elimination, of the small farmer?

Might I also ask the Commissioner whether, in view of the large amounts of agricultural products imported into the Community by virtue of various trade agreements, he will inform Parliament of the net cost of all these imports to the agricultural budget and finally just whose side is he on — agriculture or the manufacturing giants and the alleged consumers' lobby?

**President.** — I call Mr Sutra.

**Mr Sutra.** — (*F*) Madam President, Mr Commissioner, when the trade unions ask for increases, they always want more than the inflation rate. Consequently, my first question is as follows: is the 1.5 or 3 % increase being proposed to the farmers really an increase in the standard of living, in addition to inflation, or should in fact 10 or 12 % inflation, according to the official figures in my country, be deducted from this?

Secondly, the production accounting methods should be very explicit. When we hear that there are Community surpluses and that production and imports are entered in the balance sheet together, I do not think we can carry on a serious argument. It would be far better not to speak of sugar surpluses when imports amount to 1 300 000 tonnes. If it is policy — and I will not comment on this now — which makes it necessary to import 230 000 tonnes of butter from New Zealand, farmers should not be the only ones to

**Sutra**

foot the bill. If it is a useful policy for Europe, let all Europeans pay for it.

My third question: you have said in the Committee on Agriculture, Mr Commissioner, that the Commission has put forward very precise and very clear proposals aimed at maintaining the *bon vin* guarantee in the viticultural sector. I should like to hear you confirm this here.

To conclude, Mr Commissioner, monetary compensatory amounts, by whatever name they are called, are and remain aid that the poor give to the rich. They are monies which are losing ground, which subsidize the stronger currencies. It has been like that since the beginning, it has always been an intolerable situation. A stop should be put to them once and for all.

**President.** — I call Mr Tolman.

**Mr Tolman.** — (NL) Madam President, the price proposals differ substantially from COPA's proposals, which were based on an objective method of calculation. Can Mr Gundelach explain the considerable departure from this method of calculation? For if this becomes the rule, I ask myself why this method of calculation is still used.

Secondly, we must achieve a fair distribution of burdens under the agricultural policy. As there are surpluses of various products, particularly oils and fats, would it not be fairer to introduce a levy for producers in Europe, especially if the surpluses are caused by large imported volumes? That was also the essence of the amendment tabled during the debate on the budget reports drawn up by Mr Dankert and Mr Aigner. I find no reference to this in these proposals. I regard that as a deficiency, and it must be made clear why no mention is made of this point in the price proposals.

**President.** — There is no more speaking time left; I regret that I cannot call any further speakers.

I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman on a point of order.

**Mrs Kellett-Bowman.** — Madam President, Mr Pranchère was allowed to ask no fewer than three questions, which cut out those of us who wished to question the Commissioner on the gross unfairness of the milk producers' levy. Our own group leader was not in fact called, though I understand that he wanted to be called. That means that a representative of the British point of view has simply not been heard on this very unfair co-responsibility levy proposal. I do think you ought to hear the leader of our group.

**President.** — The European Democratic Group had the opportunity of expressing its views through Mr Marshall.

I call Mr Gundelach.

**Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission.** — Madam President, I first want to thank those who have put questions to me. To Mr Früh, I would first and foremost say that the Commission has chosen, and rightly so, to make its first political presentation of its proposals to this House. It is always unavoidable, after decisions have been taken, to hold a technical press conference. The question of making the very first presentation to the European Parliament can, as he suggests, be solved only by coordinating the dates of these decisions and the meetings of Parliament. But the first presentation of these proposals was made here this morning.

Mr Früh then raised the question of the objective method, as have indeed other honourable Members, last among them Mr Tolman. I think it is very important to be clear on this point. The so-called objective method indicates the figure of 7.9%. There is no disagreement between COPA and the Commission on the calculation of that figure, but the figure must be seen in the light of its own premises.

It tries to calculate, on the basis of input costs and output prices, what is needed by way of price increases to maintain agricultural incomes in relation to other sectors of the economy. It is based on a system of stable currencies and has to be adjusted to take account of currency changes — which itself is a non-objective exercise; but it has always been established, and it is part of the legal text establishing the objective method, that it can only be one element which has to be seen in the light of other elements such as the development of the market, the budget and the economy as a whole. Otherwise there would be no reason for any discussion, whether here or in Council or elsewhere: one could just calculate the figure, slap it on to the prices and wait for the results.

Worse than that: the objective method, while objective within its own properly defined premises, has two defects from the point of view of giving a clear picture of agricultural incomes. First, it is based upon one stable figure for increasing productivity in agriculture — 1.5, year in and year out — which is not based on any empirical study: just an increase of 1.5 to 2, and the figure of 7 goes down to 6 or 5. Here we have a rule of thumb, no more. Furthermore, the figures in the objective method are based upon little more than 400 reference farms, where the calculations of costs and prices are carried out on the basis of a static volume of production — that existing in 1974-75, whereas in fact the production of every agricultural item throughout the Community has increased by between 2 and 5% every year: this has not been incorporated into the objective method. Everybody will know that the income of a farmer or any other economic person is the product of the prices received

### Gundelach

and the amount he sells, but the actual amount is not taken into account here — only the amount as it was several years ago.

Consequently, apart from the figure only being one among many, in itself it does not give a picture of the income situation in agriculture: it can only be one element among many others. These others indicate that there is indeed a decline in real incomes for farmers, but not of this order of magnitude: rather of one which corresponds to the prudence which we have to demonstrate for market reasons. Furthermore, Mr Früh, the budget issue was clear; I do not think I am over-estimating — if I am, I have obviously been misreading the decisions of this Parliament in December last year, and I do not think I have — and within those margins we are seeking to maintain the real incomes of farmers on the average throughout the Community. That is the goal, and we are seeking to maintain it.

To Mrs Castle, I would like to say yes, it does indeed look somewhat strange to increase the prices for a few commodities in structural surplus and then for one of them to cancel the increase in the form of an already established, but now re-invigorated, co-responsibility levy. The reason why it is being done, is, quite honestly, in answer to Mr Pranchère and others who have pointed out that the negative monetary compensatory amounts have mostly been dismantled, that positive monetary compensatory amounts also have to be decreased, and this can only be done if there is a nominal increase in prices in units of account; otherwise there will be a nominal decrease in prices in the national currencies of the countries in question, and that has been ruled out of order in the Council as well as in Parliament. That is why, Mrs Castle, one has to take this somewhat peculiar course of increasing with one hand and taking away with the other. It is the only way some progress can be made in dismantling monetary compensatory amounts. However, I would like to say to another honourable Member that while these monetary compensatory amounts are a serious obstacle to the free development of agriculture and agricultural trade in the Community, to say that they are the poor man's contribution to the rich is rather going beyond all reasonable limits. Look at the income figures and you will see that, thanks to the lower increases in prices in units of account, accompanied by heavy devaluations of those currencies which could be devalued, the real income situation has not been particularly bright in these regions. Therefore what is proposed is really going quite a long way.

Yes, Mr Clinton, I absolutely agree that there are certain regions of the Community, as I said in my initial statement, which are considerably worse off than many other regions of the Community. And I said in my statement that I believe that the right answer to this question lies in structural or special measures. It is my hope that this Community will one

day be willing to deal with special problems in particular parts of the Community without having to face the prospect, each time one is suggesting a special cure for special problems somewhere, that the cry will go up — as it has again today — of discrimination. If we wish to bring about a higher degree of coherence in this Community, we must also be willing to take special action in particular parts of the Community in order to bring it about.

I do hope that the kind of problems you, Mr Clinton, and others have referred to can be dealt with by the structural proposals we have made — and maybe by some additional measures which we could put into our milk scheme, provided they do not become generalized throughout the Community but are related only to those who have no other choice than to stick to a limited dairy production.

To the honourable Member who considers the Common Agricultural Policy a terminal cancer, I must admit that I consider the term below the level at which I am prepared to answer.

*(Applause)*

It is not true that, as Mr Pranchère indicated, agricultural incomes have been on the downturn since 1974. Real incomes in agriculture, were increasing until the last 12 months, and the difference between incomes in other parts of the economy and agriculture has been narrowing. Now again we have a lag, as we had for a short time at the beginning of the energy crisis in 1974, which was recovered relatively quickly. But do not forget that 1980 holds out what is not a terribly bright picture for other sectors of the economy as well.

In the course of the short debate this morning, I have been told that I made no reference to the imports of butter and soya, which are really at the root of our problems. That is trying to wriggle out of the difficulties: it is exactly the tinkering which I must warn this House against. For the last three or four years, we have indeed been net importers of milk products and butter, but the difficulty does not lie here. In 1979, we were even importing more than twice the quantities we had been importing from New Zealand. Our problem does not lie here either. We are big importers of, for instance, soya, as we shall be discussing later today, for the purpose of feeding our pigs and our poultry (which seems to be the most successful sector of agricultural policy): only a marginal part is used as fodder for cows producing milk. It may be a marginal factor in our equation, but it is certainly not the main reason for the continued increase in milk production. Take a look at the map and see the regions which are based on national fodder-grass: there you have the highest figures for increases in milk production. Let us not suggest illusory courses and thereby avoid attacking the real problem! The fact of the matter is that the Community is an increasingly important exporter of livestock.

**Gundelach**

I do not, Mr Davern, believe that the additional levy is going to cushion production at a high level. It is exactly in that type of production, where great investments have taken place, that this kind of levy will have its greatest effect. Its impact will obviously be less on the smaller farmers, many of whom are united in cooperatives with opportunities within the dairy field of offsetting ups against downs. This attempt to present the scheme as if it were intended to defend the bigger producers is quite obviously ill founded, as is Mr Blaney's question to me, whom do I defend — the big or the small. I defend the fundamental interests of the Community and nothing else, and I will accept no other comments in this regard.

Mr Sutra, I stated in the Committee on Agriculture that the Commission would propose, and has proposed, to the Council consideration of a system for the so-called distillation of the *bon vin* and further that, in view of the special harvest this year, we should be proposing a special scheme for distillation.

Mr President, I believe I have answered most of the questions which have been put to me, and I am sure that in subsequent discussions in the various committees of this House and finally in the plenary debate thereafter, there will be ample opportunity to go into all these matters with all the seriousness and in all the detail necessary. I share with Mr Früh the absolute conviction that it is our responsibility, even in difficult circumstances created by pressures on the economy as a whole, to see to it that the farmers get a fair deal. That is what lies behind the proposals we have made. While recognizing the economic, budgetary and other difficulties with which the Community is confronted, we must nevertheless, within the limits imposed by these difficulties, give the farmers a fair deal. That shall be our guiding principle, and on that basis we are open to any discussion organized within this House. We shall listen to your final advice, when it comes, before decisions are taken in the Council.

*(Applause)*

IN THE CHAIR : MR POUL MØLLER

*Vice-President*

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

**Mr Delatte.** — Mr President, I am astonished that Mr Gundelach did not answer the questions on agricultural prices.

6. *Activities of the Communities in 1979 and Commission work programme for 1980*  
(presentation)

**President.** — The next item is the statement by Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission, on the activities of the Communities in 1979 and the Commission's work programme for 1980.

I call Mr Jenkins.

**Mr Jenkins.** — Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is a considerable responsibility to present the Commission's programme for the first time to this new Parliament, but it is a responsibility which my colleagues and I welcome at the beginning of this, the fourth and last year of our mandate. The introduction of the Commission's programme for 1980 fits naturally into the proceedings of a well-established and working Parliament. I look forward to the debate which will follow on Thursday on the main lines of that programme.

Today I intend to concentrate on what we see as the central issues confronting us. I do not intend to say something about everything or attempt a complete Cook's tour of the horizons of the Community. You must therefore forgive me if some things are left out. This does not mean that we do not attach importance to it. It merely means, in my view, that a speech is not a catalogue and a catalogue is not a speech.

First it would be right to look back briefly at what the Community achieved in 1979. Although 1979 ended with its difficulties, it should in many ways be seen as a year of major Community advance. We saw substantial success on a number of major fronts. First, we put in place the European Monetary System after less than a year of discussion, and have seen it establish itself gradually and unspectacularly. We will need to do more to strengthen and support the EMS, but its creation is, in my view, an important landmark in our development. Second, we have concluded the accord with a new European partner, Greece, and have begun the process of welcoming her into the Community. This accession — and the other two which are likely to follow — emphasizes the underlying vitality of the Community and the attraction which it holds for the reborn democracies of Europe. Third, we concluded, after many years of difficult and largely unglamorous negotiation, the Tokyo Round. This MTN achievement offers us the reasonable prospect for a further development of the free world trading system on mutually beneficial lines, despite the new and more difficult circumstances which face us in the economic and employment fields. Fourth, we reached agreement

## Jenkins

at Lomé on a renewed convention enhancing and strengthening our relationship with the now 58 ACP countries. Fifth, at the Strasbourg European Council last summer and subsequently at the Economic Summit in Tokyo we led the way towards establishing a new apparatus of cooperation in the energy field. Above all, we saw this Parliament elected — in my view, perhaps the biggest harbinger of hope for the future — bringing a new and powerful democratic dimension to our Community affairs.

I make these points to this House because the essential vitality of the Community can sometimes be too obscured by the dust of pressing short-term problems and difficulties. Within the framework of our common institutions there remains a deep reserve of invention, imagination and sustained cohesion which can be brought to bear in the common interests of Europe. It is well to remember what we have already achieved *together* when we contemplate the problems that we have to resolve *together* in the future.

Looking ahead, we face no less than the break-up of the established economic and social order on which post-war Europe was built. The warning bells have been sounding for a decade. Bit by bit we have seen the collapse of that long period of monetary stability founded on the Bretton Woods agreements; that process began even before the rise in oil prices in 1973. Energy price increases may not have been the only cause of our present misfortunes but they have been the main catalyst. We have built our industrial society on the consumption of fossil fuels, in particular oil, and it is now certain that if we do not change our ways while there is still time — and 1980 could be almost the last opportunity — our society will risk dislocation and eventual collapse.

Most of the economic indicators are bad. Whereas in 1979 growth of the European economy amounted to about 3.3 %, in 1980 it could fall substantially below even the 2 % which we were forecasting in a somewhat dispirited fashion at the end of last year. Unemployment rates, which in the early 1970s averaged under 3 % for the Community as a whole, rose to 5.6 % in 1979 and are forecast to rise to well above 6.0 % this year. Average inflation can be expected to increase from 9 % last year to nearly 11.5 % in 1980. The current account deficit on external trade is estimated to rise from almost \$ 8 billion in 1979 to more than \$ 20 billion this year under the impact of last year's 65 % increase in oil prices. We may once have hoped that the waves of our recent discontents would quietly recede and that the easier world of the 1960s would re-emerge from beneath the waters. Such facile optimism is now totally untenable. The signs of irreversible change are now visible in the accelerating decline of some of our older industries; in the impact of new technologies in many areas of our daily lives; in the changing and more difficult pattern of our trade.

The essential question for 1980 and the years ahead is therefore: how we adapt our society to the new economic realities?

I turn first to the question of energy which was a central issue for the meeting of the European Council in Strasbourg last summer, and subsequently for the Economic Summit in Tokyo. It was, let us recall, the first time the Community had fixed and defended a global target figure for our oil consumption and imports. Yet since then progress has faltered. You will be debating this matter in many of its aspects tomorrow, but I nevertheless believe it is right to emphasize the main points now.

In the short term, energy conservation must be the cornerstone of our policy since it forms the quickest and the cheapest way of contributing to a restoration of the balance between supply and demand. I say 'in the short-term' because we can and must move quickly. But conservation is not, of course, a stop-gap which we can then abandon. It is short-term in the sense of being urgent, but not in the sense of being temporary. Some progress has already been made. Thus the total energy consumption of the Nine fell by about 8 % between 1974 and 1977. But the potential for further savings is immense: recent studies have shown that over the next two decades there could be savings of 20-35 % in the transport sector; 15-35 % in industry and agriculture; and up to 50 % in the housing and service sector, on the basis of currently available technology. It is the Commission's view that with wider use of best practice in energy-saving equipment and in design, energy savings by 1990 could be as much as 100 million tonnes oil equivalent in excess of Member States' forecasts: in other words a 20 % reduction of our import needs.

Second, we believe that throughout the Community we should rapidly raise the levels of our investment in new ways of saving energy, in exploiting out native resources, and in developing new sources. This cannot be left entirely to the market place. Of course, industry must make the investments it thinks profitable and contribute to the common effort; but a big responsibility inevitably rests with each Member State and with the Community as a whole in giving a lead to investment in areas of high risk or high technology, particularly where there are big initial costs and long payback times.

There are three obvious areas to which I draw brief attention. First, we must reverse the downward trend, experienced through the 1970s — perversely in view of our experience during this decade — in the consumption and production of coal. Investment is needed for new production capacity; for the construction, modernization and conversion of power stations using coal; and for demonstration projects in coal liquefaction and gasification. Secondly, the Commis-

## Jenkins

sion believes that the delays which have occurred in the development of nuclear energy in different parts of the Community should be made up as soon as possible. Thirdly, we need to devote far more time and attention to the development of other sources of energy, those sometimes called new and exotic, but in fact often old and well tried. What we get out of such sources will be in direct proportion to what we put into them. We must not fall into the error of supposing that because a source is apparently cheap, simple, and small scale it cannot be as good as that which is expensive, complicated and large scale.

Fourth, we need to put greater efforts into our research and development programme. At present only 2 to 3 % of the Community budget is devoted to energy, and only about 4 % of energy investment, within the Community is provided from Community sources. There is much that we can do to concentrate national efforts, to stimulate planning, to avoid unnecessary duplication and give the direction of advance.

In all these areas we have to reckon with the need to protect the environment, to limit and assess the consequences of pollution of land, sea and atmosphere, and to make what we do as safe as we humanly can. Concern about the consequences of developing new and existing sources of energy has been somewhat unfairly focused on the nuclear aspect. There are hazards connected with the greater exploitation of coal, in particular in its effects on the atmosphere; there are hazards in our continued high consumption of hydrocarbons; there are hazards in the development of nuclear energy, among which nuclear waste disposal is conspicuous; but, as is sometimes forgotten, there are also hazards even in the use of wind power, wave power, and solar power in its many forms. In working out our programme we must see the hazards as a whole and deal with them honestly and openly.

I think that we have made some progress in recent months towards fuller appreciation of these problems. But it is now six years since the first severe warning, and I fear we have missed many more opportunities than we have created. The lesson of recent developments in the Middle East is that we shall not have another such period of grace.

Our efforts to overcome these problems will require time, money, and determination. The most tangible is money. Here the Commission is looking at possibilities which include the idea of some form of energy tax or levy. Such a tax or levy would of course need to be consistent with our international obligations and should have regard to macro-economic as well as energy economy considerations. We shall keep this House closely informed of the progress of our work, and look forward to full discussion with you as soon

as our thinking is more precise. When I was in Washington in January, I found that similar ideas were also under examination there. The effect of any Community initiative would be all the greater if it were undertaken in cooperation with our major industrial partners.

Energy problems may well be the catalyst in quickening the pace of economic change. But I am convinced that the major, perhaps the ultimate test, of success or failure in the next decade will be the attitude we adopt to the challenge of the new electronic technologies. The developments now rapidly unfolding herald a new industrial revolution. The first effects of these developments can already be seen reflected most starkly in the loss of jobs in traditional industries. The results are sudden, sharp and devastating. For example, in the traditional watch industry in the Federal Republic of Germany there was a drop in employment of some 40 % in the mid-1970s. In printing and publishing, where composition direct from the keyboard has cut out traditional skills, we are now witnessing the prospect of a fall in established employment which could amount to 70 %.

But these dramatic effects tend to hide the gains to be had from the same technologies. Such gains come from the demand for the new products available, either wholly new products or from the spin-off effects of increased demand for the products of existing technology. They also arise because of the more efficient use of resources leading to lower costs and the release of resources for investment elsewhere. The introduction of new data-processing techniques in accountancy, for example, has coincided with a substantial growth in employment, an increase of some 300 000 jobs in France in this sector alone in the past seven years. These are real gains. But because they do not always arise in the same regions or industries as those affected by unemployment, they often go unnoticed. We need, not only to exploit these new developments, but to contain their social effects and provide far more information than has hitherto been available about them. What is certain is that our major competitors will not hold back. Already they have worked out more consistent and wider scale strategies than we, and the technological gap between the United States and Japan on one hand, and Western Europe on the other is, if anything, increasing.

In November last year the European Council was informed of our ideas for the development of a Community strategy in this field. You will already have seen the paper which sets this out. We proposed that the Community should develop a social policy to prepare the way for innovation, create a homogeneous European market for telematic equipment and services, foster the growth of a European information industry, promote industrial and user collaboration, enhance existing national and European programmes for satellite communication, and above all apply the

## Jenkins

new technologies to the Community itself on the continental scale open to us. At that European Council we were invited to develop more fully the main lines of the strategy we had proposed 'in order that we may act in 1980'. The Commission will rapidly so act. I regard such action as vital to the health of our economies, the adaptation of our society and the economic vigour of the Community over the next decade.

Before I leave this perspective of the future, I want to mention one other point of great importance for the Community. This is to underline the need to improve the organization of transport within the Community both on its own merits and to serve Community as well as purely national needs. There are few areas of more importance for the cohesion of the Community and the convergence of the economies of its Member States. You already have before you a draft financial regulation for transport infrastructure, and you will have seen our Green Paper on the subject. Without going into details here, I should like simply to commend our ideas and seek the sustained support of this House for them.

I turn now to the increasing interdependence within the industrial world in which these changes are embedded. Our Western economies and societies are rooted in the twin concepts of competition and cooperation. Without competition, there is a prospect of a widening gap between our achievements and those of our major partners and rivals. Without cooperation, we risk damaging each other and losing sight of the vital interests we hold in common. It is on the basis of realistic but humane policies within the Community that our competitive position can be safeguarded; and on the attitudes we adopt towards international cooperation that the essential interests of the Western world can be advanced. It has been a Community interest to play an active role in the series of Economic Summits, last at Tokyo, in 1979 next at Venice this June. The way in which the Summit countries are working increasingly together is one of the more encouraging developments of our time.

But the industrialized countries account for only a small proportion of mankind; and the Community more than any other industrial group is linked by history, culture, interest and trade with the rest of the world. The recovery of our economies cannot be dissociated from the development of the poorer countries and the growth in world-wide demand. There is an essential interdependence in the modern world which the energy crisis has illuminated and reinforced. We shall soon engage in a further round of discussions in the North/South dialogue. In these discussions the Community must be able to speak with a single voice not just — as is sometimes suggested — at the technical level, but at the top. Our political and economic interest in establishing consensus and cooperation is clear. Three themes will run through the negotiations

and form the basis for greater stability in international economic relations which we all seek. First the need to ensure a better balance between energy supply and demand; second the steady growth of the economies of the poorer countries, which is in our interest as well as theirs and third the provision of special help for those in most need. Within the Community and among the other industrialized countries, progress in this area is a high priority for 1980.

Concern for the rest of the world should not obscure concern for what is happening here, within the Community. I refer to the disfigurement which present rates of unemployment represent, not only for the functioning of our economies, but for the equilibrium of our society. We must adopt new attitudes.

Here I make three points. First our people must be closely informed about the changes that are occurring. They must be able to see beyond their immediate horizon to the totality of the changes that affect them. Otherwise we can expect little but defensive and restrictive attitudes to changes from workers who see only that their industry is contracting, or that their own firm is closing. Second, if we are to make the necessary but difficult changes in our society required by developing technology, our policies must encourage greater mobility and willingness to change jobs. In that process temporary unemployment may sometimes be part of the price of progress, but people must be given the means to adapt to new opportunities and to learn new skills. Third, we must reduce to the minimum the average period of unemployment. That requires that we must put more effort into training and retraining; that we ensure a better match between available skills and job opportunities in different sectors and regions; and pursue further our discussions on the different aspects of time-sharing

Last month this House had an important debate on unemployment. The Commission has taken careful note of your resolutions. Our policies in 1980 will take full account of them. Here I mention some central points. As Vice-President Ortoli mentioned in last month's debate, the Commission has proposed the maintenance of a relatively high level of public spending to sustain growth. Next, we are coming forward with specific ideas about how to cushion the social effects of the telematic revolution to which I have already referred. In our paper we suggest ten areas for action. We look forward to discussion about them with the social partners. Next we shall try to extend Community action to help in the reorganization of industrial sectors in particular difficulty. I have shipbuilding, steel and textiles particularly in mind. Finally we are looking again at our policies for young people and for women. Young people of working age under twenty-five make up less than 25% of the whole population, but nearly 40% of the registered unemployed. There is no more serious problem for our society as a whole.

## Jenkins

Last year the Social Fund committed some 800 million ECUs for training and job creation. The total should be more this year. But we still have to find up to 800 000 new jobs a year until 1985, when the demographic — the number of young people coming on the labour market — pattern is likely to change dramatically. Community institutions and Community funds cannot deal with issues of this order of magnitude alone. But they should have a catalytic effect on the policies followed by the Member States. We need to get the balance right. The Community provides the framework within which national economies have the major role but within which Community funds have nevertheless a significant function. Last year the Community framework was greatly strengthened by the introduction of the European Monetary System. If I had foreseen a year ago the stormy waters on to which this frail craft would be launched and have to make its early voyages — a year in which the yen depreciated by 30 % against the dollar; the dollar by 10 % against the ECU and gold set off on its wild and unpredictable course; had I foreseen all these storms for the first year of the life of the EMS, I would not, perhaps, have been very confident of its survival. Not only has the system survived, it has worked well, involving only two small adjustments to central rates and providing a valuable buttress of greater monetary stability in Europe at a difficult time of international turbulence. I much regret the continued absence of the United Kingdom from full participation in the system.

*(Applause)*

I hope the experience we have gained in the EMS will encourage our ninth Member State to come in, and make its contribution to the good health and fortune of the system. Without sterling the system is frankly incomplete. Without participation the United Kingdom is not playing its full part in Europe.

At Dublin the European Council confirmed the timetable already laid down for progress in the System in particular towards the creation of a European Monetary Fund. There is now some hesitation; it should not be allowed to persist for long. The Commission is playing an active role, notably in the discussions with the Monetary Committee and the Central Bank Governors, and will be reporting on progress to the next European Council. I should like to see a steady extension of the work of the EMS, for example through closer coordination within it and elaboration of common policies with regard to third countries and currencies. In saying this I in no way wish to detract from the role of the dollar which is and will remain for the foreseeable future the principal medium of international exchange. Rather our efforts should be seen as part of a common effort with our major trading partners to rebuild a framework within which the monetary turbulence we have experienced in

recent years can be effectively contained. In that process, the EMS has a major role to play.

I turn briefly, Mr President, to internal issues relating to the budget. These issues have dominated Community discussion for six months. I in no way complain. They are of importance and need to be approached in orderly fashion. But let us keep them in perspective. They are essentially part of the process of putting our house in order. Once settled we can get down to the bigger and more important issues affecting the future development of the Community. We cannot afford to spend much more time on family squabbles.

As the House knows, the Commission will decide on its proposals for a new budgetary document for 1980 tomorrow, and Commissioner Tugendhat will present them to Parliament on Thursday. I hope that, on the basis of these proposals, it will prove possible to move rapidly towards agreement between the Community institutions on the 1980 budget. It is, I think, in no-one's interest for these difficulties to be prolonged. The Commission is at the disposal of both parts of the budgetary authority to give any further help that may be required.

A vital element in our budgetary proposals is clearly the related issue of agricultural prices which Vice-President Gundelach presented to you this morning. Obviously our proposals must and will be considered on their merits, but they also need to be seen in the light of the mounting agricultural surpluses of recent years and the structure of the 1980 budget. Fundamental change cannot be achieved overnight. But the proposals we have made could, if adopted by the Council, mark a significant step towards containing expenditure and thus putting our agricultural policy into a better relationship with our other Community policies. For the first time in the history of the Community we should have a lower level of expenditure on agriculture — in money let alone real terms — than in the previous year. Failure to act now by the Council, following our proposals, could in my view have consequences for the continued existence of the common agricultural policy in its present form.

I now turn to the complex of problems which go under the label of convergence and budgetary questions. The House will recall the specific mandate given to the Commission by the European Council at Dublin. The result was the paper we sent to the Council and to this House in the first week of February. I make two observations on it.

We covered two broad issues: structural questions affecting the less prosperous Members of the Community, and budgetary questions affecting the United Kingdom. We believe that the proposals we have made under both heads could provide a solution to both sets of problems. In this way we hope that we have, as it were, cut these problems down to size, and

## Jenkins

made their solution one of practical and specific negotiation. Let us not have too much metaphysical but unrewarding argument.

Next, we believe that what we have proposed would be good not just for the countries directly concerned but for the Community as a whole. To remedy an imbalance is one thing: it has to be done, and we are doing it; but to reinforce the direction of our structural policies and thereby promote genuine convergence is another, and in my judgment much more valuable and important. That is our purpose. We now have to work out the detailed programmes to give effect to it. As you will see from our paper we have taken good care to avoid disturbing good existing Community policies. Instead, we have focused on the temporary, special and *ad hoc* measures which we think a solution of the problem requires.

There will now be a further period of discussion here and in the Council of Ministers. That period of discussion should be short. It is time for us to settle these issues and put them behind us.

My final points are about our institutions. These have been under scrutiny in the report of the Three Wise Men on the Community as a whole, and in the report of the Spierenburg Group on the Commission. I have three points to make.

There was remarkable similarity of view in both reports about the role and responsibilities of the Commission. While both pointed to external factors and internal weaknesses, developing over a decade or more, which had led to some dilution of its effectiveness, there was no dispute that the Commission should continue to exercise its political powers of initiative in full independence. That is indeed our prime responsibility. The Commission is neither the servant of the Council nor the secretariat of the Parliament. The institutional framework of the Treaties depends on a creative partnership, perhaps I should say creative and constructive tension, between independent bodies each respecting the other and each with its own defined responsibilities. Within those responsibilities the Commission must be allowed to get on with the job and to fulfil its role as the executive of policies as well as the proposer of them.

Like all organizations the Commission needs to adapt and renew its own response to changing circumstances. For this reason we took the initiative in 1978 to appoint the Spierenburg Independent Review Body to examine how the Commission's organization and staff resources could best be adjusted to meet future needs. This report will be acted upon. We regard it as our responsibility to hand over to our successors the best possible administrative structure. We will shortly be considering a range of proposals designed to secure streamlining of our administrative services, improvement and strengthening of our internal coordination

and planning, and better control over the use of staff. In giving effect to these reforms we shall need the understanding and support of the budget authority. We would welcome an early debate on our proposals in the appropriate committee of this House.

Last, the Commission hopes that there will be rapid consideration leading to action on the wider institutional issues raised in the reports. Decisions will soon be necessary on the composition of the next Commission. Our experience does not lead us to think that it should necessarily be smaller than the present one; but nor do we think it should be larger, as the logic of a Community of twelve might suggest. Although I cannot commit the new Commission, I think it right that it should, as it were, submit itself to this House on taking up office.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

I am not proposing anything so formal or precise as a vote of confidence; but I know that, to fulfil its functions as it should, the next Commission must be in a position to feel that it has been accepted by those who represent the people of the Community.

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

I conclude Mr President. Following the events in Afghanistan, tension in the world is perhaps closer to danger point than at any time over the last two decades. The gravity of the situation was recognized by the almost unanimous view expressed by this House in its resolution last month; in the serious and important discussions within the Political Affairs Committee which I attended a fortnight ago; and in the series of actions which the Community has taken together in condemnation of Soviet aggression. These events come on top of the difficult economic and social problems which already are exercising pressure on the Community system.

We can achieve nothing unless we act in the spirit of solidarity. That solidarity depends on respect for the rule of law, not only in our own society but in the world as a whole. Our Community institutions — the symmetry of Parliament, Commission, Council and Court each operating within a common framework — are our foundation. We depart from it at our peril. There can be no bargaining with the law. If we flout our own rules for whatever reason, we can hardly expect to command authority or influence elsewhere. No consideration of temporary advantage or national self-interest can transcend our common interest in an orderly world in which rules are respected until there is agreement to change them. The Court interprets the law on the basis of the Treaties of which the Commission is the guardian. There is no duty to which the Commission attaches more importance. It is the rock on which the Community stands.

*(Loud applause)*

**President.** — I should like to thank the President of the Commission for his statement. The debate on the statement will take place on Thursday.

### 7. *Restructuring in the shipbuilding and textile industries*

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on :

— The report by Sir David Nicolson (Doc. 1-623/79) and Miss Forster, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs on the proposal of the Commission of the European Communities to the Council for

I. a decision on Community aid for restructuring or conversion investments in the shipbuilding industry

II. a decision on Community aid for restructuring or conversion investments in the textile industry, particularly in the man-made fibres industry

— The oral question with debate by Mr Carossino, Mr de Pasquale, Mr Leonardi, Mr Bonaccini, Mr Ippolito, and Mr Gouthier, to the Commission (Doc. 1-612/79) :

Subject: Crisis facing the shipbuilding industry — restructuring and conversion programmes

Considering that :

- the deepening of the crisis facing the shipbuilding and ship repair industry described in the six-monthly report which the Commission of the European Communities has presented to Parliament has given rise to serious concern ;
- there is increasing recognition of the fact that it is not simply the future of a few shipyards which is at stake nor merely short-term difficulties which are involved, but that a whole wealth of experience, preparation and technology accumulated over many decades is at risk. This situation has forced various Italian shipyards to stop recruiting workers and recently to lay off large numbers of workers, now obliged to seek unemployment benefit and as a result tension has increased in the Castellamare di Stabia, Palermo, Taranto, Trieste, La Spezia and Pietra Ligure yards ;
- further reorganization in addition to that carried out in the 1960s at the Community's request appears to be totally unacceptable for economic and social reasons as it would increase the already serious imbalance of employment and income between the most highly-developed and the least-favoured regions of the Community. This would have an adverse effect on a country like Italy where the shipbuilding and ship repair industry is of strategic importance, particularly in the southern regions where it is the main industry ;
- medium- and long-term forecasts for this industry are unreliable as was demonstrated in the 1960s when the European shipbuilding industry was forced to rationalize just before the greatest boom in the industry's history ;
- the energy crisis, the growth of short- and medium-range traffic, the radical new developments in marine engines and the carriage of goods by sea, the need to

modernize fleets on grounds of safety and cost-saving have led a number of countries to consider their forecasts and to plan programmes of aid for this industry.

Does the Commission not feel that it should :

1. review its own programme and forecasts, the criteria governing the granting of assistance for the restructuring and conversion of shipbuilding and ship repair yards ;
2. enter into fresh negotiations with individual Member States with the aim of improving the efficiency and competitiveness of shipyards to enable them to overcome the serious crisis facing them and give fresh impetus to their activities ?

I call Sir David Nicolson.

**Sir David Nicolson.** — Mr President, in introducing this report I shall speak mainly on shipbuilding, leaving my co-rapporteur, Miss Norvela Forster, to speak on textiles. However, I should like to make it clear that the substance of the comments made both by Miss Forster and myself must be regarded as applicable to industry in general, and that it is a general industrial policy which we seek. There is a sad story of indecision and delay in this matter going back as far as 1973, and the Community still has no policy on aiding the restructuring and conversion of industries in crisis. Even now the Council has still not adopted a basic regulation, and the Commission has had to go ahead and designate these two industries and allocate appropriations before either a Council decision or an opinion from this Parliament has been forthcoming. Now this sort of thing cannot go on. It displays a total lack of leadership not to mention a disregard for Parliament's budgetary authority at a time when we have over six million unemployed in the Community and a further 60 thousand jobs are in peril in the shipbuilding and associated industries, which have already lost more than this in the past five years and now have only about 150 000 employed. We threw out the Council's last budget because of this blind disregard for priorities, and we now demand a proper overall policy for the next five years backed up by a proper allocation of financial resources from the Ortolani facility and the Regional and Social Funds in this whole vital area to follow up our action and to give meaning to our words. The Community is the largest trading bloc in the world and we depend on sea-borne trade. Apart from the pressing social and regional reasons why action can no longer be delayed, there are also strategic reasons for not allowing this industry to decline further and its technology, skills and its facilities to wither away. The world as always is changing. New ship-owning and shipbuilding nations have merged into positions of prominence, for example last year Hong Kong ordered one and quarter billion dollars worth of shipping and will probably be the centre of ship-owning in another 10 years. Already three Hong Kong owners have more ships than the

## Nicolson

whole United Kingdom fleet. Such owners do not automatically come to Europe for their ships any more, and they will not come at all unless our yards are modern, imaginative, dynamic and competitive. Despite subsidies and other temporary forms of help, our order book continues to be low and our share of world orders is declining.

The outlook is gloomy and our yards are half empty. We cannot allow this situation to continue, and we must regenerate this industry on a permanent basis and encourage it to find new outlets to improve its prosperity. As you all know, we have an energy crisis and there is much work to be done, to which shipbuilding and marine engineering could contribute, for example, in energy conservation applications in industry, in anti-pollution equipment if we turn more to coal, in plants for producing oil and gas from coal, in plants for producing alcohol for fuel from agricultural sources, in the conversion of utilities to coal, in nuclear energy projects, in the modernization equipment needed in coal mines and, of course, in the building of offshore oil-drilling equipment. This is surely appropriate in view of what President Jenkins has remarked today. This shipbuilding industry must not be narrow in its area of work, but must be part of the engineering industry in a wider sense.

We have an urgent need to build the equipment I have referred to and we have an equally urgent need to use our skilled capacity fully. In at least one case, a non-shipbuilding industrial company has bought a shipyard and is building chemical plants there, employing over five hundred people. In another case, in Japan, a paper-pulp plant was built in a ship-yard dock on a floating platform, towed to Brazil and up the Amazon and put to work. Are we then to accept that we are unable to compete with the Asians, with Taiwan, with Korea, or for that matter with Brazil or Poland? Are we unable to harness the greater technologies and abilities of Europe to put life into our own industry? To seize the opportunities which exist, which are available, we need investment, and we need it quickly, not to expand shipbuilding capacity, not to subsidize old declining operations and regions on a continuing basis, but to modernize the facilities and make them more flexible and resilient. This should come from an expanded Ortolì facility, possibly 10 billion units of account for industry as a whole, as a start, as indeed my colleague, Derek Prag, suggested in his speech, in this House recently, when we debated unemployment. This could provide the necessary loan finance. In addition, we need investment premiums and interest rebates from the Regional Fund which is also vital, for both industry and infrastructure, and we need funds for retraining, youth training and education from the Social Fund. Nor should we forget this Parliament's suggestion for an economic analysis and research unit, which was made a long time ago and which the Commission has ignored. Where is the promised research and development necessary for this

industry? How are we going to develop a proper new initiative. If we do, it will have to be coordinated. It demands big thinking and action rather than words. There are always so many reasons in life why something cannot be done, but now let us find a way out of this morass of inaction and do something.

There is no more time, and we must provide the necessary leadership, which is obviously not going to come from anywhere else. So let us stick to our guns for a properly balanced budget and a proper overall industrial policy, and, as a first step, I would ask you to approve the Committee's report and support our motion for a resolution.

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

**Mr Pannella.** — (*I*) Mr President, I wanted to make this point. We have decided to hold a joint debate on the report by Sir David Nicolson and Miss Forster and on the oral question with debate tabled by Mr Carosino and others. I would like to raise this problem. We intend to speak more particularly on the oral question and therefore, under Rule 47.4 we have five minutes speaking time on this oral question. To me, Mr President, it seems obvious — I ask for your understanding and courtesy — that in the present case we should not go by Rule 28 since it is on the basis of Rule 47 that you are asking the Members tabling the question to speak and since yesterday it was explained that Mr Almirante was entitled — as seems right to me — to speak on this subject even though it was on account of an old oral question tabled by him.

I therefore merely wished, Mr President, to give advance notice, as a procedural motion and contrary to any different interpretations which I would find arbitrary, that we intend to use our rights under the Rules of Procedure with regard to this debate.

**President.** — The allocation of speaking time for the various debates was discussed yesterday by the Bureau and was approved by Parliament at the beginning of yesterday's sitting.

I call Miss Forster.

**Miss Forster.** — Mr President, as Sir David Nicolson has said, this motion for a resolution is not confined merely to shipbuilding and textiles but calls for a total industrial restructuring policy. The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs deplores the delays that have taken place in discussions between the Commission and the Council and we regret that the Council has done so very little over the past two years in this field. We therefore propose two solutions. The first, short-term, the second, a longer term, more radical solution, based on an own-initiative report from Parliament. The short-term solution is covered by paragraphs 5 and 6 of the motion. We ask that shipbuilding and textiles be designated eligible for Community assistance and, in particular, that 17

**Forster**

million units of account be immediately allocated to synthetic fibres. This has partly been covered by the adoption by the Council in December of a regulation specifically relating to man-made fibres and approval for the spending of 14 million units of account out of the 17 million units of account that were available. 16 out of 26 projects were approved and the Commission must report both to the Council and to Parliament on their implementation. Most of the projects are in Italy and I regret that many of the grants have been to large companies. I hope that in future small firms will also benefit. One of the projects is in fact the construction of commercial boats, and having heard Sir David Nicolson talking about the problems of the shipbuilding industry, I hope that this is indeed a wise investment.

On the procedural side, the committee feels very strongly that we have waited far too long for information about these projects and for Council approval. I hope that in future the responsibility of the Commission for implementing the budget and that the supervisory powers of this Parliament over the budget will be upheld.

Sir David has already talked about the problems of the shipbuilding industry and I would now like to highlight some of the problems that are facing the textile industry.

There is gross over-capacity in man-made fibres. The raw material costs of these fibres have increased enormously and there is severe competition from low-priced fibres and textile goods coming in from America. Competition is in fact fierce in all sectors of the textile trade. Goods are coming in under the multi-fibres arrangement from such countries as Hong Kong and Korea, and also, outside that arrangement, from places like Greece and Portugal. The textile industry accounts for about one in ten of the jobs in the Community and in some areas it accounts for as many as three or five in ten. It has been estimated that the industry lost a million jobs in the 1970s as against about 100 000 jobs in the steel sector. In the 1980s unemployment could rise to 2 million. This is in the context of 6.5 million unemployed in the Community today. The search for alternative employment, therefore, is going to be extremely difficult in textile-producing areas such as Northern Ireland, Lancashire, West Yorkshire, Scotland, in the UK in Northern France and Southern Italy. However, the long-term problems facing the textile industry and also shipbuilding are not unique and we must face the fact that similar difficulties will arise in other industries in due course.

It is for this reason that the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs proposes an own-initiative report. We will be examining, not only what aid should be given to shipbuilding and to textiles, but what help should be given to any other industry in

crisis. Another most important question is what help we should give to promote the new growth industries which will generate future jobs and provide the base for Europe's continuing economic stability.

What sort of strategy do we want to study? We are not looking at matters which industry should solve for itself, nor at those items which fall within the province of national governments. Our search is for solutions that can be provided most effectively only at the European level. They could include, for example, major capital projects on transport and communications, or, perhaps, organized support for any new industry that will depend on its growth for major purchases from the public sector.

I should like, if I may, to speak for a moment as a Member of the European Democratic Group because I cannot forecast at this stage what conclusions our committee will reach in its own-initiative report.

British Conservatives believe in keeping public expenditure to a minimum, and I am sure we would hope to find ways in which the Community can help industry without additional expenditure. At present, agriculture accounts for about 10 % of the jobs, and 5 % of the added value in the Community, and yet it takes 80 % of our budget. This must be wrong and more money at the current account level must be devoted to industry. Even if this is done, in the short term at least the Community's own resources are limited and the aid which the Community can give industry must be extremely small. In the longer term, the budget may increase and it is also probable, as Sir David has said, that we will need to look at other sources of money for capital projects.

In the meantime, however, thinking and planning cost relatively little, and I would hope that the Parliament would spend some time considering what sorts of industries would be viable in Europe in the 1980s and 1990s. Europe differs from America and most of its trading competitors in having a larger proportion of its workforce in manufacturing industry and having less land and raw materials per head of population to support its 240 million people. We will therefore be far more vulnerable than many other countries to worldwide recession, and, in particular, to increasing competition from the newly industrialized countries.

For all these reasons, Mr President, my short-term theme is plan and think now and pay later, and by pay I mean three things: Firstly, the payments we will need to make to finance our industrial restructuring. This finance will have to be coordinated with the work of the Regional and Social Funds, and with the European Investment Bank and with spending by Member States.

Secondly, the pay or the real value of our wages, which will not be maintained unless we solve our economic problems, and thirdly and most important,

## Forster

the payoff from success which will create the wealth without which we cannot defend our freedoms.

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

**Mr Pannella.** — (*I*) Mr President, I shall try to express myself in the clearest possible manner so that you can grasp, without the assistance of your services, the kind of objection that I now propose to put.

Mr President, Rule 28 of the Rules of Procedure lays down, in effect, that, on the proposal of the President, after consulting the chairmen of the political groups, speaking time may be rationed. Here we have a first anomaly. Such a decision has been taken for a whole sitting, covering eight debates. This is certainly an anomaly but you are right, Mr President; we discussed it yesterday and in that sense, to my way of thinking, all the Assembly has done is to confirm an infringement of the Rules. What you said a little while ago, Mr President, was therefore right and I commend you for it.

My present concern, however, is something else. Rule 47.4 reads, literally :

“One of the questioners may speak to the question for not more than 10 minutes. One member of the institution concerned shall answer. Other Members of Parliament may speak for not more than five minutes and may do so only once.”

Mr President, if we do not apply Rule 47, the questioners will not have the right to speak except within the time allowed for their group. But if Rule 47 is applied you cannot fail to allow questioners time to explain their own questions without this being deducted from the time available to them for speeches on behalf of their own group. That is why I ask that Rule 47, which you are now applying in this debate by combining various oral questions, should also apply to the remainder of the Assembly.

Mr President, I would point to the risk of the Rules of Procedure, or at least their interpretation, being changed day in day out. As a final argument, Mr President, allow me to add that, by rationing speaking time for the whole day it is clear that it cannot be your intention to do this for every case because otherwise you would have to allocate speaking time to the groups even for tabling procedural motions or declarations of vote.

Rule 47 should therefore be applied given that it is inadmissible to curtail the speaking time reserved to the political groups under Rule 28, speeches for declarations of vote, procedural motions, etc.

Mr President, I thank you for the patience with which you and the honorable Member have followed this attempt of mine...

(*Interruption by Mr Barbi*)

Mr Barbi, there certainly are limits; your intelligence has its limits, try not to exceed them.

**President.** — Under the Rules of Procedure Mr Carossino has 10 minutes speaking time. This does not change the decision taken yesterday. Parliament can, by a majority decision, reduce the speaking time laid down in the Rules of Procedure. It would, of course, be better if that did not happen, but as long as Parliament has so much work to complete all we can do is either prolong the part-session or reduce speaking time. *Tertium non datur*, to use a language which, I am sure, Mr Pannella understands.

I call Mr Carossino.

**Mr Carossino.** — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, combining the debate on the question tabled by me and other Members in the Communist Group on the crisis in the shipbuilding industry with consideration of the proposals for decisions on Community aid for restructuring or conversion investment in the shipbuilding industry and in the man-made fibre textile industry unquestionably helps to highlight the urgency and importance of this debate.

The urgency stems from the fact that this sector has for some time been in a crisis situation throughout the world and that developments in maritime transport last year have worsened the situation and impaired prospects of recovery.

The crisis is clearly far from being overcome and the Commission's proposals for tackling it, in so far as they do contain anything positive, seem partial and inadequate.

Above all, these proposals must be judged too late and out of phase in relation to the crisis period. Shipyard orders began to fall as far back as 1974. In the meantime, the effects of the crisis have made themselves felt in the Community countries with the loss of over 50 000 jobs and further deterioration in the already precarious financial situation of many yards.

The proposals are inadequate on the financial level in that they make provision for aid totalling 17m European u.a. in the 1978 budget and 10m European u.a. in the 1979 budget in payment appropriations for the two sectors. The man-made fibre industry would seem likely to absorb the major part of the available sums so that very little would remain available for the shipyards.

The arrangements are also unsatisfactory because they do not specify how these appropriations should be divided up nor the yardsticks that would be used to judge the eligibility of the different programmes.

Now it seems to us, precisely because of the scale and gravity of the crisis that, what is necessary is not

## Carossiono

recourse to limited or partial aid but a full-scale strategy of an overall kind which would define and coordinate aid for the restructuring and conversion of all industries in crisis situations using the instruments already available to the Community, namely the Social Fund, the Regional Fund and European Investment Bank.

Instead, the measure in favour of the shipbuilding industry seems to me to take the shape mainly of a programme of aid for reorganization as though this were the inevitable consequence of the crisis.

We are fully aware of the gravity of the situation and the need to tackle the problems involved in the processes of industrial conversion and restructuring with realism but we also feel that the pursuit of the objective of restoring conditions of efficiency, productivity and higher levels of production quality in European shipyards cannot and should not be dissociated from the objective of protecting levels of employment.

What is more — as Members know — medium and long-term forecasts on the demand for shipping and new craft are relatively difficult to arrive at because they are affected by a number of variables closely dependent on trends in world trade and economic growth. At the moment things are not going well, but they could very well change in the near future. This, incidentally, is what happened in the sixties — a point we should not forget — when, on the insistence of the Community, the Italian shipbuilding industry was persuaded to reorganize on the very eve of the biggest boom that has ever happened in the history of shipping. It is not, of course, a matter of deluding ourselves that more favourable times are returning but of acting to stimulate and encourage tendencies of which the signs are already apparent — such as the increase in short and medium-distance trades, the measures that various countries are taking to increase the safety of ships and to reduce the dangers of pollution, the constraints brought about by the energy crisis with regard to reducing costs and fuel consumption — which help to accelerate the ageing of shipping and the introduction of more advanced technologies for ship engines and the ships themselves.

For these reasons we feel that the Community should not confine itself to suggesting drastic reorganization of production capacity but that what is wanted instead is a shrewd policy designed to encourage a selective demand for new ships and at the same time — as has been proposed by the rapporteur for the committee — to limit the adverse effects due to the restructuring process by encouraging diversification of production in Europe's traditional shipbuilding activities.

In Italy's case, it is clear that this strategy is a compulsory choice for a number of reasons.

Firstly for, so to speak, strategic reasons relating to the security of supplies and the independence of its

foreign trade. Italy, in fact, has already carried out a reorganization programme for its own fleet. In 1970, Italian shipowners accounted for 3.3 % of the world fleet and by 1978 this had fallen to 2.8 %.

The Italian merchant fleet's contribution to the sea transport balance affecting our country is only 26 % of seaborne imports. This implies heavy expenditure helping to worsen our country's already precarious financial situation.

Then there is the problem of age. Compared with world averages, the Italian merchant fleet's age group breakdown is one of the oldest there is.

The Italian shipbuilding industry was restructured in the sixties and if it now had to reduce still further, below its present limited production capacity, it would incur the risk of losing any independent capacity to renew the national fleet and falling below the minimum threshold necessary to regain optimum efficiency in shipyard output.

Lastly, there are the various socio-economic realities of the Community that must be borne in mind. The shipyards at Castellammare in Campania, Palermo in Sicily and Taranto in Puglia are in peripheral and disadvantaged areas. In some cases they are the only major production activity in regions with high unemployment rates.

But in other Italian regions as well — Liguria (my own region), Tuscany, le Marche, Veneto, and Friuli Venezia Giulia — seaport and shipyard activities form the connective tissue in a system that has built up during the course of decades and sometimes centuries and on which their economic and social equilibrium was and still is based.

For all these reasons, and because of the strategic importance of the shipbuilding industry in these areas, it is essential to have more effective measures than those now being applied and which are not simply forms of aid and support but include coordinated initiatives linked to strict transport policy planning criteria, more particularly in the maritime, port and shipyard industries.

In its last part-session, Parliament studied the employment situation in the Community and in every speech concern was expressed at a situation that was tending to worsen and in which there were over 6 million people already out of work.

Well now, in the shipbuilding and related industries the number of jobs under threat in the next few years will exceed 100 000 according to the most conservative estimate, to which have to be added a few thousand more in the steel and man-made fibre industries.

For these reasons, we support the request made in the motion for a resolution by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs which recommends

**Carossino**

the formulation of a global policy for the next five years regarding aid for restructuring and conversion in the industries in difficulties.

We consider that the European Parliament should use all the powers at its disposal to bring pressure to bear on the Council and impel it to finally approve the basic regulation for aid to industry, taking into account the comments and proposals which Parliament itself made at the time on the basis of a report by Mr Spinelli.

With regard to the shipbuilding industry we feel that the Council should approve the communication from the Commission regarding an action designed to promote the scrapping and building of deep-sea ships as a matter of urgency in order to sustain the demand for ships from Community shipyards.

These, Mr President, are the proposals that we wished to set forth because we are convinced that the Community will be able to surmount the difficulties and the disintegrating tendencies that it is encountering only if it succeeds in focusing its own efforts on reactivating investment policy in order to get the economy moving again and to accelerate the process of Community integration.

**President.** — I wish to point out that there are forty-five names on the list of speakers for today's proceedings. I therefore propose to close the list of speakers at 11.30 a.m.

I call Mr Seal on a point of order.

**Mr Seal.** — I would like to raise a point of order, Mr President. A number of amendments to this report have actually been drafted. Could you tell me when these amendments will be distributed to Members so that we can see which of them we would prefer to support?

**President.** — The draft amendments are at this moment being translated so they can be distributed to Parliament, probably during the lunch-break.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Mr President, you have told us when they will be distributed. I would like to ask when they will be spoken to under the Rules because otherwise we shall not be able to vote on them.

**President.** — The Secretariat can only state that they will be distributed during the proceedings. Mr Pannella, I therefore suggest that you refrain from speaking about the draft amendments until they are distributed.

The list of speakers will be closed at 11.30 a.m.

I call Mr Davignon.

**Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission.** — (F) Mr President, in view of the time allotted to the Commission I would prefer not to speak now but to reply to the various speakers all at once. If I do not do this, since its speaking time has been limited, the Commission will not be able to make a worthwhile contribution to the debate.

**President.** — Mr Almirante has put down a question for Question Time on the same topic and may therefore speak before the other speakers.

I call Mr Almirante.

**Mr Almirante.** — (I) Mr President, what I wanted to ask is this. Having tabled a question I will need to know the Commission's reply before I can give my speech any substance. Otherwise all I can do is to speak to my question again and there is no need for that because it was printed and issued yesterday during Question Time. I therefore ask you to call me to speak after the Commission has replied to my question as well.

**President.** — Mr Almirante, you will be called to speak after Mr Davignon has answered the other speakers.

**Mr Almirante.** — (I) Mr President, I agree and thank you for your clarification. I would ask you to bear in mind — I shall not take advantage of it because I shall speak very briefly — that my time in this case should not be put down to the non-attached. It will be the time — and very short I assure you — allowed me to reply to the Commission as the Member submitting the question. In short my speaking time in this case will not affect the time allocated to the non-attached and the Rule applying to me in this case will be Rule 47 and not 28. I repeat that I have no intention of taking advantage of this; I shall speak very briefly indeed.

**President.** — Mr Almirante, your proposal has been noted.

I call Mr Delors to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Delors.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this debate gives the Socialist Group an opportunity to plead for an overall concept of industrial cooperation in the Community. As we know, this is a vital question for the future and the prosperity of our countries. It is a difficult subject because until now it has not been possible to create a general framework likely to benefit Community action and derive from it all the social and economic effectiveness of which it is capable.

## Delors

In so doing, we are not ignoring past experience or the efforts made by the Commission, sometimes successfully, or the positive start that has been made on such projects as Airbus and the Ariane rocket. In other words, our approach is neither dogmatic nor unrealistic. It is based on the idea that action by public and private undertakings and national intervention would achieve better results if supported and supplemented by a genuine Community policy. And Mr Jenkins showed the same sentiments this morning when he too called for stronger Community action. Hence the suggestion made by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs that an own-initiative report should be drawn up to permit the creation of this stimulating, forward-looking and operational framework. But at this juncture I must say that, as the Socialist Group sees it, such Community action will be worthwhile only if the industrial policy aspect assumes a more finalized form and becomes more cohesive, more global and also more future-oriented.

To begin with, the more finalized form. Neither the redeployment nor the development of our industries will serve any purpose unless these objectives include, as the top priority, the right to work and the fight against regional imbalances. But the programmes submitted to us would have a deplorable tendency to overlook these aspects. We never forget that we are here to take account of the anxiety and suffering of all those who are the victims of restructuring and to help them to find employment and confidence in the future again. My colleagues of the Socialist Group who have put down amendments, will underline this aspect, which is fundamental in our eyes, of the horrendous problems facing the workers in our industries and the regions from which they come.

Do I need to remind the House that one of the reasons why the Socialist Group rejected the 1980 budget was the refusal by the Council of Ministers to include in it the amounts required to finance a social programme worthy of the name for the iron and steel industry?

Today we denounce the same deficiency in the still very vague proposals that have been presented to us for the textile and shipbuilding industries. Nothing is said, moreover, of the threat faced by the already disadvantaged regions or the regions with but one industry, as is often the case with shipbuilding — due to the absence of any dynamic policy for the creation of new activities.

But we also want a more cohesive policy which would come closer to removing our anxieties. How, for example, can we agree today to Community action in the shipbuilding sector and forget that we European parliamentarians have in our briefcases a more ambitious scrap and build plan. Would it not be preferable to tackle all these things together, the redevelopment aids, the new building programmes and also the necessary links with the European sector of maritime trans-

port, because too often spreading the aid granted only strengthens the fleets of our competitors and neglects the interests of our own ships and our own cargoes? That would be more dynamic and more cohesive, just as a horizontal approach to the various means of action we have — the Social Fund, the Regional Fund, the European Investment Bank and also an industrial fund still to be set up — would be more cohesive.

We also want a global policy. As Mr Spinelli's report of March 1979 on Community aid to restructuring and redevelopment indicated, it is necessary, but not sufficient, to put into effect all the provisions of the Treaty of Rome. Without waiting for a new Treaty to be drawn up, which will undoubtedly prove essential in this field one day, the Commission should be able to take account of all the parameters of global action and scale. The coordination of public contracts, the setting of European standards, more extensive harmonization of aids, a joint effort in research, a common and far more offensive external policy. If we do not have this, whatever the quality of our undertakings and of our national interventions, we will allow our handicap to increase, particularly *vis-à-vis* the United States and Japan.

And finally, the Socialist Group would like to see a future-oriented policy. To govern is to foresee. The future of our countries will also depend on their ability to make full use of the potentials of science and technology. The exploitation of the seas, biogenetics, the new means of transport and also the new information technologies, a field in which I should like to welcome the action taken by the Commission, while repeating that it will not succeed unless the Community provides itself with the operational framework which it at present lacks.

To revert to the subject proper of the report being debated today, I should like to add that the sole purpose of the amendments tabled by the Socialist Group is to illustrate the positions of principle which have just been described. Firstly, the desire for an active social policy implemented simultaneously with the restructuring and redevelopment measures, a social policy which follows the destiny of the workers as closely as the destiny of the harder hit regions, where new activities must be introduced. Secondly, the call for democratic control, prior control when it is a question of deciding the orientation and criteria for the granting of aid, subsequent control by Parliament when the success of Community action is to be evaluated. In the same spirit, it seems to me, thought should be given to regular consultation within the special sectoral committees of the European Trade Union Confederation and of the employers' organizations. If these amendments, the importance of which must be measured against the principles involved, are not adopted, the Socialist Group will feel obliged to reject the draft opinion that has been presented to us.

## Delors

But, ladies and gentlemen, I do not think it would be possible for me to conclude my statement without appealing to the political will of Europeans. Is it not extraordinary and incredible that the Ministers for Industry have never met since the Community came into existence to state their points of view on industrial problems and to examine the many proposals made by the Council or the Commission? That is why, and I now turn to the representatives of the Council, I would urge them to take a decision to form and arrange for the regular meeting of a Council of Industry, whose mission it would be to press politically for and organize Community action, and to provide it with that multiplier effect to be found in the efforts of the Member States and industry.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we are on the eve of a third industrial revolution, one that is full of peril but also full of promise. We should not allow Europe, faced with this gigantic challenge, to be late yet again to join the fight.

**President.** — Your request to the Industry Ministers will probably be forwarded by the Council representatives who are present.

I call Mr Barbi to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD).

**Mr Barbi.** — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in my view the Assembly ought to approve the motion for a resolution tabled by Sir David Nicolson and Miss Forster. First and foremost, because it deplores the fact that the Council has not yet formulated any proposal for a regulation on so difficult a subject as restructuring and conversion in the industries in difficulties, which the mounting problems of the present economic situation are making increasingly serious. The absence of such a proposal is a grave matter not only because it severely cripples Parliament's budgetary powers, as our Committees on Budgets and on Economic and Monetary Affairs have pointed out, but even more because it deprives the economies of our nine countries of a Community policy in this field — as has already been stressed by other Members speaking a little while ago — in which disturbing and not merely economic but also social and human imbalances are apparent. There is therefore an urgent need to frame an overall policy on aid for restructuring and conversion in these crisis-hit industries.

I cannot help expressing my disappointment, Mr President, that precisely now when we are levelling criticisms at the Council there is not a single representative of the Council here.

For the above reasons I, too, feel that Parliament should approve and support the Commission's initiative calling for this policy to be set in motion even should the Council fail to adopt any regulations. But since we know that one of the reasons — perhaps the

main one — why the Council has so far been reluctant to take any decision is the concern that the extent of Community aid for restructuring and conversion might become excessive if the economic crisis persists and spreads, we feel we must also endorse the recommendation of the rapporteurs to the effect that the Commission should construct a well-defined overall policy in this sector for the next five or ten years — in other words a medium-term policy. What we have to do therefore is to be as clear as possible about the scale of the aid that will be necessary, define its limits and envisage what it will mean in terms of finance. In other words we have to devise a new instrument that will develop and give force to new Community policies with restructuring and investment objectives.

In any case, I am under no doubt that the European Community must intervene in these sectors that, as we can see, are being badly hit by the present changes in the international division of labour. It is certainly very clear that none of our individual countries can cope with this problem on its own and that they could well find themselves following mistaken, costly and counterproductive policies.

We need to know — as a Community — where restructuring is needed, where we need to modernize and bring our technology up to date and where, on the contrary, we need to convert, in other words reduce production capacities and look for alternative activities. We have to choose — as a Community — the strategic sectors that must not be abandoned or cut back, and those which, instead, can be left alone without concern because of their lack of economic and political importance.

Aid for the textile industry and particularly for man-made fibres is necessary and urgent — necessary because of the features of the crisis in that industry outlined in the study by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and urgent because of the economic and social problems created by the crisis which is also having severe repercussions on other industries. Hence the need for us to overcome the present deadlock between the Commission and the Council and to approve without delay the request of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs not to postpone or delay the implementation of these programmes.

In the shipbuilding field, particularly, it seems to me that we cannot lightheartedly shut down yards which we may perhaps need again in a very short time — as happened only a few years ago. In any case this cannot be done in those areas where drastic cuts in production capacity have already been made only a short time ago. In the last few years, as Mr Carossino recalled, what we call the Caron plan was applied in our country and that brought about the closure of some big yards. Born as I was in Trieste, I would

**Barbi**

remind you of the shutdown of the San Marco yard which had been one of the glorious traditional features of the city. In such areas, shipbuilding is an irreplaceable economic flywheel. I am thinking about Castellammare in the Naples area, Taranto in Puglia and Palermo in Sicily. In this connection, since any shutdown of shipyards — though already reduced to what they now are — is inconceivable in the south of Italy since, above all, it would be in flagrant and violent contrast to regional policy and the policy of economic convergence that the European Economic Community says it wants to intensify and improve, I request that, for these undertakings, the Commission should explicitly plan not conversion but the necessary aid for restructuring and technological modernization to put them in a position to stand up to competition on the international markets captured by producers with low and often very low labour costs. And I think that the same criterion applies to a large part of the UK shipbuilding industry.

I also feel that the scrap and build programme proposed by the Commission is also valuable because it is aimed at regenerating the flow of orders from our own shipowners. I hope that the difficulties raised by the German and Danish governments on this point will be overcome and that this useful path may also be taken.

Lastly, I too urge the Commission to coordinate national and Community financing and incentive measures with the maximum possible efficiency in order to prevent not only duplication and misuse but also any form of distortion in free competition, because it must be borne in mind that, apart from anything else, these sectors are largely occupied by State-owned or partly owned undertakings.

**President.** — I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mrs Kellett-Bowman.** — Mr President, the Nicolson-Forster report raises the question whether the synthetic-fibre sector is worthy of priority treatment, both in its own right and when compared with other industrial sectors in difficulty.

Now the *Financial Times* is not a cheap tabloid given to scare-mongering. It is a factual newspaper respected throughout the world, and so it was alarming to see its centre page — a four-page spread — on 10 January headed, 'Half of Europe's Textile Jobs at Risk in the 1980's', and on 4 February, 'Europe's Textile Industry Faces the Storm.' Textiles desperately need help, and as a survey of 400 companies published yesterday found, textiles are facing a deeper recession than other manufacturing industries.

But we are talking today of restructuring. What is the use of restructuring for a market which is being virtually destroyed by unfair American pricing policy? In such circumstances, as fast as we restructure other parts fall into bankruptcy. We are losing the battle.

The import penetration by US fibres, yarns and cloth was limited until the last quarter of 1978, when America went into the dual pricing of energy feedstocks in a big way, which gave an initial advantage of between 30 % and 40 % to US producers. This works out at roughly 20 % saving on a finished product as it reaches the consumer.

The report on page 9 refers to naphtha derived from oil as being the prime raw material for synthetic fibres, and so it is in Europe. But the House will be aware that the US industry, for historical reasons when they had more gas than they could possibly use, is based 30 % on naphtha and 70 % on liquid gases. The proportion is, of course, more than the reverse in the UK, which is 90 % dependent on naphtha, and no amount of restructuring will alter this.

Because of the United States' demand for aromatics for lead-free petrol, the world price of naphtha has risen much faster than gas, and not only is the European textile industry hampered because of its greater dependence on naphtha but the American system of dual pricing, both of naphtha and of gas, accentuates the European disadvantage.

The UK market is especially endangered because of the organization of the market, which is heavily dependent on a few huge chain-stores where the US is currently mopping up all the orders of textiles, including PVC-coated products and carpets, because of the competitive edge given by dual pricing.

It is now agreed by the Community that it is absolutely vital that immediate steps be taken by means of a countervailing duty or quotas on this matter. If this were not done, the so-called restructuring of the European textile industry would be a total waste of time as company after company closed down.

It is disappointing, I must say, Mr President, that the Community is not tackling this problem together. Nevertheless, it is helpful that the Commission has agreed that the UK has a special problem and is now able to take unilateral action to reduce unfair US imports, so that a restructured industry, when this occurs, can in fact survive.

The restructuring measures before us today, however, brings restructuring aid only to a small part of the European textile industry, mainly in Italy. The problems elsewhere are equally acute — particularly, as the rapporteur said, in Northern Ireland and North-West England, and help must be extended in the very near future to these regions, some of which have 50 % of their jobs in textiles. Only last month one company in my constituency closed down and another went on short time, and this week another is closing.

When considering restructuring, we must bear in mind the problems which new entrants to the European Community will pose to the textile industry. My

**Kellett-Bowman**

group has suggested that the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning should undertake an 'own-initiative' report on the implications of enlargement on the regions, and I hope that this will be permitted, because only if we know the full implications of enlargement can we know what restructuring will be required. It is also essential that EEC regulations are rigidly applied to such places as Korea and Iron Curtain countries.

This regulation is a prototype for future regulations and therefore its terms are very important. Article 33 requires on-the-spot checks, and this must be rigorously enforced. Any member refusing to allow such checks should be denied all further aid.

One thing is certain, we cannot allow an industry to die which employs, directly or indirectly, a tenth of the working population of the Community. Action is urgent and I and my group very much welcome the fact that the European Parliament has recognized this fact by singling out this industry for special help. I very much hope that it will not be a case of too little too late. I wish the regulation and the report and the excellent work done by the rapporteurs the very best of luck.

**President.** — I call Mrs De March.

**Mrs de March.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the shipbuilding industry is facing a crisis. Its disease has been called by the policies of austerity, national desertion, implemented in each of the Member States. Its disease is caused by Community projects that set out to scuttle it.

In October 1979 the French members of the Communist and Allies Group expressed the hope in an oral question that a debate might be held on the new European projects relating to the shipbuilding and ship repair industries. Today we have a report by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs stating that the shipbuilding sector is eligible for Community restructuring and redevelopment aids.

To what end? For 'recycling to new industries', according to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

And then, even before our Assembly has been able to state its views on the new Davignon scrapping-building plan, we find before us proposals for Community subsidies to speed up the closure of shipyards, a programme for human and economic wastage including further redundancies.

And they talk to us about 'redressing crisis-hit economies'.

The various European plans and the one introduced in 1975 did not put a stop to these crises; quite the contrary. While the capitalists got out of the crisis almost scot-free, the half-yearly report by the Commis-

sion in Brussels shows that, for the whole of the Community the number of jobs in this sector fell by 50 500 between 1975 and 1978.

And the need for a 'long-term strategy aimed at meeting the requirements of the market' leads the Commission to estimate at 50 000 the number of redundancies European shipyards still have to face.

What logic can produce a prospect of this kind? Your criteria of viability, gentlemen of the Commission, are linked to the profits of the multinationals. We, for our part, challenge the term 'over-capacity' and the use made of the oil crisis as a pretext by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs to allow massive unemployment and national decline. 'Giving the viable part of the shipbuilding industry a chance to survive', you call it.

What you call international competitiveness are the conditions of the market, the laws of competition, where the profitability of capital is the only determining factor and no reference is made to the interests of the people, to any rationality. The Community seal is in fact no more than the banner of subservience to the interests of the multinationals. In this present-day piracy the field is thus left to the American, Japanese and Greek shipowners.

This makes it easier to understand why the real reasons for enlargement are being concealed. On 20 November in Brussels, before the Foreign Ministers, Commissioner Davignon outlined the fundamental reasons for the new Community plan, the value of which, the Commissioner said, lies in the assistance that can be given to the Greek shipowners, most of whose ships are more than fifteen years old, but whose fleet accounts for 70 % of the European total.

Most of these ships fly flags of convenience. In France we still remember the ecological catastrophe of the *Amoco Cadiz*. Nevertheless the crew of the *Tofalos*, a Greek ship flying a flag of convenience, took over the vessel in Saint-Malo this week because there were no safety arrangements, the ship was unhygienic and there was no decent food for the crew. That's human rights in what is known as the 'free' world for you. They fought for their wages and their dignity, and they won.

Was it not at the colloquy of the European Economic Community in Marseilles on 11 October of last year that American shipowners declared: 'Flags of convenience do not represent a problem but a safer, more economic solution, a means of muzzling the demands of seamen's unions.'

We solemnly reassert today that the economic plans for our country must not be decided in Brussels. The Davignon plan will have cost 5 138 jobs in France, 2 500 of them in my region, Provence-Côte d'Azur, and thousands in the Marseilles repair yards. This is an intolerable waste of human beings.

**De March**

This has found expression in the shutdown of the productive machinery, despite large amounts of public aid. Since the beginning of this year the sea, an area that allows communication, has become a stake in the economic game. With the aim of cutting back, restructuring, causing redundancies, achieving a continuous decline in production the French Government grants millions to the shipbuilders without public control and has ships built abroad. At the same time, the United States of America applies safeguard measures to protect its merchant navy and provides itself with the means to compete with and dominate our market.

Yesterday in Marseilles, in my region, the workers of the shipbuilding industry faced charging police outside the regional council in defense of their jobs. As a Communist deputy I support the struggle undertaken by the workers, engineers and managers who demand of our Government real steps to force the French companies to build, repair and sail French, and this at a time when in France freight levels are on the decline, while 1 500 000 gross register would be required to ensure my country's commercial independence and meet its demand for ships and ensure full employment.

Rejecting the social consensus, these shipbuilding and repair workers are continuing their fight and are thus opposed to the supranational projects for European integration. They are defending the great maritime calling of France and the future of our regions.

The fundamental cause of this crisis in the shipbuilding industry is in fact to be found in the policies aimed at austerity, redeployment of profits and above all the maintenance of a growth rate which makes it impossible for this sector to resume production and consumption. In the face of the Community measures envisaged in order, you say, to prevent the 'fragmentation of national measures', we in France reject the 'side-effect' of the solutions to the crisis and the new Community projects. It is at home that we call on the French Government to respect the merchant navy plan and to ensure that the subsidies granted by the Community — which would serve to conceal national industries willingness to go into liquidation — are not in any way ambiguous.

We the French members of the Communist and Allies Group defend the basic interests of the working class in our country. Those interests are indissolubly linked to national interest, to a major policy of independence going hand in hand with international cooperation and also with a new world economic order. It is in France that we stand by our shipyards, the reduction of working time, the achievement of new rights, the introduction of genuine democracy at the place of work. We fully agree with the democratic call that has emerged from our major shipyards and been taken up by the people of our regions: 'Build, transport, sail French.'

Yes, our shipbuilding industries do have a future. We for our part have the know-how of our workers, engineers, managers and technicians and considerable assets for the maintenance of our yards and research departments, for the development of maritime activities and of our economic potential in line with the future exploitation of the seas. Every day, as our people continue their fight, this future is being built to meet the need of our country and of this Europe for social progress, to achieve which we have committed ourselves to act, to put a stop to the plans for unemployment, austerity, industrial demolition adopted by the European Community.

**President.** — I call Mr Damseaux to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mr Damseaux.** — (*F*) Mr President, Mr Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, on the subject of Community action in favour of the textile and shipbuilding industries I should like to make in essence four remarks. Like the report, I regret the absence of a general policy on aid to the restructuring and redevelopment of all crisis-hit industries but I admit that the two sectors we are discussing today really deserve priority treatment, even if the Council has not yet thought it worthwhile to adopt a general basic regulation. My first remark concerns the plan presented by the Commission, which sets out to ensure both the modernization of the existing industries and the reduction of production capacity. Modernization of existing industry, because in recent years too few investments have been made and freight capacity has fallen because the world is suffering from endemic overcapacity. Demand has fluctuated with the closing and re-opening of the Suez Canal, the oil crisis and the economic recession, without having any effect on freight capacity.

On the contrary: in the newly industrialized countries capacity has aggravated the present situation. It may be asked why Taiwan and South Korea have made massive investments in the shipbuilding sector. The answer is that the companies concerned employ a substantial workforce, and another factor to be considered is the direct effect they have on employment in the iron and steel industry, for example.

We must therefore realize what indirect effects a reduction in measures for the shipbuilding industry would have on other sectors, while also bearing in mind the paradoxical situation we must face on the one hand, there is no reduction in capacity, on the other, a new balance has been struck in the world in that Japan's share fell from 46 % in 1970 to 34 % in 1978 and the share of Western Europe, including the Community countries, from 43 to 35 %, whereas the Third World's share rose from 11 to 30 %.

Secondly, I venture to draw your attention to the way in which our countries treat the development of

**Damseaux**

regions traditionally dependent on shipbuilding. Rather than trying to establish a Community policy, it must be admitted that each country has always faced the temptation of withdrawing into itself and adopting measures of a radically protectionist type and that today our Governments are engaged in a veritable credit war with little or no consideration given to the effects such a policy can have on other countries and other regions.

Building a ship represents a major investment, but at the moment we have shipbuilders who are selling their products at incredible prices, forgoing payments in the first few years and charging abnormally low interest rates, which bear no relation to the rates charged on the market in the ensuing years. I have no hesitation in asserting that the present situation has the air of an economy controlled by the governments rather than of a market economy, of which my group and I myself remain firm supporters.

We must revert to a market economy and again respect the laws of competition. We must have the courage to realize that certain yards must be closed, simply because we are no longer able to compete with other markets due to our production costs and principally the cost of labour. It should be remembered, for example, that the cost may vary by 40 % depending on whether a ship is built in Taiwan or in Denmark. In a sound economy such distortions cannot be tolerated indefinitely without endangering the overall economic and budgetary equilibrium of our Community and its Member States.

Thirdly, if we reduce our production capacity, we must take account of the regional aspects of our policy. It is illusory to imagine that we can reduce production capacity at each yard in a linear fashion, by a third or a quarter for example, and also believe that because a region has always depended on shipbuilding or textiles, it must do so for ever.

Companies must be closed down even if the economy improves. The challenge we face will be simultaneously to ensure the improvement of companies that have remained both modern and competitive and to keep alive companies which play a vital role in their region pending its industrial redevelopment. We will have difficult choices to make in various situations, but I feel that competitiveness must have priority over certain regional situations in the long-term interests of regional balance and of the regions themselves, because government programmes will not be able to restore competitiveness and know-how where it no longer exists.

I am sure that our British colleagues, for example, will face these facts, if only when they think of the position of their car industry. Where we must close down plants in regions very much dependent on ship-

building or textiles, regional development plans that ensure the establishment of sound and competitive undertakings in those regions must be drawn up.

Fourthly and lastly, the textile industry has long had to contend with social dumping by the developing countries, and today it faces economic dumping not only by the developing countries but by developed countries like the United States, which by selling oil products to the manufacturers of man-made fibres at preferential prices artificially aggravate the situation in the Community. On behalf of the Nine, the Commission should discuss this matter with the Americans with the aim of putting an end to these concealed and unfair aids, which are harmful to our industry.

To conclude, Mr President, I should like to make two observations. We have not tabled any amendments, but I should like to say two things about the explanatory statement. The first concerns point 34, which refers to the development industries. We are afraid that this might give rise to a policy of 'picking the winners', to which we cannot subscribe, since on the one hand it would involve the risk of misplaced investments and distortions of competition and, on the other hand, it would amount to state interventionism. My second observation concerns point 42, the present wording of which seems to us very general, since it would too easily permit the wide-scale use of a free interpretation of the rules of competition contained in the Treaty. Agreements that temporarily restrict competition cannot be allowed unless they are essential to the restructuring that is needed and are accompanied by a commitment regarding the measures to be taken in this regard.

The Liberal and Democratic Group of the European Parliament will vote in favour of the motion for a resolution tabled on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs by the rapporteurs, Sir David Nicolson and Miss Forster, both of whom I should like to thank and congratulate on the quality of their work.

**President.** — I call Mr Poncelet to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

**Mr Poncelet.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my remarks will principally concern the provisions included in the motion for a resolution now before us that relate to what is known as the restructuring of the textile industry. The provisions proposed by the Commission with regard to aid credits for the redevelopment of the textile sector, and particularly the chemical fibre sector, are, it must be admitted, interesting.

That is why I say straightaway that the Commission should be in a position to allocate as soon as possible and also on good terms the payment appropriations

## Poncelet

which are earmarked for this purpose and which, I would remind the House, were entered in the 1979 budget. On the other hand, it is essential that the financial action taken by the Community in a field that is so indispensable for the textile industry, a particularly sensitive and exposed sector, should not be reserved, as seems to be the case — and I should like some assurance on this subject — solely for the man-made fibre industry.

In addition, I should like to have here and now a commitment from the Council or the Commission that the benefit of the financial operations will be extended without reservation to all sectors and all branches of the European textile industry. However, these operations, which I have said are interesting, will be effective only if they form part of a genuine and cohesive European textile policy, which, ladies and gentlemen, I regret to say — and I shall explain my point in a moment — is not the case.

It will be remembered that, very late in the day admittedly, a textile policy was established in December 1977 by the Community's Council of Ministers, in other words before the massive, unreasonable influx of imported textile products at low prices from countries not having a social system — I shall not name them: that has already been done, and I shall be generous enough not to repeat the list — and these imports have had the disastrous consequence of eliminating hundreds, if not thousands of jobs, mostly in the Member States of our Community which have a sizeable textile industry.

The application of the policy to which I have referred involves something known as 'globalization', which was defined very belatedly. The Commission's task was therefore to conclude the necessary agreements in the form of multi-fibre agreements, association agreements, or commercial contracts with the State-trading countries of Eastern Europe. At the same time, and rightly, I realize, the textile industries were urged to carry out the restructuring required to modernize their plants so that they might be more competitive while avoiding, of course, excessive production capacities in a market where consumption is, as we know, stagnating.

But after the establishment of this policy in 1977, what do we find today? On the one hand, the Community's Council agreed in 1979 to new textile agreements imposing new quantitative limits on imports, which have resulted in the global ceilings laid down in the policy previously adopted being exceeded by a large margin. I would point out that these new imports have been particularly harmful to cotton products manufactured by the Community's industries. I am referring, of course, to the agreements concluded after 1977 with China, Greece and certain Mediterranean countries.

Is it really, ladies and gentlemen, a good policy for Europe to leave to third countries the job of supplying

all or most of such basic consumer goods as textile products? Moreover, I am afraid that the lax attitude towards textile imports noted at frontiers in 1979 is likely to seriously jeopardize the major efforts made by the European textile industry and to increase the risks to those, and there are many of them, who had confidence in the commitments that had been given and invested as they had been asked to do and as I said a moment ago. These industrialists, who had confidence in the decisions taken by the Council, are now rightly wondering what purpose their efforts served, and they feel that their investments have been commitments to a lost cause.

I should like to point out that the first figures available to me in fact indicate a revival in investment, as was hoped and for which facilities had been provided, in the European textile industry, notably in Italy, in the Federal Republic, where investments have increased by more than 15 %, and in certain sectors in France, where the increase has been over 20 %.

Ladies and gentlemen, a situation like this cannot go on. Whether we are talking about public or private financing, so uncohesive a European textile policy will, if it continues, result in a waste of public and private finances in the Community and in major losses of the jobs we are trying to protect and I would refer in this respect to the excellent debate which took place in this Chamber on employment problems at European level.

But at Community level the inconsistencies I have just described are unfortunately joined by others. Thus, at the same time as the Commission is proposing that appropriations should be allocated to restructuring and redevelopment as a means of reducing surplus textile production units, it is contributing, but this time in the form of regional aids, to the financing of the introduction of new textile plants in the less favoured regions of the Community.

These new units, which are financed and maintained by countries outside the Community, the United States and Japan for example, will increase European production capacities in sectors which everyone today recognizes as being already in surplus. Moreover, these investments from outside the Community, I would point out, have been made in Community countries under abnormal conditions of competition. For example, these industrialists from outside the Community are sometimes paid subsidies equal to 35 to 55 % of the amount of investment, loans at very advantageous rates and tax reductions up to 1990. I won't go on, but these are obviously disguised aids, which distort competition.

This brings me quite naturally to put the following question to the Council and the Commission: will the European Parliament again be presented tomorrow with a proposal for an increase in the appropriations, as happened today, for the redevelopment of the textile industry at the level at which import quotas

**Poncelet**

have been granted substantial concessions, resulting in abnormal conditions of competition in some Member States of the Community?

To conclude, I demand that the textile policy established at Community level in 1977 and accepted despite the constraints it imposes by all those in positions of responsibilities in these European industries and by all the Member States be rigorously enforced today. It will be — at least this is my opinion — if the Council and Commission have the necessary will. The investments that have been made, not without some difficulty, by industrialists in the Community's Member States are in line with that policy of 'globalization' which was adopted in 1977 and fixed the import quotas that should be respected.

Any action tending away the Community textile policy adopted in 1977, through an increase in imports, through distortion of competition within the Community or through production surpluses, is unacceptable. In the long term such action would be the death of the European textile industry and in the short term it would aggravate unemployment here, which is already at an intolerable level. That is why, Mr President, I await with great interest, believe me, the Council's and Commission's answers to my various questions.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella to speak on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defense of Independent Groups and Members.

**Mr Pannella.** — (*I*) Mr President, there is no need to record my speaking time for two reasons. One is that I am not speaking on behalf of the group but on my own and the other is that I am not prepared to speak in a debate in which the Rules are broken and in which you have gagged the Members of this Parliament.

Mr President, there is a general strike in Trieste precisely because of the crisis in the shipyards. To force us to speak in this way, against the Rules, is shabby treatment to which I refuse to consent.

A Parliament that breaks its own Rules does not lay down the law but has the law laid down to it by pressure groups. This is a Rule, Mr President, which I absolutely refuse to obey and I shall not therefore speak. And it should be entered in the minutes that you are breakers of the Rules, laws and gravity of this Parliament.

**President.** — I call Mr Petronio.

**Mr Petronio.** — (*I*) Mr President, there is a point in Sir David Nicolson's report on which I would like to dwell in the short time available to me and that is his important reference to the need for specialization in European shipbuilding that can be achieved by selective conversion and restructuring.

I will focus on this aspect of the report in order to avoid the criticisms levelled at aid granted to specific crisis-hit industries — which would cause a flood of request for sectoral aid.

On the subject of specialization, I would like to deal with the specific case of the port of Trieste and its shipyards, now in a serious situation from which they could extricate themselves if enabled to give new life to their very old and solid traditions and activities.

In Trieste, the San Marco dockyards could still have a future — being the leader in the Mediterranean for the building of offshore oil platforms, special craft of the 'castor' or 'Trieste bathyscaph' type, the latter conceived and built by Professor Picard in the city of Trieste — for naval repairs and rebuilding jobs of all kinds.

In this direction, the industry — now losing against the competition in terms of both delivery and price — could grow. The San Marco dockyards require considerable investment if they are to operate at maximum efficiency and acquire the necessary competitiveness in the European context. Even so, a dry dock (No 4) is now being built which, to be finished, needs the last third of the grants promised for its construction, since otherwise the other two-thirds already spent will literally have been thrown overboard. Another point that should not be forgotten is that nothing more has been heard about the planned degasification station whereas this would be essential to the port and for the life of the dockyards. Without it there will be no way of degassing the approximately 350 tankers coming to the refineries each year which could stop in the dockyards for repairs. There is an ideal place for this station — the area near the refinery jetties.

I have quoted a concrete case of specialization, conversion and restructuring in one shipyard; but the dockyards lack other things — lifting gear, now reduced to an old gantry capable of lifting 18 tonnes at the most which, though bearing the glorious name of Ursus, cannot last much longer.

Another problem is that of the staff and the trade union situation. The yards are working at an average of five hours a day instead of the regulation eight so that it will be necessary to increase productivity and increase working hours.

In spite of these problems, Trieste is still number one in terms of capacity and it would therefore be a very serious mistake not to try to help the dockyards to prosper as much as possible by focussing above all on offshore structures, the new dry dock with the degasification station alongside and a concrete investment policy.

**President.** — I call Mr Spencer to speak on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

**Mr Spencer, draftsman of an opinion.** — Mr President, I rise to draw the attention of the House to the opinion of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment on these reports. As my voice is currently something of a crisis-hit industry in its own right, I am sure colleagues will forgive me if I am somewhat briefer than is traditional on these occasions.

The opinion of the committee draws particular attention to the need to deal with the social problems of crisis-hit industries within a coherent, properly-argued and well-administered Community industrial policy. Nothing can be worse for those faced with redundancy in such industries than the dance of uncertainty with which they have been confronted in the last few years. We stress that any Community aid must be seen in the light of our retraining programmes, of our regional and infrastructure programmes, and it goes without saying that the standards of consultation with the workforce involved must not fall short of those which we demand of others in a different context.

These industries present a very real case for Community action. The action has been sadly delayed. However one views the situation, one cannot avoid the feeling that somewhere along the line there has been dirty work at the pass. I refuse to blame either the Council or the Commission, I choose to blame both of them. Community actions in this area, if they are to be effective, must be a great deal better thought out, a great deal more certain, a great deal more closely linked to other Community policies, if they are to do anything but aggravate the situation by raising false expectations. As we talk about industrial regeneration, we are not just talking economics, we are talking about people's livelihoods, about the hopes and their fears. Your Committee on Social Affairs and Employment looks forward to the day when we have a coherent industrial policy within which those hopes may grow and those fears decline.

**President.** — I call Mr Caborn.

**Mr Caborn.** — The report presented by Sir David Nicolson and Miss Forster is correct in its criticism of the Council of Ministers for the lack of action in shipbuilding and textiles, and indeed we have heard as well the comments from the Social Affairs Committee, who are critical of the Council of Ministers and the Commission.

The whole question of industries in crisis and the direction in which we should be looking has been dealt with by Jacques Delors, my colleague: I think it was an extremely good contribution this morning and one that you might have expected to come from the Commission rather than from him.

I turn to shipbuilding and to the amendments which I have tabled on behalf of the Socialist Group. It is

unfortunate that they are not before the Assembly this morning so that we could go through them. I would like to go through the amendments in some detail, because when one looks at debates that have taken place in this Assembly, one finds that my colleague, Mr Prescott, on 18 January 1978 presented a very full picture of the shipbuilding industry, and then, on 31 July 1978, presented a 24-point programme in great detail to the Commission. This, I have no doubt, Mr Davignon will have studied, but little or no action has been taken on either of those reports; in fact one can say that the debate that is taking place this morning and this afternoon is a re-run of 18 January 1978. Two years later, all the same clichés are being used about the shipbuilding industries, whether in Italy, Germany or whatever; all the same arguments are coming out, but little or nothing is being done. Mr Prescott tried to put the matter in its proper light; it secured quite a measure of agreement amongst all Members of the Assembly at that time, but little or nothing has been done. It is therefore in view of this non-action by the Commission and the Council of Ministers that I have tabled the amendments — not to detract at all from the long-term industrial strategy that was being marked out in 1978 and which people have talked about in 1980, but because it is now extremely urgent — and 'urgent' is the word that has to be underlined — if the shipbuilding industries in some of the Member States are to be maintained as industries at all. The position is now considerably worse than it was in 1978, although we were calling for urgent action then, and Mr Prescott's report, I think, quite clearly underlines that.

The dependency and frustration felt by workers in this sector has already been indicated in this Assembly this morning, and it is growing into an angry mood. Particularly the shipyards that are on the geographical fringes of the Community believe that their very survival is at stake. We are therefore asking in the amendments for some very simple things to be done — things that have already been discussed and have already been promised. For example, in the first amendment we ask for improved standards and for a reduction in the incidence of damage to the marine and coastal environment under the IMCO regulations.

I will quote from the anniversary speech of Mr Jenkins of 13 February 1979. A draft Council decision requiring Member States to implement the IMCO guidelines on the inspection of foreign ships in their ports ran into procedural difficulties early in the year. Nevertheless, the President of the Commission announced in his programme speech of 13 February 1979 that during the first half of 1979 a proposal would be submitted to the Council for the improvement of shipping inspection in Community ports. This proposal has not materialized to date. In a statement made on behalf of the Commission on 7 September 1979, it was suggested that the Commis-

**Caborn**

sion hoped to present a proposal before the end of the year. To the best of my knowledge that has not been presented. The first part of the amendment therefore calls for the implementation of the IMCO regulations. More than that, when agreement has been reached within the Community, we believe it ought to lay down that ships which do not comply with those standards should be denied admission to Community ports. We believe it is important that we ensure safety and also protect the environment, and we believe we have got to be pretty strict about these matters within the Community.

In the second amendment we call, again in line with what the President said, for the conservation of fuel. We believe there is an urgent need for conversion from the turbine to the fuel injected engine, and it is of interest that the Japanese Ministry of Transport has set aside 40 billion yen this year for the conversion of ship engines. We believe it is an area that is important now, particularly in regard to the conservation of fuel, but it is economically and industrially sound as well.

Thirdly, there should be a complete review of the domestic credit terms given within the Community. We believe this should be done bearing in mind the policies outside the Community, but once a policy has been agreed, this should be policed within the Community on strict lines.

Fourthly, there is the question of 'Scrap and Build'. We must hurry with the 'Scrap and Build' programme, whatever form that may take. If one looks at the form which the Commission has proposed, we find that many of the ships, particularly in the United Kingdom that would have come under the 'Scrap and Build' programme have now been sold off to third countries and are flying flags of convenience. I know there are some opponents, particularly in Germany and Denmark, but if some action had been taken on this programme, then at least we should not now be seeing certain ships on the high seas which would have been affected but instead have been sold to third countries and are flying flags of convenience.

What we are asking of the Commission, Mr President, is that some urgent action be taken. The need, I can only say again, is for urgent action. Whilst not detracting from the long-term strategy, we believe that these immediate steps must be taken to ensure the survival of the shipbuilding industry in the Community.

**President.** — I call Mr Ingo Friedrich.

**Mr Ingo Friedrich.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I find it very gratifying that Parliament is again discussing the Community's subsidization policy. The crisis-hit steel sector is now followed by the shipbuilding and textile sectors. I feel — and I should like to make this quite clear — that the report now before us is an excellent work and forms an admirable basis for our statements. But we must ask

ourselves the basic question whether we should always discuss aid problems individually or whether it would not be preferable to consider them within the context of an overall aid policy. I should like to make four brief comments.

Firstly, shipbuilding and the textile industry are two sectors whose difficulties have not only been caused by external factors. No, it must be said that management itself has contributed substantially to the difficulties that have arisen by recognizing market trends too late, and, in my opinion, not reacting carefully enough.

The agricultural market, ladies and gentlemen, is for us a striking example of how a public budget cannot in the long term provide finances against the development of the market. In shipbuilding we have an overwhelming interest in an intact infrastructure. We see the need to take account of the employment situation in these undertakings and to take action.

Secondly, we do want to take short-term support measures. But it must surely be clear that they will result in almost inestimable overcapacities. I would warn those in Parliament who intend to call for controlled structural crisis cartels to be allowed.

Undertakings which are protected against the pressure exerted by the market to bring about change must realize and accept that the aid granted for this purpose is subject to strict time-limits. If they are to receive aid, the aid must therefore be granted for only a set period, and we must ensure that that period is not exceeded. The consequence will otherwise be in the long term split prices and a subsidization race.

Thirdly, with its limited resources the Community cannot solve the specific problems of specific undertakings. Its commitment is to use support measures to help the competitive situation of the market as a whole. The measures taken must also be adjusted to this end.

To conclude, I should just like to say this: if our work is always to be aligned with the principles of social market economy — and that is of decisive importance for me — it will be helpful to have an early-warning system in the form of prompt reports on the situation in crisis-hit sectors and of descriptions of the effect of conditions in the country and at the time concerned. That is a proposal I should like to make.

We should not always be intervening with our measures like some kind of fire brigade which puts out the fires of acute crises. We must achieve a situation in which we can take preventive action so that the fire does not break out in the first place, because once it has done so, it is usually too late. That would amount to closing the stable door after the horse has bolted.

**President.** — I call Mr J. D. Taylor.

**Mr John D. Taylor.** — Mr President, colleagues, I should like to begin by congratulating Sir David Nicolson and Miss Norvela Forster on the excellent report that they have presented to the House this morning, for debate this afternoon. Excellent reports they were, but one wonders if, in the context in which we discuss them today, we are actually wasting time; because, as Sir David Nicolson quite rightly pointed out, the Council has failed to approve the basic regulation, and until that vital decision is taken, little progress can be made. I think it should be recorded in passing that the Council is negligent by being unrepresented here today by a Minister to hear this important debate on the problems facing the shipbuilding and the man-made fibres industries throughout the Community.

*(Applause from certain quarters of the European Democratic Group)*

The second point, Mr President, is this: in 1978 we earmarked 17 million European units of account to aid these industries. In 1979 we earmarked 10 million units of account, and for the 1980 budget, which thankfully was rejected by this Assembly, there was a mere token entry of financial support for the man-made fibre and shipbuilding industries. So once again we are talking into thin air.

I represent as Ulster Unionist Member the constituency in Northern Ireland which is an area within the United Kingdom with the highest unemployment rate — 11% — some 60 000 out of a total of 550 000 workers are now unemployed. Two of our main industries are in fact shipbuilding and the man-made fibre industry. The shipbuilding industry, Harland and Wolfe, the largest shipbuilding yard in the United Kingdom, at one time employed 28 000 men. Today it employs only 7 000 and there is notice of further redundancies. There are only four ships currently being built in that great yard, and unless there are immediate orders in the near future there will be massive redundancies in the city of Belfast.

Likewise we have the man-made fibre industry. Northern Ireland, which had a great textile background in the linen industry, had to change over very quickly into man-made fibres during the past 20 years. We attracted, as a result of the programmes of the then Northern Ireland Government of Stormont, Dutch, German, American and French firms, employing a total of 10 000 people in the man-made fibre industry. Today that has been reduced to 6 000, with further redundancies now on notice. And so, in an area of high unemployment, of some 11%, as I have mentioned, we have a situation where we have both the man-made fibre industry and the shipbuilding industry in decline in Northern Ireland. The trade unions in our community are forecasting that we shall have 90 000 people unemployed by the end of this year — a record level for anywhere within the Community.

We are grateful indeed to Vice-President Haferkamp for coming to us in Northern Ireland last Friday and for taking such a personal and sincere interest in the problems he saw. He spent most of the day visiting our man-made fibre plants in the Carrickfergus area, and he cannot but have been impressed by the seriousness of the situation.

Of course one of our main problems is the over capacity within the Community. But additional to that, as Mrs Kellett-Bowman mentioned, is the immediate threat from cheap imports from the United States. Our government in London has sought action under Article 19 of GATT, and I do hope that there will be an early and prompt response to that invitation by the Commission within the next five days, which does in fact mean taking a decision before the end of this week.

There are a few points I would like to make in the brief moments available to me on that application by the United Kingdom Government. Firstly, there was a lack of Community spirit within the Council on the matter of dealing with cheap imports from the United States. France, the United Kingdom and Italy were the only countries which showed concern over this matter, simply because those were the three countries that are most seriously affected. The other countries, because they are not affected, showed little interest or support.

Secondly, I would like to ask the Commissioner, Mr Davignon, who is here today, how he can expect the action which the British Government intends to seek to work effectively? How is it possible for us to take unilateral action within the United Kingdom to curtail imports from the USA and prevent the other EEC countries being used as a back door for the entry into the United Kingdom of US-textile imports.

Thirdly, Mr President, I would like to stress to the Commission and to the Council of Ministers that when they consider the British application that they take into account not just the threat to the polyester industry in the United Kingdom but also the threat to tufted nylon carpets and to nylon itself. I would like to see these other two items included in the curbs package. The reason is, Mr President, that the United States' share of the United Kingdom market — not the Community market, but the United Kingdom market — for nylon carpet yarn has actually increased from 8% in 1978 to 30% in the last quarter of 1979. This is a greater increase than the share of the polyester market already achieved by the USA. Finally, on the matter of curbs on USA imports, I hope and trust that the agreed quota restrictions on imports from the USA will be related to pre-1979 conditions and will not take into consideration the large imports from the USA during 1979. To be realistic they must be related to the figures up to and including 1978.

**J.D. Taylor**

The excellent report by Sir David Nicolson and by Miss Norvela Forster noted that the Commission is examining a number of specific proposals from synthetic fibre producers to see if their projects meet the criteria for eligibility for aid under this scheme. We know of course that much of the money already earmarked has been allocated for particular projects in Italy. But I would like to enquire from the Commissioner, in view of the fact that I have been speaking especially on the situation in Northern Ireland today and in general the situation in the textile and shipbuilding industries in the United Kingdom, if it is presently considering any applications from industry within the United Kingdom.

I have great pleasure in supporting this resolution tabled in the name of my two colleagues.

**President.** — I call Mr Leonardi.

**Mr Leonardi.** — (*I*) Mr President, on behalf of the Italian Communist Party, I have to say that we are in favour of the two proposals made by the Commission and the motion for a resolution tabled by Sir David Nicolson and Miss Forster. We are in favour of the proposals because, at bottom, they represent the application of a basic regulation on which we gave our favourable opinion several months ago.

We approve the motion for a resolution by the two Members because, with their pertinent criticisms of the behaviour of the Council of Ministers and the Commission, they highlight the limits of these decisions and urge the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs of this Parliament to draw up an own-initiative report analysing the problems of industrial conversion and restructuring. With all these limitations, therefore, we are in favour of the Commission's decision proposals. We are in favour of the Community nature of the aid without regard to its limited scale or the conditions applying to it. In effect, this will be the first direct and active intervention by the Community in the industrial field, the first initiatives taken for two sectors in particular difficulty. In this way an attempt is being made to depart from the Community's traditional policy — based on intervention of a passive nature solely aimed at removing obstacles — and to allow the free expression of forces that exist in the system and that would have been in a position to ensure prosperity, employment and progress.

We feel that this phase in Community policy must be regarded as ended as proved by the present situation with its high level of unemployment and the severity of the current crisis. We must therefore switch over to a policy of active and direct intervention in order to change structural conditions and in which initiatives of a public and private nature may be taken. This is the only way, with active aid and Community

resources, that the serious problems of today and tomorrow can be tackled and resolved because they call for an enormous effort of restructuring and conversion from our countries in order to adapt to the new world context so profoundly different from that in which they developed. The small-scale aid envisaged in the two decisions we are considering have this meaning — in our view — and therefore we approve them. Above all, they introduce a new instrument of which we shall have to make good use. Our doubts, of course, concern the way in which the Commission will be using it but, if we oppose the introduction of the instruments, clearly we shall be unable to object to the way in which they are used.

It is clear that, while we support this initiative, we know perfectly well that Community action, as currently performed, tends to support established interests (and will continue to do so), in other words a system that we want to change and which, instead, pointless attempts are being made to rationalize primarily at the expense of the workers. Very often rationalization means a smaller workforce and layoffs, and sacrifices, therefore, primarily made by the workers. The present crisis is worldwide but it has a specific character in our countries where the move into a new phase of industrialization will call, in addition to effort in the new sectors, for the defence and improvement of the sectors that already exist and which up to now have employed the majority of workers. This task cannot be tackled by private cartels, which is what we have always tried to do, for the simple reason that, in that way, the crisis will not be overcome and instead, injustices and imbalances will be increased. It cannot be tackled by public aid purely at the national level. This is the path followed by our countries in the period between the two wars with results that we all know and which we, the Italian Communists absolutely refuse to repeat. These problems need to be tackled first and foremost at the Community level with Community aid, coordinated of course with national measures, and using all the instruments that already exist including the new mechanism we are trying to introduce today.

Certainly we, like others, must criticize the fact that, so far, the Council of Ministers has never thought of organizing any meetings of a Council of Ministers of Industry and also the fact that the European Investment Bank does nothing to coordinate its investments with Community and national policies. Even so we cannot refuse our support, as I have said, to the introduction of a new instrument for direct and active aid in the industrial field. We certainly do not agree with the opinion of the Commission that the main responsibility for the crisis in our shipyards, at Community level, lies with our countries' inability to maintain exports which have always formed a large proportion of the Community shipbuilding industry's activity, a fact which, according to the Commission, is due to

**Leonardi**

other countries coming to the fore in this sector. In our view, the crisis in the Community shipyards has to be seen above all as the inability to meet the transport requirements of our Community which, as everyone knows, is the biggest trading power in the world and meets 90 % of its import and export requirements by sea transport. We believe that the crisis in the shipyards stems largely from the fact that our Community has no transport policy as the result of which our shipbuilders are unable to arrange for the necessary specialization to meet the Community's requirements in particular and, on that basis, to recover their export business.

The same could be said for man-made fibres, which cannot be seen as a separate sector but solely as a part of the broader whole of the chemicals and textile industry working to meet Community requirements. In substance, the problem to be solved is the choice of whether the new instrument that we are creating will be used to repeat the faults of public aid at national level generally aimed at covering up private enterprise failures, or whether it will be used to tackle new problems in a new way, in other words to apply to a new world the great potential of far-reaching conversion and restructuring of our Community's economy and above all its industry.

For these reasons we feel that the Commission cannot continue to use this new instrument solely for emergency aid as at present but that it must think about fully-fledged sectoral policies. We know that, in this field, our opinion differs from that of the Commission and the Council of Ministers. To confine ourselves to horizontal policies means, in substance, purely trying to alter the conditions in which existing forces of both private initiative and public aid may express themselves; but limiting ourselves to horizontal policies as is now the intention, means repeating old mistakes in a new way and this will very quickly demonstrate their complete inefficiency and incapability.

**President.** — I call Mrs Ewing.

**Mrs Ewing.** — Mr President, the causes of the crisis in the shipbuilding industries in all the Member States have already been talked about and explained. We know that the aggressive attitude of Japan's trade policy and other Eastern countries has been partially responsible. We have all watched this happen. Now we have poor prospects for new orders, and there is a gap between the selling prices we can look for in the world market and the production costs in yards elsewhere where they do not observe the same respect for labour or for the obligation to offer a fair return for labour.

The position is bleak, and I say here, as one from Scotland, that it is extremely bleak there too. Scotland is not alone, but one of the great traditional industries of Scotland is facing a crisis of disastrous proportions.

In Northern Ireland, the unemployment rate, as was mentioned, is 11 %, and in Scotland it is 9 % and getting worse: 200 000 people are unemployed, and massive redundancies are on the way. Two areas where there are several shipbuilding yards, Dundee and Clydebank, facing a real threat of many thousands more jobs being lost and the closure of more yards. And yet years ago Scotland had the world's place in shipbuilding that Japan now has. It is a piece of history, but unfortunately, like most history, it leaves behind tremendous social problems. So I welcome those parts of this proposal which are geared to facing up to the social problems of such devastated areas.

Now while there is massive overcapacity in the production of ocean-going vessels, there is a brighter prospect in the undercapacity of the world in naval and other specialist vehicles, I am thinking now of such things as drill ships, drilling rigs, leisure craft (because after all we are told we are going to have more leisure and presumably we are going to have time — some of us anyway — to enjoy it in leisure craft), passenger ferries and, of course, fishery protection vessels. As one who often speaks in this House on the question of fishing, may I remind the House that we have to protect our waters and that we have not nearly a large enough fishery protection fleet.

Now in Scotland and indeed in EEC yards, one thing we do have to offer the world trade is a highly-skilled and adaptable labour force capable of producing specialist vessels meeting the most advanced technical requirements. We can certainly say we can do this in Scotland. It can be done in France, Ireland and yards all over the EEC, so perhaps what we should be concentrating on in the long term is an acceptance that EEC yards will produce the specialist ships of the world and if necessary import the less sophisticated ships.

I would like to touch on two particular problems. The first is how EEC yards are to cope if they are competing against yards where there are subsidies of all kinds. Now some of us think there are subsidies within the EEC which are partially concealed, but that is something the Commissioner perhaps would comment on when winding up. If he can give me an assurance that none of the EEC yards practice hidden subsidies, I would be very reassured indeed. Certainly in the UK yards we are not permitted to allow subsidies and you have the situation, if I could take a simple one, where total packages are offered from Norway, just across the North Sea, involving loan-financed guarantees and barter contracts. When you add it up, no wonder Norway seems a good place for a ship to be built in, while we are deprived and our hands are tied within the UK and within the EEC! I would like the Commissioner, when winding up, to tell us what he thinks can be done on this matter which is a severe problem for all of us.

**Ewing**

The second problem concerns flags of convenience. I think this has been touched on by two previous speakers. I would first of all welcome the part of the 'Scrap and Build' policy, which imposes a penalty on an owner who, having got aid to build, immediately sells to a third country; but I am concerned about the part under the heading of demolition, and I quote.

The Commission is planning to so organize the programme that a ship-owner may, as part of a 'Scrap and Build' scheme, offer for demolition vessels registered in one of the Member States during the twelve months preceding.

Any of us who are interested in the high seas, in the fishing industry and the pollution of the seas must warn this House that ships flying flags of convenience in a world with far too many tankers are not really associated with the country of the flag. Greece is about to enter the Community, and Greece is one of the four worst offenders in the international scene.

Now it seems to me that the Commission's scheme is broad enough to allow Member States who I think are reprehensible, including my own, to permit companies to operate in Community waters and to ply their tankers there under flags of convenience. Many of the companies in the North Sea oil-fields are doing just that, and the UK is not by any means the only offender. I would like the Commissioner to comment on this in his winding up, if he will, and to assure us in some way that we are not allowing such reprehensibly behaved companies to derive any benefit from a scheme which has after all, been devised — and, I think, wisely devised — to try and improve the situation of the people in our shipyards. All that would do is further a set of dodges. I really think that that is one of the most important issues that have to be faced in what I think is a good, ambitious and imaginative scheme put forward by the Commission. The social obligations must be faced.

I would like to welcome the remarks of Mr Jackson at the beginning of the debate with regard to diversification, because here, I feel, is another of the areas in which EEC yards are particularly suited and sufficiently sophisticated to cope. Further ideas along these lines might well be developed by the Commission.

Lastly, on a rather more practical Scottish note, may I welcome the idea, which I referred to in this House before, of setting up an institute of economic analysis? As Scotland hasn't yet got an institute, Mr President, although we've often welcomed the coming of any such institute, as we were the people who produced the man who invented economics (perhaps a very bad day's work; nevertheless, Adam Smith was one of our sons), perhaps we might offer to take this institute of economic analysis: it might help our

unemployment situation, but it might also help constructively to perfect the plan that has been put before the House today.

**President.** — The proceedings will now be suspended until 3.00 p. m.

The sitting is suspended.

*(The sitting was suspended at 1.10 p. m. and resumed at 3.00 p. m.)*

IN THE CHAIR : MR JAQUET

*Vice-President*

**President.** — The sitting is resumed.

8. *Urgent procedure*

**President.** — I have received a request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure on Mr Enright's report on food aid for Palestinian refugees.

The request for urgent debate is justified by the need to assist the Palestinian refugees as soon as possible through UNRWA.

The request for urgent debate will be put to the vote at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

9. *Restructuring in the shipbuilding and textile industries (continued)*

**President.** — We now resume the debate on the shipbuilding and textile industries.

I call Mr Bonde.

**Mr Bonde.** — *(DK)* Mr President the report on Community aid for the shipbuilding and textile industries implies an invitation to act unlawfully. This is the only way one can interpret, for example, the opinion of the Committee on Budgets, which supports the idea that the Commission should use taxpayers' money without applying the necessary legislation from the Council of Ministers. The granting of aid to different sectors of the economy is traditionally a matter for legislation. The power to adopt laws resides in the national parliaments and the Council of Ministers, but there there is a right of veto and so all Community legislation is in fact, subject to formal national control. It is this legislative power that it is now proposed to transfer, to enable the supranational Parliament to ally itself with the supranational Commission against the Council of Ministers. In the absence of valid regulations from the Council we must regard any aid, for instance, to the textile and shipbuilding industries as unlawful, and we shall ask the

**Bonde**

governments to oppose the payment of such aid, just as we ourselves, of course, shall vote against such proposals.

Danish shipyard workers tell us that from 1975 to 1979 the level of employment in the Community countries' shipyards dropped by 15 %, while in Denmark it dropped no less than 50 %. This is not because we have lost the ability to build ships, nor because our wages are too high compared with productivity, for the Danish unions concerned are convinced that we can easily compete so far as shipbuilding is concerned. But we cannot compete with large national exchequers and there are eight schemes in the Community countries which finance up to 40 % of the cost of a new ship. We can see this just now, with a Danish shipbuilding firm, DFDS, placing an order worth 500 million kroner in France. The government's call to step up exports has obviously been misunderstood, so we are now exporting jobs. If the Community wants to do something sensible about textiles and shipbuilding, it should, in the view of the Danish shipyards, try to eliminate all systems of aid which are contrary to the Treaty. The Council could usefully be looking at this instead of drawing up new aid measures.

Just consider what will happen if such schemes proliferate and, for instance, the textile industry is shored up with farm policy type mechanisms, with intervention prices for shirts, export refunds for shirts, subsidies for converting shirts to trousers, and if this restructuring works, subsidies for storing trousers, which can then be sold with the help of a subsidy to those who have had to sell their last trousers to be able to pay their quota to the Community!

**President.** — I call Mr Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berleburg.

**Mr Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berleburg.** — (*D*) Mr President, it is a very good sign that Parliament is again discussing the Community's subsidization policy. The crisis-hit steel sector is now followed by the shipbuilding and textile sectors. These two sectors have got into difficulty not only because of external factors. No, management has often got itself into difficulty. The key word here is 'over-capacity'. That is the main problem. In overcoming the difficulties, we should take appropriate account of this market situation. No public budget can go on financing against the market in the long term. The regional difficulties must be recognized. In shipbuilding we have a strategic interest in an intact infrastructure. We also see the need to take account of the employment situation in the undertakings of the textile industry and ancillary sectors. Contrary to what some of those directly concerned officially advise — I have access to opinions of the shipbuilding and textile industries — we would even like to take short-term support measures.

But it must surely already be clear that if the efforts to adjust production fail, almost inestimable over-capacities will remain. I would warn those here in Parliament who call for controlled structural crisis cartels to be allowed. The assistance required in the public interest must be limited, otherwise we shall be the ones who are gambling away the chance of survival that ailing industries have.

Undertakings protected by aids against the pressure of adjustment must have a deadline by which they must complete their conversion efforts. If subsidies are to be substantial, they must also be subject to a time-limit. Otherwise there will be a growing danger of third parties deriving benefit, and we may have split prices and a subsidization race. With its limited resources the Community cannot resolve any of the present difficulties. Its commitment is to help restore competition as a whole with support measures, and these measures must serve that end.

My group regards redevelopment investments and encouragement of research and development as helpful. It agrees that subsidies in the textile sector should be earmarked for specific purposes. In view of the differences in infrastructural concept from one Community country to another directions on the use of subsidies in the shipbuilding sector would not seem to serve a useful purpose. Subsidies for systematic cut-backs must be restricted to specific crises.

The Commission should be told that large-scale cut-back measures or subsidies are out of place and, at least as far as the shipbuilding sector is concerned, the money would leave the Community's economic process, because the employment created by scrapping vessels usually — and I would almost say primarily — benefits the low-wage countries. I would warn against evaluating funds only in quantitative terms. In a given decision-making situation the quality of the funds in particular should be fixed, on the one hand from the viewpoint of the recipient, for whom they should have a satisfactory effect, on the other from the viewpoint of the donor, who makes it known that those concerned retain their extensive decision-making powers. The amount, arrangement and budgetary authority can take account of this. Unlimited funds will have to be excluded here — that is my view — like any move towards a specific industrial structure fund.

I will finish by saying that if the sick industries we are discussing had conducted themselves more wisely, had not created over-capacities and not perhaps even gone so far as to have the thought of State subsidies in the back of their minds, we could be using the money for other, more necessary Community projects.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — I call Mrs Salisch.

**Mrs Salisch.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am speaking now as a member of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, and I must emphasize that from the quite specific viewpoint of my committee I can but support the criticisms levelled this morning at the Commission and also the Council — above all the Council. I would refer you to what was said as long ago as 1978 on the basis of the document drawn up by Mr Prescott. One particular part of that document calls on the Commission to look very closely — albeit in the shipbuilding sector — at the effect Community subsidies have on national subsidies and also private investments in certain sectors and principally at the effect they have on the workers. This seems to me to be the most decisive point of all, ladies and gentlemen. I followed the debate very attentively this morning, and I also heard some Members saying that they regret workers are affected by these restructuring measures. I heard Mr Spencer interpreting the opinion of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. But no one actually called for account to be taken of workers' interests in the context of these restructuring programmes in the shipbuilding and textile industries. On behalf of the Socialist Group I should therefore like to revert to two very important points which we worked on together in committee and to introduce them here as an amendment to the Nicolson-Forster report. These amendments state quite clearly: we want the priority in these restructuring measures to be placed on the maintenance of jobs, which does not, of course, mean that the jobs must be maintained at existing plants. But we say we can agree to restructuring measures only when we have heard a binding statement on what is to happen to the workers affected. It is simply not enough for us to attempt to make subsequent compensatory payments to the workers concerned and to offer them alternative jobs in their regions. No, this must be done beforehand, and I must tell you that as a member of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment I am slowly beginning to feel like a nurse in Europe, because every time some economic measure is taken, we of the committee are afterwards instructed to soothe the fevered brow, as it were, and that least of all can be our task. If we really meant, ladies and gentlemen, what we said here in this House on 15 January, that we intended to make a decisive contribution to the fight against unemployment in Europe, we must also get it very clear in our minds, when we are dealing with small pieces of the industrial policy, where we can take the first steps to help workers. When we speak of the mobility of workers, that surely cannot mean that those workers must leave their regions: it must mean that where jobs are eliminated, new ones are created and the migration of workers to highly industrialized areas is prevented.

We all know, Mr Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, how catastrophic the consequences of concentration in industrialized areas are for all

concerned. We also know what it means to a worker if he has to leave the area in which he has settled. That is why we must do more in this House than pay mere lip service. We should also use the amendment to the Nicolson report later to say what the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment — with the agreement of all its members — has really already anticipated: we should say that the crisis-hit regions cannot tolerate any further reduction in employment and that this European Parliament is therefore only prepared to agree to restructuring if appropriate provision is also made for the workers concerned. To put it more clearly: job creation or employment measures must form an integral part of any industrial policy. Mr Commissioner, you have not so far proved that you would have pursued an industrial policy along these lines. Perhaps you will take this up again in your reply. Nor have you been able to show us how far the Council is prepared to go in this direction. But this is the only way in which we can together achieve convergence in Europe. Shrugging our shoulders, Mr Commissioner, will not help us. I am prepared to believe that you have tried. And in that case, we will also give you appropriate support in this House.

And even if we are only dealing with part of the overall subject, we should set this priority and adopt appropriate decisions as they have been tabled here by the Socialist Group in the form of an amendment. Then we can be sure — I hope — that funds will really be made available for retraining and advanced training and, ladies and gentlemen, we will have achieved a little of what we proclaimed herein this Chamber on 15 January.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Prag.

**Mr Prag.** — The document that Mrs Salisch referred to — the opinion of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment drawn up by Mr Spencer — has in fact been distributed and should be available, I believe, in all languages. It is Document No 1-623/79/Annex, dated 11 February.

**President.** — I call Mr Beazley.

**Mr Beazley.** — Mr President, Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, in what I have to say on the Commission's proposal for Community aid for restructuring and conversion instruments my wish is to be wholly constructive. Too many industries, whether age-old labour-intensive industries like shipbuilding and textile or modern high technology and highly capital-intensive industries created immediately after the war, like synthetic fibres, are faced with difficulties of adjustment to new conditions. Such adjustment has been made necessary by new circumstances arising from industry's direct competition within the European Community as well as from new forces from outside.

## Beazley

In this latter respect, the changes have been as great as within Europe. The USA's powerful competitive position has been strengthened by the weakness of the dollar and, in the very important petro-chemical industry, by the two-tier pricing of American oil, with its enormous effect on oil-based feedstocks for synthetic fibres, plastics and many other industries. From the Far East and Comecon countries as well as from other new industrial areas, new competitive forces have come which are often based on high Western European technology allied with underpriced labour and capital resources against which Western European industry, however efficient, cannot compete. For Europe to have a secure economic base and an acceptable level of employment, viable industries must be helped to protect themselves on a European scale when attacked. They must be able to restructure themselves, again on a European scale, when changed circumstances demand it, and they must give way to more suitable industries when they no longer fulfil a useful purpose.

What are the lessons to be learned from this proposal from the Commission to help European industries which find themselves in crisis?

Firstly, without agreement within the Council, no desirable measures can be taken and the Community and individual Member States' industries will certainly decline.

Secondly, delays in decision-making by the Council merely exacerbate the difficulties of the industries concerned. In this respect may I regret the unacceptable way in which the current proposals were handled. How could a Council regulation, issued on a Saturday, 22 December 1979, but whose delivery was delayed, a regulation concerning 14 million European units of account, which had to be committed by Monday, 31 December, give the synthetic fibre industry as a whole any satisfaction that its problems were being seriously considered? Nor will European electors, particularly those being made redundant, or consumers facing higher prices, because the inflation caused by their aspirations for consumer satisfaction is unsupported by an economic competitive industry, accept that the Council of Ministers and, I am afraid to say, the Commission are completely fulfilling their duty.

What is the position of the synthetic fibres industry? This is an industry which is shrinking at the rate of about a thousand people per month and which is at the present time being undermined by raw materials from the United States of America and by imported textiles from many sources throughout the world. From the 175 000 it employed in Europe in 1971, it will have shrunk to a hundred thousand people by the end of 1980.

This is an industry in which a very high percentage of the basic chemical inventions, the technology and the machinery used was developed or invented in Europe.

In what other highly technological industry where European productivity is extremely high and constantly expanding, owing to the fast increase of technological improvements, has employment shrunk by 36 % in the last decade, or 33 1/3 % in the last six years?

Yet restructuring is essential and capacity must be closed. The latest available technology must be utilized and new employment in creative industry must be found for the excellent quality of labour and the high level of training which the synthetic fibres industries employ.

I must ask concerning the future: what are we to decide about the sums of money included in the budget for 1979, what are we going to have in the budget for 1980, and what principle should we follow for 1981? It is quite clear that the Member States living together within the common market cannot make the necessary adjustments on their own in isolation. Industry today is an international business, and European business and its problems must be solved on this basis.

So what recommendations must I make? I must support, and am very keen to do so, the proposal of the Committee concerned, to draw up an own-initiative report on the requirements of the European industry to adjust to new conditions. The measures taken must relate to the long-term prospects of these industries. There is no case for propping up industries which for any reason do not have good prospects of being internationally competitive in the future. Action must be taken early in the crisis, so that restructuring is in fact possible, and that conversion is not the only remedy available. This in fact is the case with the synthetic fibres industry. It is clear that industry must be seen as a whole. It is not desirable or possible to achieve the objectives of such measures if they are limited to two industries alone. Many industries like leather, even in my own constituency, must be considered in accordance with their needs and before, in fact, they fall into the position of being a crisis industry.

So I will conclude by supporting the proposals of Sir David Nicolson, in regard both to the source and size of the funds necessary, and may I add that without a healthy industry, adjusted to the conditions of modern competition and the needs of modern European society, the European concept will have no basis on which to thrive, and may become merely a powerless ideal with no influence in the world.

**President.** — I call Mrs Hoffmann.

**Mrs Hoffmann.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the measures proposed by the Commission to resolve the crisis in the textile industry are in line with all European restructuring plans. In calling for aid, the report advances excuses which the French members of the Communist and Allies Group do not accept: oil prices, the shortage of raw materials, the

**Hoffmann**

lack of competitiveness, the cost of labour, production capacity. We do not accept them because they are contrary to the interests of the workers in this industry, contrary to the national interest which is essential to the future of this sector.

In my country more than 200 000 jobs have been lost in the textile industry over ten years. A particularly scandalous example is the Rhône-Poulenc group. This group has just announced that by July 1980 it intends to close two of its factories, RPT Lyon-Vaise, famous for the quality of the yarns it produces and the only source of very fine yarn in France, and RPT Vaux-en-Velin, the only plant in France producing synthetic industrial yarn. The total stoppage of production as forecast by Rhône-Poulenc would compel my country to import all the industrial yarn it needs from factories of the same group in Switzerland and Spain, which would manufacture the yarn we would be obliged to import. And the closure of the research center at Vénissieux, the only centre for research on man-made and synthetic textiles in France, would make us even more dependent on foreign sources.

In all, it would mean loss of work for 2 359 wage-earners in this region alone, conscious, voluntary, calculated murder, because these factories are viable, their machines competitive, their engineers, technicians, managers and workers competent and experienced. This is in fact a new stage in the restructuring plan which has as its objective the limination of 6 000 jobs and the closure of a third of the group's factories.

That is perhaps what the Commission calls 'social measures'. I repeat, the Community would be financing redundancies and the scrapyards to the benefit of the redeployment of the multinational companies in this sector. Who in this Assembly will speak of the benefits, real enough for Rhône-Poulenc, which rose in 1978 to 317m old francs, of the decisions in favour of investments in its factories in Brazil, the Federal Republic of Germany and Spain?

That is the truth which some people try to hide. We will not let you abuse the people of our country with words. It is a scandal to see the tools of work being smashed in this way, while millions of families lack the absolute necessities to clothe themselves, when we know that man-made fibres account for an average of 64 % of the total production of textile articles, when we know that two thirds of the man-made fibres used by the French manufacturers are imported and that two out of every three textile articles sold in the French market are of foreign origin.

Yes, our industry suffers from massive imports, but these imports are made to the greater profit of the employers. Competitiveness is used as an argument for exerting greater pressure on wages, for forcing on the wage-earners in this sector ever harder working conditions and ever higher rates of production. In 1975 the Commission was forced to recognize that imports from certain countries were having a consider-

able effect on the Community market. In fact, this policy of restructuring the textile industry in Europe paved the way for the crisis which is today being used as an alibi for fresh public financing in the guise of aid to competitiveness.

The solution to the crisis in the textile industry is not a European one. It has above all a national dimension and is to be found in the fight being fought in each country by the workers, like those of the Rhône-Poulenc textile group in France, to keep their jobs. To stop the scrap merchants from moving in, to get the textile industry out of the crisis, a radically different policy must be implemented, one that takes into account the satisfaction of national requirements and not the thirst for profits of the giants in this industry. The development of each country's internal market means boosting consumption by the people. In France, textile consumption amounts to only 13 kg per inhabitant. But if production capacities were used to the full, it could soon reach 19 kg per inhabitant, as in the Federal Republic of Germany.

But that obviously means satisfying the demands of the workers in this sector: reduction of working time, adapted vocational training, bringing forward the retirement age, the introduction of safeguard measures designed to stop closures, real checks on the origin of products and of import routes. This is the only way that an end can be put to the unemployment that rages in this sector. It is not the course the Community is taking when it decides to grant new credits for restructuring and redevelopment, particularly in the man-made fibre sector.

**President.** — I call Mr Remilly.

**Mr Remilly.** — (*F*) Mr President, for almost six years now the European shipbuilding industry has faced a crisis, a crisis which we have denounced from the outset. The reasons are, on the one hand, the depressed prospects of the world market for new buildings and, on the other, the yawning gap that has appeared between sales prices on the world market and the cost prices of Community shipyards.

The latter phenomenon is, of course, explained by the aggressive commercial policy pursued by Japan, the Eastern European countries and certain developing countries. It is therefore an abnormal situation that we should continue to suffer this crisis passively, and yet Community shipbuilding has achieved reasonable expansion in recent years. Its building capacity roughly corresponds to the new tonnage requirements of the Community's shipowners. We must therefore today assume responsibility for the future of European shipbuildings, which is in line with the economic importance of the EEC. The European shipyards, especially the French, have modern equipment, particularly suited to the building of the most sophisticated vessels, and they make use of the most advanced technologies. In these circumstances, the Community

## Remilly

must take some counter-measures to alleviate the effects of unfair competition from third countries which take advantage of the freedom of the seas.

It would seem reasonable to envisage a situation in which Europe builds the more sophisticated vessels for itself and imports simpler ships from third countries. From this point of view, we are coming in ship-building very close to the major objectives of a policy of growth, which consist in the maintenance of superiority with regard to technology and innovation. It is therefore important to say that we cannot accept a European policy based solely on the principles of reducing internal distortions, in other words oriented towards the control, restriction and then elimination of the aids granted in the various countries of the Community. We do not want a finicky Europe which adopts for the administrations of the Member States control procedures which are increasingly restrictive and which therefore cause major delays in the functioning of aid systems, compromising the conduct of what are already very difficult negotiations, the outcome of which is, however, extremely important for the companies concerned and therefore for their workers. But it must be said that for several months now, under the fourth directive, all the aid files have been submitted by contract, which is likely to cause harmful delays in a number of difficult matters involving negotiations. Let us beware therefore, under the pretext of reforming structures, of driving ship-building to bureaucracy.

On the other hand, at the level of industrial policy proper, we welcome the possibility of the establishment of a scrapping-building programme to encourage both the scrapping of older vessels and the building of fewer and smaller replacement vessels. This would above all make it possible to avoid old ships being sold off to owners who practise dumping in the transport market by keeping in service too many ships which represent, through the excessive numbers of disasters that occur, a real danger to the marine environment and eventually to mankind.

**President.** — I call Mr De Goede.

**Mr De Goede.** — (NL) Mr President, in the few minutes I have I do not intend to repeat the important remarks that have already been made in the course of this debate. I will use the time available to me to pinpoint some of those responsible for this deplorable state of affairs. And I must say that Parliament can scarcely be blamed. In March 1979 it delivered an opinion: the Spinelli report, which called for a basic regulation setting out general criteria for Community aid to industrial restructuring in crisis-hit sectors. Less than a year later, today, Parliament is again stating its views. Parliament will have to be more careful in the future, that is obvious. And I agree with Mrs Salisch that better coordination of the activities of the various parliamentary committees is also

needed. As the principal objectives for Community aid the Commission has proposed investments in rationalization studies, modernization of equipment, better training in management and sales, support for redevelopment, this to be achieved by means of investment premiums and interest subsidies and in conjunction with other Community instruments, such as the Social Fund, the Regional Fund, the European Investment Bank, and, of course, support from the Member States.

But, Mr President, how very little has in fact been done! The Council may rightly be accused of excessive hesitation and indecision and to quote Sir David Nicolson, inactivity. I hope not only that the Commission will be reacting shortly, but also that the Council will be accounting for itself, because it has every reason to do so. It is therefore sad to see no one from the Council here at the moment.

Mr President, the problem is an enormous one, with major consequences for employment. The textile industry accounts for 10 % of the industrial activity of our Community, at least as regards its effect on employment. In addition, the textile industry, in which 30 % of the working population are employed in some areas, is concentrated in certain regions. I am referring now to the textile industry, in which many women are involved. The Nicolson report talks about the loss of tens of thousands of jobs in the ship-building sector. But, Mr President, it is sad to read that in the textile sector hundreds of thousands, if not two million jobs are at stake. The *Financial Times* of 10 January and later editions went into this subject in some detail. This will — rightly — cause great political and social anger in the Community. After all, we are not sitting here for nothing, we are sitting here on behalf of our citizens, the 250 million citizens of the Community, two million families of which are again being threatened. It is incomprehensible that the six million unemployed, perhaps as many as nine million if we include those not registered as unemployed, may now be joined by a few million more rather than the figure being reduced. Why is so dreadfully little being done? Are we simply accepting the situation as inevitable?

This morning Mr Jenkins referred to five areas in which progress had been made last year. But let us not put ourselves on the back because of this: we should feel ashamed for our shortcomings, and this is one of many. There are great social tensions in the Community, less growth, more inflation, major deficits in the balance of payments, high energy prices. In the debate on Mr Jenkins' statement on Thursday I hope to go into this in greater detail. But today I must appeal to the Commission and Council to come up with a master plan quickly, one which outlines structural measures specifically for the endangered branches of industry, and this in conjunction with the policies of the Member States. So far the action we have taken has been far too sketchy.

**De Goede**

The Socialists are right to table amendments to the Nicolson report, which I nevertheless greatly appreciate. But it does not place sufficient emphasis on the accompanying social measures of this economic process. I hope that the amendments tabled by the Socialist Group will find the support of a majority. If that is not the case, I hope that what might well happen does not in fact happen, that the Socialist Group does not vote against the Nicolson report. If it does so, we shall be completely empty-handed. We, Mrs Dekker and I, willingly endorse these amendments, which place the emphasis on the social aspect. If they should unexpectedly not be adopted, we will nevertheless vote in favour of the Nicolson report.

**President.** — I call Mr Seal.

**Mr Seal.** — I would like, Mr President, to concentrate my contribution on textiles. Whilst I agree with some of the points made in the report we are considering, I just wonder why we are actually debating it at this particular time. The report concentrates on the 1978 allocation, and this money has already been allocated; it is water under the bridge. Instead of talking about this money at this particular time we should look at the way it has been allocated and see if we can learn something from it.

But first of all I must make the point that, if we are serious about restructuring industry, then the amounts of money that we are talking about — 17 000 000 units of account, 10 000 000 units of account — are totally inadequate. Instead of tens of millions of units of account, we should be talking about hundreds of millions. Let us hope that this is the kind of figure that will appear in the 1981 budget. Now in my opinion this particular report does not place enough emphasis on using money to create alternative jobs for workers who have been made redundant by restructuring. I think this is a vitally important area; and from what the President of the Commission said today, it is going to become even more important. I can speak from experience as the representative of a constituency where many people are being made redundant.

Let me turn, however, to the allocations in the 1978 budget. It is my understanding, though my information may be incorrect, that the Commission official who was responsible for the allocation was chosen, and I quote, 'for his specialized knowledge of the Italian textile industry'. It is therefore any wonder that 13 of the 16 projects went to Italy? In fact, I understand that all 16 would have gone to Italy, if France and Belgium had not got a whiff of what was going on. Certainly the UK never found out. No United Kingdom firm was approached, either formally or informally, for their ideas or projects. The British Man-made Fibre Association wasn't formally consulted,

even though, when the Council discussed it on 20 December, the United Kingdom representative said — I believe — that he would approve it on the understanding that Britain would get part of the cash.

In West Yorkshire, the area I represent, local authority money is being used to provide courses to improve the English of some redundant Asian workers in order to try and make them more suitable for employment. Money is being used for courses to try and improve the skills of some of the workers who have been made redundant in order to try and help them get employment. The trade unions and the local authority are working very well together. I personally have helped in many cases to bring the trade unions and the local authority together. Now to me these projects would have been far more worthy than many of the cases which have been chosen in Italy. It is one of the things which, when I think of my constituents, when I think of the people who are redundant, and when I think of the way that this money has been allocated, leads me to say that the allocation is not only biased and irresponsible, but disgraceful and immoral. This biased allocation must not be allowed to happen again. We must set up a system, Mr President, which is not only fair but is seen to be fair by everyone. Only then will there be no quibbles.

Now let me turn my attention to the man-made fibres part of this report. I would like to know why the Commission gave preference to man-made fibres. They have not put forward any detailed arguments or any information to support this. And I ask, is the situation in man-made fibres any worse than that in wool textiles? I think not. It may be that the Commission chose this approach rather than take action against the USA. The Commission can take action when they want. They took action very quickly against the Philippines. The amounts for 1981 must be allocated very systematically. The money must not just go to man-made fibres. It must include all the textile areas.

My final comments, Mr President, concern industrial policy in particular. I agree with what the first speaker, Mr Nicolson, said today. It is time the Commission worked out an industrial policy. The President of the Commission spoke today about the growth of unemployment and the fall in expansion. It is not enough for the committee to produce its own-initiative report. The Commission must produce its own ideas and come forward with ideas on industrial policy for the Community. They must take a holistic approach. There is no point in merely tinkering with restructuring. And in the system they put forward there must be a clear place for textiles, and then textiles must be defended. The employers want this, the trade unions want this, and it is time the Commission produced it. As was said this morning, this is their final year of the mandate. Let them produce this

**Seal**

report, this policy this year. But in the meantime I ask this House to accept these amendments.

**President.** — I call Mr Davignon.

**Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission.** — I will speak at the end of the debate on all the matters which have been raised. However, I cannot sit here and listen in silence to Mr Seal's contention that the Commission's policy was based on biased advice given by an official of the Community, acting on the basis of his nationality and not on the basis of his Community loyalties. I wish to refute it. It is unacceptable, unfair and unfounded.

*(Applause)*

I would point out to Mr Seal that 18 months ago I indicated to the textile industry as a whole and that I made it clear at three meetings of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs of this Parliament that we were considering files on restructuring and reconversion. Those industries which failed in those 18 months to tell us what they had in mind have no right to complain, and have no right to ask anyone to complain on their behalf. I have met three times with the association of trade unions in the textiles industries and told them what we had in mind. I therefore reject this accusation. That is all I wish to say at this stage of the debate.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Normanton.** — Mr President, the House has indicated its support for the integrity of Commissioner Davignon on this and indeed on many other points. I think that, in that sense, it was a timely intervention.

Mr President, I quote 'what is happening to the textile industry today will happen to each and every major industrial sector tomorrow'. Those crisp, clear and unequivocal words were included in the annual report of the British Textile Employers Association—of which I was later privileged to become the President—as long as 15 years ago. History has shown how painfully true that forecast has proved to be. We today are once again debating not just textiles but, in the same context, shipbuilding. We could, and I believe we will, be adding many more sectors of European industry to this list in the future. The point that I want to make is that we the Community—and I am not singling out any individual or any institution—have still not evolved a Community strategy for dealing with a long existing series of problems in the field of industry, quite apart from the new and increasingly serious aggravation which has emerged in recent years. I am referring of course in this context to the new economic environment of world trade, the recession and the like. It is no longer a seller's market, and the change from a seller's to a buyer's market is a very relevant and important consideration.

Neither the interests of the textile industry nor shipbuilding would be served by a major policy switch

toward protectionism. This is the privately and sincerely held view of responsible leaders on both sides of industry. This may be a solution for a closed self-contained economy such as that of the USSR. It would be disastrous for the Community to desert the commitment, as an act of political faith, to the expansion of trade as a whole. What is required however, is the establishment of some form of—and I use the word advisedly—regulatory mechanism. The multi-fibre arrangement was but one such instrument which was invoked to ensure that expansion of trade takes place in an orderly manner and on an equitable basis. It is the absence of such a framework, or the absence—or feared absence—of a commitment to its future extension after the expiry of the MFA which creates a most disturbing if not damaging influence on the future prospects for these two major industries.

Interventionism, in the strict political sense of that term, by the Community, by the Commission on a Community basis, would I believe be damaging to these industries in the short- and to the whole of European industry in the long-term. To create an environment in which companies can make their own commercial business decisions, to use the commercial leverage of the Community to eradicate the growing number of examples of one-sided trading relationships around the world, are in fact the areas in which, I believe, the Commission and the Community have a special role to play. Only by adopting such a policy will the economic well-being of these industries and our economy as a whole be assured for the future.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Welsh.

**Mr Welsh.** — I think my colleagues have eloquently put the case for the British textile industry, and it may come as a relief to them to know that I am not going to mention my constituency, my country or anything else in connection with this debate. I would like also to add my congratulations to the rapporteurs on their document, but I hope they will not take it amiss and will understand when I say that I feel that the whole document is based on a misconception.

We tend to toss the word 'restructuring' around as if it had some magical significance of its own, and we don't very often direct our attention to explaining what we mean by restructuring. Restructuring in my book does not mean propping up economic businesses which are no longer competitive on the world markets, and it certainly does not mean 'dealing with the consequences', to quote the document, 'of industrial decline'. We heard President Jenkins this morning very eloquently reminding us of the challenges of the 80s, and I feel we should regard the Commission's industrial policy as a response to that challenge. Structural funds, which are scarce, should go to progressive, modern, competitive industry. We

## Welsh

should be investing in telematics; we should be investing in electronics; we should be upgrading the whole range of Community industries into the 1990s: we should not be using these scarce funds to perpetuate the industries of the 20s.

We have heard the obsessions of Mr Seal, talking about full employment. Frankly, the Community industry policy should not be directed to keeping people in uneconomic, boring, repetitive jobs in mid-Victorian conditions. That is not what it is for. We have a Regional Fund and we have a Social Fund. There is not enough money in either of those funds, I agree, but they surely should be directed at coping with the social consequences of industrial change, not the industry policy. That, Mr President, should be directed at paying for the process of industrial change. If you look at our own steel industry, you will see what happens when you waste your capital resources on keeping people in uneconomic, uncompetitive jobs for too long instead of investing them in the machinery, plant and equipment that is going to pay for those people's benefits in the future. Let us take up Mr Jenkins' challenge and let the Commission take it up. He said that the Commission wanted to be regarded as an institution on its own, with its own range of competencies. Well, perhaps, in the field of industrial policy the Commission could begin to do that by coming out with a clear industrial strategy for the Community as a whole. Nowhere else could this be better done than in the field of textiles, and I would say to Mr Davignon that what we are looking for is honesty from the Commission—honesty in the sense that they should tell industry what they see its future to be. If we have too much capacity, all right, let us say so, and let us help them get rid of that capacity, but do not let us continue to duck the issue with half-promises and half-assurances of a future that almost certainly is not going to exist. What the textile industry needs, what its workers need, is the ability to plan in consistent circumstances, and if the medicine is bitter, well let the Commission have the courage of its convictions and hand out that medicine.

*(Applause)*

**President.**— I call Mr Purvis.

**Mr Purvis.** — Mr President, first of all I should like to support my fellow Scot from across the passage, Mrs Ewing, in her approach to the shipbuilding problems of our area of the Community. Scotland is proud of its shipbuilding heritage and of its marine engineering skills, but it has also suffered more than most from the ravages of decline in this industry, and it is suffering in the current depression. We talk of restructuring and the need for restructuring. In Scottish shipbuilding, restructuring has been a way of life for the last several years, but behind all these evolutions and convolutions there has been a fundamental change taking place. Shipbuilding is no longer just the construction of steel fabrics, although even that aspect is becoming more and more a sophisticated

computer and technologically-based operation. The mere fabrication is an area beset by worldwide competition and price sensitivity. We are having to look for uniqueness and specialization where innovation, high technology, advanced and original design provide the competitive edge and a profitable enterprise.

As many speakers before me have said, prolonging the death-pangs can only be justified where there is real promise and not just a vague hope. Unthinking subsidies can readily damage innovation and viable competitors next door. So we must keep the stimulus of competition very much in mind when we consider help to industries in crisis. Our assistance should be directed to research into new and specialized applications, new technologies, new designs which are energy-efficient or incorporate the new technologies in micro-electronics, pneumatics, construction techniques, metals and propulsion. We must improve management skills and retrain and allow for the mobility of labour. And to kill two birds with one stone, one of the birds mentioned this morning by the President of the Commission was that we should promote capital investment in our indigenous offshore oil and gas fields in the form of additional oil platforms and pipelines.

Not only will this provide extra energy supplies and promote platform construction, an industry into which shipbuilders can often diversify, it will increase the demand for specialized support vessels, it will promote the developments of new and advanced technologies and innovation in marine and submarine applications, and this will help to meet the burgeoning demand in this one specialized area of the worldwide oil-hunt.

So we want a Scottish shipbuilding industry with a long-term, prosperous future, and I see from the debate today that my colleagues from shipbuilding areas all over Europe wish the same for themselves. So let us therefore, in a concerted and European approach to the problem, not featherbed indiscriminately, but broaden our horizons and those of the industry by encouraging and sponsoring enterprise.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Fich.

**Mr Fich.** — *(DK)* Mr President, I should like to begin by saying that I am sorry that we are discussing only some of the problems today and I endorse Mr Seal's criticism of the random way in which the relatively limited funds available were allocated last year. If I say that we should be discussing wider measures, it is, of course, because all these piecemeal measures that we are implementing do damn all to solve the general problems confronting us. I shall just mention,

**Fich**

in regard to the shipbuilding industry, the whole question of surplus capacity. There have been many suggestions today about how we can use this surplus capacity to build better ships and the like. But there is no doubt that we must, somehow or other, first carry out retraining and restructuring in this sector. And here I would say that there are two main criteria. The first is that it must be done in a socially acceptable way, as has been suggested by our group and, secondly, Spain and Japan must also take part in this adjustment of capacity that we are obliged to undertake. But the second and most important problem which I wish to raise is the whole question of national aid measures. One reason is that we have just, in the last two weeks, had a very tragic example in Denmark of what national aid measures can mean in the shipbuilding industry. It concerns a ship which should have been built in Denmark. Instead, it has gone to France, for the following reasons.

Firstly, the French State has granted 80 % in public loans. Secondly, the French State has granted 20 % in semi-public loans. Thirdly, the French State has granted a direct subsidy of 100-150 million French francs, and fourthly, it has given a guarantee that, if estimates prove wrong, it would be prepared to grant further subsidies for the ship. Of course, I congratulate the French workers in the yard concerned who have now secured employment, but I must point out that this has merely transferred the employment problem to Denmark instead and that cannot be a satisfactory way of going about things. These national aid measures should be under control, particularly if they — as in this case — have a blatantly distorting affect. We are soon to get a revision of the fourth directive on shipbuilding and it must be clearly understood that it needs to be tightened up quite considerably. I am quoting the International Metalworkers' Federation, which, at its conference in Copenhagen last November, agreed on the need to get these national aid schemes under control. I think it essential to include these fundamental considerations in the debate when we are discussing these matters.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Almirante.

**Mr Almirante.** — *(I)* Mr President, allow me first of all to express my polite regret for the refusal to agree to a request which seemed to me proper and above all rational, in other words the request to be able to speak after Commissioner Davignon's reply. I had been in good time in tabling a question which, on the decision of the enlarged Bureau, was put on yesterday's agenda. I was told that yesterday I could not speak to it because the subject and therefore Commissioner Davignon's reply to my question were on today's agenda. I asked to speak after the Commissioner's reply, but this was refused. I do not fully understand why; in any case I shall confine myself.....

**President.** — Mr Almirante, the reason is simply that it is traditional in these debates that the Commission speaks last.

**Mr Almirante.** — *(I)*... Mr President, I am not accustomed to protesting; I am just stating my point of view — and I feel I am doing it politely — primarily to explain to you and the Members that my speech will have shortcomings to the extent that it will be assuming a reply that it has not yet had. I therefore appeal to Commissioner Davignon's courtesy in asking him, if possible, to give me a favourable reply.

I nurture this hope, Mr Commissioner, because in substance what I am asking in my question coincides perfectly, in its principles, with the content of the report presented by Sir David Nicolson whom I thank and whom — interpreting the favourable opinions voiced from every side in this Assembly — I feel we can all thank.

My question arises from the same requirements that called for the motion for a resolution. The requirement expressed by Sir David Nicolson is, first of all, that major priority should be given to two crisis-hit sectors — shipbuilding and man-made fibres — and I am concerned with the former. Sir David Nicolson's motion for a resolution asks that a general programme should finally be implemented with regard to the crisis in the shipbuilding industry and I too ask for a general programme to be implemented. It is clear from Sir David Nicolson's report that the crisis in the shipyards is particularly acute and unresolved in certain countries with Italy at their head. As an Italian Member of the European Parliament I am particularly concerned with the shipbuilding crisis in Italy and since I am a Member elected for the South of Italy I am concerned about the crisis where it is particularly serious as in Southern Italy and, in particular, at Castellammare de Stabia, where the shipyard is in a state of semidemolition. Mr Petronio dealt, a few hours ago, with the problem of the Trieste shipyards which, together with those in the Neapolitan area form the high point of the shipbuilding crisis in Italy. In Sir David Nicolson's paper, it is proposed that the general programme should be sustained by a policy of investment. In this connection I must point out, Mr Commissioner, that the Member whom you checked a little while ago, and very rightly in my view, for his ill-considered statements had obviously not read the motion for a resolution or at least the Nicolson report from which it is clear that the 17m u.a. are now entered purely pro mem. because, not having been used in 1979, this sum is no longer in the budget where something more than just an investment programme is proposed, in other words the floating of a loan in an attempt to solve the shipbuilding and man-made fibres crises or at least to help those firms that are worst hit. This loan will probably amount to 2 billion u.a., a part of which would go to the regions worst hit by the crisis, like my own country for example and, within my country, Southern Italy.

### Almirante

In my question I have asked for protective measures against non-European competition and in particular that from the Japanese and I feel that, if we succeed in working out an overall plan to defend the European shipyards, this cannot fail to include, perhaps in the context of the Tokyo round, measures to prevent or at least curb the ruthless competition waged above all by Japan.

In my question I have asked for programmes to restructure the old fleet. I am very pleased to read, in the Nicolson report, the proposal for the scrapping and replacement of old ships which will mean that the purpose of conversion in the shipyards will not be to close them down but to allow them to operate more efficiently and more usefully and not to leave a large proportion of the workforce unemployed — or, as happens in our country, dependent on the integration fund.

Lastly, I have asked that loans be granted to firms buying new ships in Italy and I have referred to the loan proposed in the Nicolson report, part of which I hope would usefully be applied to save, at least partly, the shipyards in my country.

If you, Mr Commissioner, were to give a negative reply to all these questions, it is not I but — with your permission — you who would be in opposition, because these are basic points in the Nicolson report and his motion for a resolution on which I note that more or less the whole of Parliament seems to be agreed. I therefore feel that, having for once moved so far in the direction of practically all sides of this Parliament, I may expect replies from the executive Commission that will rekindle hope about the frightening shipbuilding crisis in which my country is plunged.

**President.** — I call Mr Davignon.

**Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission.** — (*F*) I have listened with all the attention that this subject deserves to the various statements that have been made. If I may explain my reply, I shall begin by discussing the Commission's industrial activities in general. I shall then go on to the problems facing the shipyards, then the textile industry's problems, and after that I shall come to various working conclusions after replying to this and that more specific question, where, Mr President, those who have asked specific questions are present to hear my reply.

Mr President, I should like to begin by thanking Sir David Nicolson, Miss Forster and Mr Spencer for the effort they have put into presenting a report which places the specific problems we are discussing in their general context. I believe they have done so objectively and lucidly and have themselves collected a certain amount of information in reaching the conclusion that we cannot go on talking about Europe and about Community action without at the same time defining the means it has to take such action.

Mr Delors, the first to speak in the debate, phrased the problem in the proper terms. What is this problem? It does not consist solely in deciding if we are going to be able, by acting with solidarity and imagination, to help to alleviate the difficulties in the textile and shipbuilding sectors. It consists in knowing whether the European Community of the year 1980, in other words a Community facing profound change in the functioning of its economy and its production apparatus, can establish a policy and strategy to overcome these new problems as it did when having to define the strategy of the customs union, that is the strategy for the creation of a single market. That is at the root of the question.

But there is today a fundamental difference: the Treaty of Rome like the Treaty of Paris before it, clearly established the legal framework and everyone's obligations with respect to the creation of this market. The activities we are talking about today — industrial innovation, social adaptation, regulations in new fields such as standards, and so on — all this belongs to a field which was not foreseen as such at the time of the signing of the Treaty, which means that whether or not our activities become reality depends not only on Parliament's support but on the Council's decision.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Commission and I myself personally will always accept the reproach levelled at us that we have not made sufficient use of the powers the Treaty gives us, and it will be our aim to show how, if this criticism has any foundation, we react to it. Mr Caborn, who is unfortunately not present, mentioned earlier on that two years ago Mr Prescott raised a whole series of questions relating to the problems of the shipyards. And here we are today, 18 months later, in a situation where nothing has changed.

The question can be phrased in more precise terms: what are we doing? We are rebelling against the legal rules of the Treaty. The European Parliament gives the Commission appropriations in the budget. And the Commission spends them, where new actions are concerned, without obtaining the authorizations laid down in Article 235.

Mr President, I do not believe that my faults include excessive timidity. But what are we to do? This is a question that must be discussed by three parties. What I mean is that since 11 a.m. this morning, when the debate began, the Council bench has been empty. I do not want to be unfair to the Council, Mr President; I have sat on the Council's side in the past. I know how difficult it is to assume the responsibilities of the Presidency of the Council, that is to say being unable to speak until a position has been adopted. I know what difficulty that presents. So I shall not be haranguing the Council. That would be neither suitable nor correct. But I feel sure that although the

## Davignon

Council cannot reply straightaway, it can make a note of the questions and answer them at the next or next but one part-session, after the Member States have discussed them. That would seem essential to me.

In our work no one must be put in a predicament before this Parliament. The object must be to obtain a clear-cut answer: yes or no, are we going to continue this game, which consists in saying that we will not enter appropriations in the budget because there is no legal basis and there is no reason to have a legal basis because there are no appropriations to spend. For the citizens of this Community it is an unfair game.

That is why I support the suggestion that has been made by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, inviting us — not only the Commission but also the Council — to discuss the question of whether, in 1980, we are together capable of showing some kind of solidarity at individual level, because — and Mr Delors said something with which I wholeheartedly agree — the objective of an industrial policy cannot be dissociated from the people to whom it applies.

We do not live in an abstract world. We do not live in a bureaucratic world. We are in the process of constructing a society based on respect for various values, which presupposes that what we achieve is in the interests of the greatest possible numbers. That is the challenge we face, and it is a short-term one.

I should now like to say, quite calmly, to those who have tried to make a distinction between the traditional sectors of industry which must be adapted and the new sectors of industry which are in growth, that all this forms part of the same strategy. I say this because I know it is the case. It is not possible to ask regions and workers who have been accustomed to success in traditional businesses to turn to new activities if we do not discuss adaptation and development at the same time. That is the essence of the problem we are facing. And I believe that this Parliament has a duty, just as the Commission has a duty, not to begin the year 1980 without having thought about what exactly this strategy consists of and what activities are involved in its implementation.

It is a difficult undertaking. Why? Because this is not a debate on principles, which consists in saying that the Member States must stop dealing with these things but transfer them to the Community, which will take the decisions. The two representatives of the French Communist Party will excuse me if I do not go into detail on what they had to say. I will simply say that if they were as attentive when listening to what I have to say as they are untiring in repeating untruths, we would have a debate and a genuine dialogue.

How can anyone venture to say, as has been done today, as regards both the shipyards and the textile

industry, that the Community's only objective is to camouflage with aids the desire to reduce Europe's production capacity, when we believe in Europe's ability to develop, and at the same time, ladies, to call for the recognition of the new world economic order — in other words to recognize that today's problems are different from yesterday's — and at the same time to assert that better answers are to be found at national and State level. All I can do is repeat what Mr Fich said just now.

If we believe in solidarity — and I believe in it — and if we believe in solidarity among workers — and I believe in it — to think, by isolating the problem of the French textile industry or of the French shipyards, account will not be taken of the Italian, German or Danish shipyards, to think this is the way to settle the problem of solidarity amongst workers — I should like to know who is telling whom stories.

*(Applause from the right, interruptions from the left)*

Don't look too hard to see which members of your group were applauding and which were not, you might have some difficulty.

Would you like me to compare what Mr Leonardi said with what Mrs LeRoux had to say? Would that be of any interest to you? I think I will spare you this comparison for the sake of solidarity in your group, to the extent that there is any left.

I listen closely to what you say even, when you describe me as the spokesman of the multinationals.

Let us get back to the facts. I ask, therefore, that within a precisely defined period that we be allowed, in cooperation with Parliament — and I believe it is important for the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning and the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment to be involved — to define the political instruments which, if they are designed in an atmosphere of solidarity, will enable us to establish this cohesive, global policy to which Mr Delors and others referred in their speeches, so that we are able to exercise a positive influence over the economic world we face.

We know such thinking will not come from the Member States. You must realize that the Commission does not have the legal powers or the financial resources to insist on a policy of this kind on its own. It is therefore clear that those who are capable of influencing the Member States are not Parliament on its own or the Commission on its own: we must act together with a strategic programme.

We are asking the Council to react, within a clearly defined time-limit, not to words, but to precisely worded suggestions. And we shall then know if the game of ping-pong, which always consists in putting

## Davignon

the ball back in the other man's court without dealing with the subject, can go on.

I should now like to take up an important question because it concerns me directly. I am referring to amendment No 5 tabled by the Socialist Group, according to which the appropriations entered in the 1978 budget were spent in some mysterious manner, without transparency and without account being taken of what Parliament and its committees had said.

Let me quietly recall the facts: we put our request for a new arrangement before Parliament on the basis of line 375 in 1978. In April 1979 Parliament delivered a favourable opinion. In the same month we forwarded to Parliament requests relating to two sectors in which we felt from the outset action was justified, the shipbuilding and textile industries.

Today, in February, we are discussing this opinion. Before the recess I presented to Parliament a scrap-and-build programme for the shipyards. It is not Sir David Nicolson's fault that these two matters could not be dealt with together, but Parliament has not yet delivered its opinion on the subject.

It therefore seems essential to me that before we start throwing accusations at one another, we establish whether the organization of work has not prevented the achievement of the transparency as we would like to have it. I forwarded all the plans before the Council had approved them. More than 50 % of these plans, I would point out, concern the creation of new jobs and fewer than 50 % of them relate to restructuring within the sector. And as I told Mr Seal earlier on — perhaps with exaggerated passion, but he had questioned the proper functioning, the honesty and the ethics of the Commission's services, which no Commissioner could tolerate — European shipbuilders have known for 18 months that projects have been set up for them, aimed at the creation of jobs, on the one hand, and restructuring to give them greater stability in their activities, on the other. Contacts may be made on the basis of the criteria laid down in the regulations we proposed in April. So to say that all this is mysterious when all the cards are on the table seems excessive to me, to say the least.

Let us now come to the shipyards. I really believe that there is a lack of proportion between the resources placed at the Commission's proposal and the problem that has to be faced. But I also believe that we shall not solve this problem until we have found an all-embracing definition of what responsibility the Community bears for all the problems connected with industrial change, whether this concerns the adaptation of sectors in difficulty or the support of sectors in which we must assert our authority and our ability to develop.

I still think the scrap-and-build programme is an essential programme, on which the Council must state

its views very soon, because it aims at anticipating new orders and therefore answering all the questions aimed at giving the shipyards fuller order-books. But I believe that this cannot be done separately. Consequently, the safety programmes and those relating to social rules in shipping must be retained. That is why cooperation between shipowners and shipyards is essential. I cannot believe that it is more advantageous to sell abroad, at low prices, ships that we would not sell to our own shipowners at the same prices, as this has the effect of increasing the discrimination they suffer at the level of maritime policy. I believe that that is a poor policy and that it can only be put to rights if an overall view is taken.

In this context we must draw the necessary conclusions from the fourth directive on aids, which is in no way aimed at refusing to provide any aid for adjustments — they are needed for the organization of change — but it must be transparent and produce the results we want. We have published a report on this subject. A fifth directive must be introduced before the beginning of next year. It will give us an opportunity to discuss all these problems, and in so saying, I am expressing both my own opinion and that of Mr Vouel. Let us think about how to improve the systems, that is absolutely essential.

I should now like to reply to the questions raised by Mr Almirante. It is not true that the crisis in the Italian yards is worse than in other countries. But it is as serious, and that is saying a great deal. And we are prepared — this is a fundamental part of our policy — to ensure that there is coordination of the Regional Fund, the Social Fund, the 'Ortoli facility', action by the European Investment Bank and, I hope, the financial resources we shall be introducing to support industry in Europe, so that a cohesive policy is pursued.

As regards knowing to which yards this policy must be applied, we will have to discuss the subject with the companies, the trade unions and the governments. It is not for us to decide that such and such an adaptation measure must be taken in one yard rather than another. We cannot substitute ourselves for the policies of the Member States. And it is in this respect that Community policy is difficult. In this case, the Community's activities will be grafted on to those of the Member States.

It is therefore inconceivable that, as we are concerned with adaptation, provision should not be made for social measures in the same context. I should like to say on this subject that the Commission agrees with every point, every article and every sentence of the motion for a resolution tabled by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. And if Members would refer to the document on the industry

## Davignon

forwarded by the Commission in 1978, they will see that we attached the same importance to measures aimed at the creation of alternative employment, social measures, training, apprenticeships and the creation of new services as to structural adaptation and industrial innovation measures, because it all forms part of the whole.

To take up briefly the question of the textile industry, we have not made a distinction between man-made fibres and other textiles. But when you have 17m EUA, you do not pretend you can solve all the problems of the shipyards and of the textile industry. I have been asked to give a clear answer and not to make promises we cannot keep. I feel that that would not be doing Europe a service. With 17m EUA it was possible to take specific action with regard to man-made fibres where capacities in this field were not going to be used to the full, while the machinery was there in the crates, in the regions. That was where action was first needed. That is why we acted in Italy to begin with. Because it was there — in Sardinia and other regions — that the factories had been installed, the training of the workers had begun and the potential, very high capacity was not being used. It was therefore logical for us to grant the first redevelopment aid where the problem was most acute. I said the first, not the only aid. And we shall now see how we can continue, as long as our policy is allowed to assume the dimensions required by circumstances.

Let me say a few words on the specific subject of imports from the United States. I have heard a great deal here on this subject, and I should like therefore to state the Commission's position. In the Community as a whole the market has not been disturbed where the GATT rules are concerned. There has not been spectacular growth in imports from America. They have been restricted to the United Kingdom and, in the case of one product, Italy. In these circumstances, it is not the lack of solidarity on the part of the other Member States that has prevented a Community policy from being pursued, as has been said here. This means that in the light of objective circumstances it is not right to claim that all the major Community markets have been disturbed by imports from the United States. And increasing our exports by 1 or 2 %, to the American market, for example, would expose us to all kinds of retaliation. That seems important to me. That is why we have said — it is laid down in the Treaty and in GATT — that there must be Community solidarity if one part of the Community market is in difficulty, the Community as a whole accepting that that Member State will not take unilateral action and that Community action will apply only to that part of the market.

And we shall ensure — in answer to a question put to me — that there is no distortion of trade. We are thinking for the moment of two formulae. If Mr Turner is interested, I will explain to him how we shall ensure that the measures that may be taken with

regard to the United States will not be bypassed by imports from other European countries.

Mr Poncelet was surprised and asked questions about the effectiveness of our external system. I should like to say that the figures I have on the first nine months of the application of the 1979 multi-fibre agreement — I have them before me now — show that the global ceilings have not been exceeded and that in many cases they were not even reached. Which does not mean that in one region or another they were not slightly exceeded, this being because we were not asked soon enough to take action. It is clear, it seems to me, that the policy the Commission has established at the level of the multi-fibre agreement has changed the situation in the Community, as any honest observer will recognize. And we shall continue along this course.

That brings me to the end, Mr President, of what I wanted to say on the general and the specific questions. It seems to me, therefore, that the decision Parliament will be taking today, in approving the resolutions tabled by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs — and taking account of the resolution tabled by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment — must refer to the need for in-depth thinking about industrial problems. By this I do not mean that we want to get out of taking action. On the contrary, we feel we should first establish the framework within which such action is needed, action based on the legal provisions of the Treaty, so that it may be required of everyone and there may be no further discussion on whether those who observe the Community rule are not the ones to suffer. It is essential that Community action contain elements that a purely national solution could not contain. This can only be achieved if the solutions found are clear, rigorous, well thought out and precise. We cannot escape this requirement. It is wrong to believe that there is a conflict between the requirements of competitiveness, the requirements of a market economy and the requirements of solidarity and transition. These elements do not conflict, they are complementary. We must join forces in defining objectives, in defining instruments and in using them in a worthwhile way. Only then will recourse to the Regional Fund, the Social Fund and the Ortoli Fund to release the money required to encourage new investment constitute an effective policy.

Allow me to add with all the conviction of which I am capable that after three years of study, effort and action in this field I am sure that the present position of European industry is no different from that of Japanese or American industry. But it must find confidence again. The workers must know that the measures that have been taken are not aimed at doing them down in their work but at stabilizing the conditions in which they work, and that these measures justify the effort they will have to make to adapt to the new circumstances.

## Davignon

Community solidarity means that resources must be placed at the disposal of all the European countries so that national efforts may be complemented by Community efforts, the aim being to correct the differences and resolve the difficulties at regional level. If this is not done, the rich will get even richer and the poor even poorer. And what Community — if we think of the first sense of this word — can withstand a diagnosis of this kind? I say this because I am convinced of it.

Throughout today's debate reference has been made to general problems. Occasionally, certain Members of Parliament have rightly raised questions specifically concerned with their own constituencies. I should like to say that the Commission's constituency is the whole of Europe. Give us the means to respond to the demands of the whole of Europe, the Commission will not fail in its duty.

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

**Mrs Ewing.** — Mr President, if the Commissioner is asked specific questions which concern the general good and not the constituency and he does not answer them — although he seemed to be interested when speeches were being made — what is a backbencher to do? I have already asked his assistants courteously if he would answer my questions, and I understood that he would. Now, he finished on a great European note, but one of my questions about flags of convenience affects all of Europe and yet did not receive any mention in his speech. Could he now give me an answer? Could he not possibly extend his remarks if only for a sentence or two?

**President.** — I call Mr Davignon.

**Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission.** — I would just like to say to Mrs Ewing that if she would care to refer to the overall document that we drew up on shipbuilding she will find specific and detailed references to the way in which we must take the question of convenience flags into account as we develop our policy.

I would have told Mr Caborn, if he had been there, that we will make our proposals on safety and connected matters in the next three months. However, there is no direct link between flags and scrapping and building activities.

As far as Greece is concerned, Greece is not at this stage being taken into consideration. We have explained that it was in the interest of the Community that we should scrap not only Community ships under our own flags, but also ships from outside fleets because this created a better situation for our shipowners. All this is explained in detail in the piece of paper that we have circulated. All additional

comments and particular questions I will be happy to answer directly if that is necessary. However, I would like to stress that in establishing a link between flags and scrapping and building the question that was asked is based on a misunderstanding of our proposal.

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

**Mr de Goede.** — (NL) Mr President, Commissioner Davignon has rightly criticized the absence of the Council's representatives from this important debate. Many of today's criticisms and remarks have been levelled at the Council. The Council is responsible for the inactivity and for many of the shortcomings mentioned today in the measures that should have been taken in good time in favour of the textile and shipbuilding sectors. I feel it would be a good thing if Parliament's Bureau made it very clear to the Council that we are disappointed at the Council's absence from this important debate.

(Applause)

**President.** — Mr De Goede, like you I too am disappointed at the absence of the Council. We shall bring this to their attention.

I call Mrs De March on a point of order.

**Mrs De March.** — (F) Yes, Mr President, a procedural motion with regard to the reply by Mr Davignon who, I give you, has answered and commented, in his way, on the two speeches by the Communist Members.

That he is entitled to do. I would have preferred him to do it with somewhat sounder arguments because, on the points that we made, there is no precise answer. What is more, the solidarity in question is indeed that of shipowners and shipbuilders. The reason for my intervention, Mr President, is Mr Davignon's last sentence when he said that the scrap-and-build programme had nothing to do with the accession of Greece to the Community. Now I am a bit surprised at your reply Mr Davignon, to the extent that on the 20 November, speaking to the ministers for foreign affairs — and this is reported in 'Europolitique' — you insisted precisely — these are your words, I quoted them this morning. You shook your head but you didn't come back to the point in the discussion, to the point — that is — that Greece has a large number of ships that are over 15 years old and that the scrap-and-build programme would therefore be very useful in her case. As to Spain, this country has already shown a certain interest. There is therefore a direct link, contrary to what you say, between the enlargement of the Community and the future scrap-and-build programme. And this is why the Communist Members have disclosed today what has not yet been the subject of a debate in the European Assembly.

**President.** — I call Mr Davignon.

**Mr Davignon.** — (*F*) I did not want to give a direct reply to your question because I wanted to avoid the embarrassment that might have been caused by the fact that the source you have quoted is not reliable and that the words you have repeated are not correct. I felt it had been necessary for me to criticize your statement on a sufficient number of points not to have to do so on that point as well. Since you invite me so kindly I shall now do so.

Since I am certain that you have read the Commission's document on building and scrapping you will have realized that we had a problem on the question of whether ships had to fly the Community flag to be eligible for the programme. We reached the conclusion that this would run counter to the development of our fleet, whose case — as I do — you plead, because our fleets are relatively young. We therefore feel it advisable to allow shipowners proposing ships flying non-Community flags to be eligible for the build-and-scrap programme. Incidentally, I said that the day when Greece becomes a Member of the Community it might be wise to change these provisions allowing non-Community flags to be eligible because by that time there would be enough old ships eligible for the programme in the Community fleet. This would not benefit Greek shipowners. It would benefit our shipbuilders. It is not the shipowners that stand to gain in this operation. How can you fail to see this? Who stands to gain? We are trying to create conditions enabling Community shipyards to get orders more rapidly in anticipation of requirements that have not yet arisen. And we are trying to ensure that Community shipowners go to Community yards to buy their ships and not to outside shipbuilders. That is the question. The problem is at the level of the shipyards not at that of the shipowners. To say that the Commission, after having wanted first to make up to multinationals, is now intent on being nice to the big Greek shipowners is an invention with as much foundation as the others you have concocted and that is all I shall say.

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

**Mrs De March.** — (*F*) Mr President, as always I find Mr Davignon's reply unsatisfactory. The document I referred to a moment ago is a highly official document that all Members have seen. It is 'Europolitique' and its very official issue of 24 November 1979. So, Mr Davignon, I note the basis of this statement reporting on the discussion with the ministers for foreign affairs, there are indeed differences between what you now say and what I read in these official documents.

I would just like to say that the proposal you referred to is silent about the disparity in the Community as regards wages, which are completely different in Spanish, Portuguese and Greek shipyards as compared with French yards. This is naturally a minor matter,

just as minor — no doubt — as the 50 000 laid off between 1975 and 1978.

**President.** — I call Mr Davignon.

**Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission.** — (*F*) Mr President, I shall reply one last time however annoyed I may feel. I would like to say, Madam, that strangely enough there is only one official publication in the Community and in the Commission. It is the Official Journal. 'Europolitique' is a newspaper, like many others, and the Commission has nothing whatsoever to do with this periodical, officially or unofficially. So it is not the Commission's 'Humanité'.

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

**Mr Simpson.** — Mr President, might I raise a real point of order this time by protesting vigorously against the abuse made of the procedures of this House in making political speeches under the guise of points of order.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — The debate is closed.

#### 10. *Welcome*

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, I wish to welcome the delegation from the Japanese Diet which has just taken its seat in the visitors' gallery, led by Mr Kuranari who headed the delegation at the second meeting in Tokyo in 1978 and at the meeting in Luxembourg in July 1979. We wish the working meeting between our delegations every success and hope that they will foster better mutual understanding.

(*Applause*)

#### 11. *EEC policy on oils, fats and proteins*

**President.** — The next item is the oral question with debate by Mr Davern and Mr Buchou (Doc. 1-613/79), on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, to the Commission.

Subject: EEC policy on oils, fats and proteins.

The EEC is a major producer of oils, fats and proteins from agricultural sources. Such is the level of production of some types, that surpluses have to be exported with the aid of export refunds. At the same time, the Community imports substantial quantities of oils, fats and proteins from third countries. These imports, often unlimited and at zero rates of duty due to current GATT obligations, are in competition with Community products and even contribute to the creation of EEC surpluses of butter and skimmed-milk powder.

1. Will the Commission put forward proposals for a co-ordinated Community policy on oils, fats and proteins?
2. Will the Commission open immediate negotiations with third countries with a view to controlling the flow of imports of oils, fats and proteins into the Community?

I call Mr Davern.

**Mr Davern.** — Mr President, the Group of the European Progressive Democrats tabled this question to the Commission because of its very deep concern at the total lack of a coordinated Community policy on oils, fats and proteins. We are convinced that if something is not done in the immediate future, the sectors concerned will suffer irreparable damage. The European Community is a major producer of oils, fats and proteins, the main examples of which are butter, skimmed-milk powder, vegetable oil, oil seeds and olive oil. Despite the significant level of production within the Community, we are at the same time massive importers of oils, fats and proteins from third countries. Such imports consist of butter, soya beans, manioc and oil seeds for the manufacture of margarine. While these imports form part of our international trading commitments, they are nevertheless in total contradiction with our consumption requirements. Taking into account our own production and the principle of Community preference enshrined in the Treaties, the total lack of any coordinated policy to deal with this blatant contradiction is an embarrassment to the Community and calls for urgent action by the competent authorities.

In the dairy sector the surpluses of butter and skimmed-milk powder are the subject of massive criticism. Much of this criticism turns a blind eye to the enormous imports of butter of over 100 000 tonnes per annum from a highly developed third country. We urge that something be done about this. We are told that the Community has made agreements with New Zealand which it must observe. While such agreements should be observed while they last, there is certainly no argument in favour of extending them for a further period when our production is more than sufficient to meet our needs. When the current agreements come to an end, we must insist that no further imports of New Zealand butter be allowed. We do not hear any suggestion either from the Commission, or from those Members of Parliament who are so enthusiastic in their support for the super-levy, that the New Zealand farmers should be asked to pay the co-responsibility levy and indeed the very high tariff imposed under the super-levy — and despite their massive contribution to the Community's surplus, the New Zealand farmers have not been requested to pay anything towards this levy. Neither do we hear much of the one-time proposal to place a similar tax on vegetable oils used in the production of margarine. Here again we have a massive imported substitute for butter whose low price is contributing to the surplus situation of our own butter production. We must ask the Commission now why they have not pursued their efforts regarding this vegetable oil tax with the same vehemence and vigour as the co-responsibility tax and indeed the super-levy. Surely, Mr President there is scope here for much progress within the context of coordinated Community policy on oils, fats and proteins. The situation regarding imports of soya beans and manioc also needs to be looked at closely.

Soya beans are largely used for the production of animal feed and are in direct competition with the skimmed-milk powder used for the same purpose. This cheap source of animal feed is used by certain Member States as a basis for intense industrial-type milk production. This in turn has had the effect of raising milk output and creating further surpluses of skimmed-milk powder. Manioc has made a similar contribution to these problems. Despite the contribution they make to our surpluses, the Community not only tolerates these imports but does so at a zero level of duty or levy. To the ordinary man in the street this is nothing short of amazing.

No one in his right mind would allow such a situation to continue. The Community is spending massive amounts of money in disposing of surpluses which have been substantially contributed to by duty-free imports from third countries and one must ask where is the logic in this.

We are tired of listening to the same old excuse that the Community has entered into national trade commitments within the framework of GATT. Unfortunately, I feel, and many of my colleagues feel that the Commission is using this excuse too often.

That argument is totally inconsistent with the Community's claim that we are the largest trading bloc in the world and that we are the greatest importers of goods and food in the world. If this claim is true, then surely we can negotiate from a position of strength and not from one of weakness. If highly developed industrial nations such as the United States can negotiate duty-free entry for their exports of soya beans to the EEC, then surely we can negotiate controls for imports from the United States with a clear conscience. Even more so, we should be able to negotiate controls with the weaker countries around the world. And in so doing, we must not seek to avoid our responsibilities to the developing nations. Obviously, there is a total conflict in the policies being pursued. Equally obviously there has been a lack of coordinated policy when dealing with these factors.

My Group is not prepared to stand idly by while Community producers are trodden on and their markets given over to uncontrolled imports from third countries. The time to seek deconsolidation of the relevant products within the context of GATT is now. We must also consider imposing taxes on imports and if necessary on Community products also. We must speed up negotiations with third country suppliers with a view to seeking voluntary restraint by the latter in respect of their exports to the Community.

Finally, the Commission will have to put forward immediate proposals for a more coordinated Community policy on oils, fats and proteins.

## IN THE CHAIR : MR VANDEWIELE

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Gundelach.

**Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission.**

— (DK) Mr President, the question of a Community policy on oils and fats has been the subject of debate and dissension in the Community since it was established. The Commission is perfectly willing to concede that this is as it should be when we are considering a coordinated and coherent policy for our own production of oil seeds, fats and proteins and our consumption of these and it made this clear in its proposal to the Council and Parliament last November. But if these questions are to be discussed properly, we must stick to the facts, and not, as I am afraid Mr Davern has done, indulge in too many illusions and attempt to lay the blame for a country's own problems where it does not belong.

What is the general connection between consumption, production and importation of these products? I should like to remove from the discussion altogether one of the factors referred to by Mr Davern, because it does not come into this question, which concerns oils, fats and proteins. Mr Davern mentioned manioc or, as it is also known, cassava. There is not a grain of fat or protein in that, it is pure starch. It is never used, as Mr Davern suggests, to feed cows. So it has nothing to do with the matter before us; it is a starch product used in compound feedingstuffs for pigs. In parenthesis let it be said, moreover, that we have tried to stabilize imports of this product which come from a developing country, on conditions favourable to that country, Thailand. But this has nothing to do with this question. It will certainly be difficult for our pig production, too, which is one of the sectors which is doing best in the Community, to have to face new increases in prices and costs.

On the subject of oleaginous and protein products, we must look at the question from two angles. On the one hand, there is the question of the products themselves and their use for human consumption and, on the other, their use in animal feedingstuffs. As far as human consumption is concerned, which Mr Davern is really most concerned about, there is, firstly, the question of the relationship between butter and margarine and, secondly, the question of the underlying causes of the existing surplus production of butter in the Community. Is this due to imports of butter from, mainly, New Zealand, and is production stimulated artificially by the use of soya and oil-cake in certain areas of the Community?

On the subject of butter production for the Community, it must be obvious from the statistics that our production has been increasing steadily year by year: up to 1977 by about 1.7 to 1.8 % per year, in 1978 by 4.6 % and in 1979 by 2.4 %, while consumption has been stagnant or declining slightly.

These figures, representing hundreds of thousands more tonnes of butter on the market within a space of only a few years, quite clearly have nothing to do with the amount of butter imported into the Community from New Zealand. In the short debate this morning and yesterday evening I had occasion to stress that the Community's butter exports in 1979 alone exceeded 250 000 tonnes and the amount of butter imported from New Zealand, its entitlement under the existing arrangements, is 120 000 tonnes. But in actual fact it has not exported more than 80 000 tonnes to the European market. In addition to the 260 000 tonnes of butter which we have exported, there are a further 100 000 tonnes of butteroil and over 160 000 tonnes of skimmed milk. We are the world's largest net exporter of dairy produce and I could add to these figures very substantial quantities of cheese. He is a brave man who dares say that our internal problems of surplus butter production are to be blamed on imports from third countries. That is obviously not borne out by these figures.

The quantity of butter imported from New Zealand does not alter the balance on the Community's internal market. Naturally, one can justifiably maintain that, since we have a surplus of butter, there is no need for us from the point of view of supply to import butter from New Zealand in future. I absolutely agree with Mr Davern on that. But the Community also has a responsibility to implement an agricultural policy. It cannot, least of all in the present international situation, when the number of friendly countries is not exactly increasing, allow itself to ignore its responsibility and co-responsibility for a society such as that of New Zealand. Particularly since that does not materially affect the problem which we are discussing at the moment.

That leaves the second question. Is this expanding production of milk to be blamed on the expanding imports of soya cake? The fact is that these imports are certainly quite substantial. The different types of product concerned amount to some 27 million tonnes, but it should be emphasized that by far the larger part of this is used for other purposes than milk production. A very large amount goes into compound feedingstuffs used together with manioc for pigs and other feeding purposes and only a very limited proportion, approximately 2.5 million tonnes, which is a very small part of the whole quantity of feedingstuffs used in milk production, is included in compound feedingstuffs for dairy cattle.

### Gundelach

So it cannot be the imports of oil in the form of soya or soya cake that are the principal cause of, or major contributory factor in, the expanding production of milk in the Community. It does play some part, but only in conjunction with a whole lot of other factors. If one considers the figures for the increase in milk production in different areas of the Community, one finds that the assertion that the areas which use these compound feedingstuffs are responsible for the increased production does not hold true. Most of the increases in recent years are in areas where cows are fed primarily from grass; whereas, in contrast, last year in those areas where these compound feedingstuffs are the main form of food we find there was, for the first time, a drop in production, that is in the milk yield per cow. I cannot therefore accept the view that the use of soya or soya cake products are a major factor in surplus milk production. It is one of many factors, but not the main one.

Furthermore, I should also like to stress that our own production of other oligineous products is quite small. It is therefore not true to say that these imports of soya cakes or soya oil, which are used for various purposes, crowd out our own production of vegetable oils for feedingstuffs. The climate in Europe does not allow us to produce very much of these. So there is no question of these imports taking the place of something else. At most one can say that they do, to a certain limited extent, take the place of protein in the form of cereal, but there is no economically worthwhile means of using more cereal in feedingstuffs instead of the oil products we are speaking about. Such a changeover would entail such an increase in costs for our meat and milk production sector that it would inevitably mean a further drop in consumption. In fact, therefore, imports are not taking the place of other products.

These reasons also explain why the Commission did not include in the price proposal which I presented to Parliament this morning a proposal for tax on vegetable oil, that is margarine, which Mr Davern has asked for. The introduction of such a tax would be difficult to justify in the present inflationary situation, when it cannot be proved that it is the consumption of margarine that is reducing butter consumption. The fact is that in recent years there has been a fall-off not only in the consumption of butter, but also in the consumption of margarine. So competition from margarine is not the cause of the reduced butter consumption; on the contrary general changes in eating habits have brought about a reduction in fat consumption. This situation cannot be altered by imposing new taxes on consumption which make it more expensive to use the products in question. A tax on margarine will not have the affect of increasing butter consumption, but will simply result in lower consumption and nothing else.

The questioners refer to our GATT agreements with the United States and other countries. It is a fact that the Community of the Six in the 60's signed an agreement with the United States within the framework of the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, in which we agreed to import these products free of duty. I presume that the Community did that at the time, because it wished to keep down the costs of meat and milk production. If we did undertake the 'deconsolidation' which Mr Davern has called for, then, under the rules of international trade, which are, after all, a precondition for our own existence, the Community would have to compensate the United States by means of other trade concessions, mainly in the agricultural sector, for more than 1 000 million EUA. Where this would come from I do not know. I am not using this as some kind of excuse, but as an argument along the same lines as the other arguments I have put forward.

Having said all this I must, however, add that I too, like Mr Davern, consider that the Community, for reasons I have discussed earlier with the honourable Members of this House, must exercise great care in its meat and milk sector. It is clearly somewhat illogical that our imports of feedingstuffs, that is to say the raw materials for these animal products, whether in the form of soya or manioc, should be increasing year by year. Here I will agree with Mr Davern that this imbalance is unacceptable. Therefore, the Commission, in its communication and proposal of last November, made it clear that it intends to follow up the negotiations that have been successfully begun with Thailand on the question of manioc with other negotiations with the countries which are supplying us with soya and soya products, so as to strike a more reasonable balance and stability in our imports, which would be more in line with the overall policy on animal produce which we are obliged to pursue because of market conditions. It should not be in the form of deconsolidation, because — as I have already explained — that is too costly and can lead to excessive increases in our own meat and milk sector. But there are other means, namely negotiations to adjust agreements, such as those we have begun with Thailand, which will enable us to bring these imports under control and help us to stabilize our markets. In the circumstances, my answer to Mr Davern is this: that the Commission does intend to implement a policy on the products in question. The Commission intends not only to carry on negotiations, for we have already done this, but to continue with the negotiations we have begun with a view to achieving a more balanced and reasonable level of imports of these products which would be more compatible with the agricultural policy we have to pursue.

With regard to imports from New Zealand, I have already stated my basic position, but, of course, that does not mean that New Zealand, which I believe

**Gundelach**

must continue to be allowed to sell us butter for political reasons, should not also accept the restraints which in one form or another are imposed on the European producers. There must be a levy which New Zealand too, should pay and it cannot expect in future to sell the same quantities to the Community as before. We should certainly show consideration to New Zealand, but in a way compatible with conditions on our own market. Our relationship must be based on a proper balance between New Zealand's exports and consumption trends on our own markets.

**President.** — I call Mrs Cresson.

**Mrs Cresson.** — (*F*) Mr President, two shades of reaction having emerged in the Socialist Group, I will put forward one now and one of my colleagues will speak later.

To begin with, as regards the consumption of manioc to which Mr Gundelach referred, whilst it is true that manioc does not contain all these protein-type elements, I would like to point out that it is mixed with soya so that the more soya imports increase, the more manioc imports increase. These increases in the quantities of soya and manioc have been considerable for several years whereas the fall in the price of soya has made this commodity more and more competitive.

What effect has this had on European agriculture? Firstly there has been a distortion as between the working conditions and costs of various producers in the Community, secondly increased burdens on the Community budget and last — and perhaps most of all — increasing dependence on third countries and the United States in particular, as we saw in 1973 when the embargo was put on American soya.

We do indeed have to have a qualified stance with regard to this question. It is true that there are considerable Netherlands and German capitalist interests in Thailand with regard to the manioc plantations — a point of importance in the campaign that we can now see building up. It is true that the north European ports, and Rotterdam and Hamburg in particular, get vast profits out of imports. It is also true that the big pig producers, and particularly certain countries in the north of Europe, benefit from these imports and, with the help of the compensatory amounts, have been able to develop their enterprises to the detriment of other countries in the south of Europe. But it is also true that we must not penalize the small and medium-size producers who use these products at a cost which is 30-40 % lower than that of European products. It is also true that it would be wrong to believe blindly that an increase in the price of margarine would solve the butter problem.

As regards Community preference, I would point out that if this applied to oils — the EEC meets 22 % of its own vegetable oil requirements — there would be an increase in the levies on oils brought in from third

countries (to differing extents depending on whether they come from the ACP countries or industrialized countries like the United States) which would build up the Community budget. European oil seed crops could be better encouraged than they are at present with aid systems and would take the place of certain surplus products it is costly to export. If an end was put — gradually of course — to the privileged importation, for example, of New Zealand butter into Great Britain — 120 000 tonnes imported without any levy whereas production is only about 300 000 tonnes in excess of consumption — Europe's alleged agricultural surpluses would be substantially cut and would no longer be an unwanted burden on the Community budget. A number of specific measures could then be taken, like prices graduated according to the level of production in farms, help for dairy cow herds, the storage of surpluses in the form of protein rather than skimmed milk and the use of lactose in animal feed, etc. These measures would help to prevent reducing the number of cows which determines the number of calves and hence the amount of meat produced, a sector where Europe is 300 000 tonnes in deficit.

In painting this rapid picture I have tried to show that it is not only by solely dairy measures — as at present — that the milk problem will be solved. I have also tried to show the effects that a better co-ordinated policy on vegetable fat imports, as requested by Mr Davern and Mr Buchou, could have on the Community budget. I have also tried to indicate how Europe's food independence, one of the points on which the Treaty of Rome was built, could be far better secured. We can see, now, how important this point is. Lastly, since with the enlargement of the Community we are going to have to contend with the arrival of olive oil from Spain, I feel that this problem of vegetable oils and fats is, today, a highly topical subject. On behalf of my colleagues in the Socialist Group who take this stance. I would like to support the text submitted by Mr Buchou and Mr Davern, stressing that it is central to our agricultural budget problems. I am gratified to know that it is the Commission's intention to study this problem and I hope that Parliament will be kept informed as regularly as possible on progress in the Commission's thinking.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Tolman to speak on behalf of the Group of the European Peoples Party (CD Group).

**Mr Tolman.** — (*NL*) Mr President, on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group I should like to make four remarks in the five minutes available to me. Firstly, we are in agreement with Mr Davern's question and analysis. He points to a number of very meaningful factors, which he has summarized in his question. Secondly, we find, if we follow his arguments, that the massive imports will result in Europe producing more and more. I am not referring here

**Tolman**

primarily to the import of manioc but a number of other raw materials. Importing increasingly large volumes, it has repeatedly been shown, means increased production and thus an increase in the problems which we face at this moment. That the item we are discussing is very topical is evident from the fact that it was also mentioned during the debate on the budget last December, when the Dankert-Aigner amendment was adopted. I remember, as if it were yesterday, Mr Dankert of the Socialist Group calling for a coordinated policy towards levies on oils and fats. I am sorry to say that I did not hear any mention made of it in Mr Gundelach's speech. But it is a clear and politically important statement by this group, to which we will be reverting in future debates.

Another important point we should like to emphasize, Mr President, concerns the distribution of burdens. This means that when levies on agricultural production are introduced certain groups being the victim in no uncertain fashion, we must not allow these groups to carry the burden alone. We therefore feel that there must be a levy on certain fat, including vegetable fats and this forms, it seems to me, part of the policy of reducing surpluses. Mr Davern stressed the need for a coordinated policy, and we would like to underline this. If we do not do anything in this area, Mr President, Mr Gundelach's policy — which we have always been able to accept in broad terms — will be unsuccessful and remain a hopeless struggle.

Finally, Mr Gundelach rightly referred to Europe's responsibility with respect to New Zealand. But I should straightaway like to name two countries for which we also bear a responsibility which we must not shrug off and which we must not shrug off on to the shoulders of the European agricultural producers alone. It is no small matter, particularly at this time, to find that hardly any mention is made of an increase in the prices of a number of products, that there will be a higher co-responsibility levy and that there will be a very heavy super-levy. I would warn against playing down and underestimating these problems. In the coming months we face a very tense debate, and for Mr Gundelach that means he must pay greater attention to this aspect and for us that we must really reach the stage of implementing the policy to which reference was in fact made in the Dankert amendment in December.

**President.** — I call Mr Curry to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mr Curry.** — Mr President I shall attempt to get away from the farm lobby phrase book which appears to have inspired the speeches we have heard so far on this subject today. I should like to congratulate Mr Davern on taking an unerring aim in missing the target by a mile. I will pass over lightly the spectacle of the man in the Dublin street clamouring for a tax on margarine. I will not mention the recipe for increased all round inflation, and not least for greatly

increased input cost to the farmer, which is contained in his ideas. Nor shall I dwell on the remarkable new concept of international law which states that if it is inconvenient you may get rid of it forthwith. I should like to deal specifically with what is at issue.

The first thing at issue is that old faithful coming out of the music box, the tax on margarine. Let us get this one straight. It will not work, and we cannot have it for several reasons. First of all if you want to clobber margarine in such a way as to make any impact at all on butter you will have to make the tax on it so savage that it would be inconceivable. The only practical effect would be to increase prices to the consumer without doing anything to solve the butter problem. Secondly we would hit indiscriminately areas which have nothing to do with the butter surplus. As you mentioned yourself, Mr Commissioner, the pig and poultry sectors would be the ones to suffer most severely at the hands of such a tax. If it is part of the plan to put up the prices of chicken and pork in the shops, this is an unerring way of going about it.

Thirdly, it would involve a serious deterioration in our relations with the United States, just when a great many people in this Parliament have been emphasizing how important it is for the communities of the West to show solidarity with each other. The tax treatment of soya is embodied in GATT. It dates back to 1962, and it would be impossible to find a satisfactory form of compensation.

Finally, it involves a betrayal of the Lomé countries, because we do import substantial quantities of oil from the third world. That is embodied in the Lomé Convention. I was astonished to see how glibly Mr Davern suggested we should safeguard their interests in an entirely unspecified manner.

Now, if I may mention New Zealand: this House will not be surprised at an Englishman defending New Zealand. We do not want to get into a bitter and violent emotional argument about this. The European Community is founded upon its international trading commitments. We have a ship mountain that we have just heard about. We still import ships. We have a steel mountain. Nobody has suggested we close our frontiers entirely to steel. It is perfectly absurd that we should wish to tear up our international trading agreements, to turn in on ourselves, to renounce and to abandon those whose spirit and understanding of political liberty is similar to our own all for the sake of 80 000 tonnes of butter. I trust Mr President that this Parliament will not wish to take that sort of measure in relation to the problem which we have in front of us.

Since we mention protein: we have got a protein problem. We are deficient in protein, but let us not pretend that we can become self-sufficient either by granting subsidies or erecting protection barriers around our own industry. That is not a realistic prospect; it is not a realistic hope. There is a threat of a

## Curry

downturn in the production of fodder crops in Britain, Holland, Denmark and France. There is the prospect of a decline in 1980, because rising energy costs have undermined the economics of an already economically doubtful business. We must decide whether we wish to embark upon a serious programme to increase our own self-sufficiency, in which case we must make available new resources. Otherwise we must abandon it. We do have to come to a decision on that one. But we must at the same time bear in mind. Mr President, that it ill behoves this House to suggest that we throw away money on the production of things which God and nature never intended the EEC to produce. Trying to follow that road has already led us into a number of extremely costly dead ends in the Common Agricultural Policy.

**President.** — I call Mr Pranchère.

**Mr Pranchère.** — (*F*) Mr President, with regard to the situation of milk oil and fat and protein production, it is inevitable that the question of New Zealand butter imports and imports of vegetable oils and fats from third countries should come up. A few figures put this question into perspective. Nearly 60 % of the EEC's oil and fat requirements are imported. The Community imports four times as much vegetable oils and fats — 43.7 % come from the United States — as the butter it produces. For vegetable oils and fats, the Community produces about only 20 % of its own consumption. These imported vegetable oils and fats totaling 4 500 000 tonnes which come in practically duty and levy-free, are equivalent to 16 times — I repeat 16 times — the quantity of butter purchased by the EEC intervention agencies in 1978.

How can the right of access to the British market of 120 000 tonnes of New Zealand butter be rated as insignificant? In 1979 that was equivalent to 6 % of EEC production and buying up an equivalent quantity costs the EEC a minimum of 1.3 billion French francs, or 7 % of the EAGGF milk budget. How can we fail to be concerned about respect for Community preference and trends in industrial milk production when we consider manioc imports which rose from 4 900 000 tonnes in 1974 to 8 000 000 in 1976 and are forecast, in a study made in 1975 at somewhere between 11 500 000 and 13 700 000 tonnes for the EEC in 1985.

To turn to the real problems at the core of this debate, firstly how can we fail to point to the role of the multinationals? Unilever exists as does the responsibility of governments — including the French government — who do not want to upset them, whence their persistent refusal to tax them. And yet a levy on imports of oils and fats equal to only one-third of the butter levy at the EEC frontiers would, according to the French milk producers organization, completely offset the EAGGF milk expenditure.

Lastly, there is the United States' determination to increase their agricultural role, as a food weapon, and to increase their exports to Europe — helped by the fall in the value of the dollar — and to see the Common Agricultural Policy broken up. The United States' highly protectionist attitude, particularly for agricultural produce — is well-known. However, at the GATT negotiations, nothing was done to make any far-reaching change to this state of affairs. The agreement on dairy products will not change US imports very much and incidentally French Communists have stated their categorical opposition to the results of these negotiations which are harmful to French farmers and French agriculture.

With regard to the GATT negotiations, we strongly condemn the French government and the attitude of its faithful supporters, the RPR and UDF representatives who, in this Assembly, accept that France should be excluded from these negotiations leaving just the Commission to handle them in a spirit of allegiance to the United States. It could of course be claimed that the Commission delegation has defended the CAP and its principles but the fact remains that, in this Assembly and in the Member States, the intention is to break down and abandon the only positive features it still retain<sup>e</sup>

The fact is that although the United States appeared during the negotiations to give up its demands that the CAP and its principles be reviewed, it was because an assurance was given that the Commission, a large majority in this House and the Member States would look after this themselves. This is indeed what began to happen during the discussion on the budget and it is certainly the objective of that large majority in the Assembly, from the Socialist Group to the British Conservatives voting for Mr Dankert's proposals, which wants deep down to undermine the few positive aspects of the CAP.

French crop and animal farmers are fed up with paying the bill for a policy of surrender, rural exodus, and restructuring purely and simply for the benefit of the agrofood multinationals, particularly those in the north of Europe.

We would therefore repeat our proposals, namely those we made during the debate on the budget and which we have set out in a motion for a resolution tabled by the French Communists and Allies Group. We ask for a tax on imports of butter and vegetable oil and fats from third countries, and for a policy to promote protein producers in the Community. We ask for the abolition of compensatory amounts which unfairly penalize French crop and animal farmers and which constitute a violation of the rules of competition and introduce major disparities in production conditions among the Nine. Lastly, we ask that agricultural prices should be geared to production costs. The French Communists will never accept that the farmers of their country be sacrificed. They will fight at their side; they demand acts, promises.

**President.** — I call Mr Maher to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mr Maher.** — Mr President, this is a very important subject, not only because of the situation relating to trade with other countries, but because of the whole problem that we are faced with today in the agricultural sector, that of deciding what we are going to do with our milk production in future and with the people who produce it.

It is idle to suggest that imports of substitute products such as vegetable oils have nothing to do with the problem. Isn't it true that down through the years margarine has in fact progressively eroded the butter market! And if the Commission succeed in reducing milk production, and as a consequence of that perhaps reduce butter production, there is no doubt that margarine would take its place. It is idle to suggest that there is no direct relation between the two. We therefore have to consider very seriously our import policy, and I take Mr Gundelach's point — and he made it very clearly — that in so far as milk production within the Community is concerned he is opposed to quotas, he is not proposing quotas. What he is saying is that he wants the farmers who are producing the surpluses to carry the cost of disposing of those surpluses. In other words, he wants to transfer the cost, as he sees it, from the taxpayer to the producer.

That is fair enough so far as it goes, but isn't true that it is not only the farmers within the Community who are creating this surplus, and wouldn't it be reasonable to suggest that the penalties should apply all round? Why should only the farmers within the Community have to bear the responsibility? Wouldn't it be reasonable to suggest that the cost be spread over all those who are contributing to this surplus? Because it doesn't matter whether fats come from the udder of a dairy cow or grow as a plant which is converted into fats — they're all competing for the same market. So, therefore, all the producers, both inside and outside the European Community, are contributing towards this problem, and all we are saying is, let's spread the penalties across the board. I don't think that's an unreasonable claim to make. I wouldn't, for instance, suggest that we should stop the imports of butter from New Zealand; I think that would be unfair and we have to take account of the problems of the New Zealand farmers. In a progressive way, and taking account of the situation in New Zealand, we may be able to lower those imports. We've done it already with cheese, and indeed with butter. But what we can ask the New Zealanders and others who are exporting fats to the Community is to share the costs with us, and I don't think that's unreasonable. And I don't know what's so sacred about these trading agreements. Apparently they're sacred — you can't disturb them. But you can disturb the livelihoods of millions of

farmers within the European Community. You can say to them, as Mr Gundelach is saying today — and don't forget that this is the harsh reality to a farmer — that if they increase their output this year over and above 99 % of what they produced last year they will have to pay — and this is the situation in some countries, at least in one that I know of and can speak for — they will have to pay the dairy to take their milk.

My God, well, if that is not a quota, I do not know what is. If that kind of recommendation were made to workers, that they had to pay their employer in order to be allowed to work, we should have a revolution, and a bloody one at that, but this is in effect what has been said. You have to pay the dairy to take your milk. Then where is this Community preference? What do these farmers do? On the one hand they are being told that they cannot have an increase in price — because that in effect is the situation — because account is not taken of inflation (in my country, farm incomes fell by 16 % in 1979), and on the other hand they are now being told that the one avenue that was always recommended by governments and by extension services to farmers if they could not get an increase in price — namely, increased production — is closed.

I would like to ask a practical question: what does a farmer do in this situation? What does he do? How does he meet his costs? How does he support his wife and family? It is ludicrous to suggest that in many cases he can change to some other kind of production, even if that were practicable. Mr Gundelach knows it well, a high proportion of these producers are small producers. To change over to beef would be catastrophic for them, it would not give them an income. What in fact you are saying is, get out of business, get into the town or the city, because that is the only option that is left to you! And one might add, get on to the unemployment queue, get more of the dole, clamour to have a house provided for you, etc., because that in fact is the reality.

So could I go back to my original point? I do not think we are unreasonable: all we are saying is, let us share the costs, and I would suggest — and I have seen some figures on this point — that if the co-responsibility levy of 1.5 % were applied to the imports of fats and oils that are competing with butter, let us say, in the European Communities, it would provide a figure far in excess of the cost of disposing of the surplus. So we do not even have to talk about 1.5 %; the levy could be a lot lower. And I do not think that the people who are importing these fats and oils would be unreasonable enough to object to sharing the problem with us. I was also interested by Mr Gundelach's comments in relation to the increase in production. He made a point that the areas where production was increasing were not those where imported feed — soya bean, manioc, etc. —

**Maher**

was being fed to the cows. It may well be that there are increases in the areas primarily producing milk from grass, but from very low levels, and I can say of my own country that the level of production per cow is little more than half what you will find on the mainland of Europe. Of course it is increasing, but from extremely low levels. Let us be factual: the areas of the Community where the output per cow is highest are those where imported feeds are being used, not the areas where cows are being fed primarily from grass.

I am disappointed and disturbed that virtually no mention has been made of other avenues that are perhaps open to us, though I know they are not easy. We talk constantly about world hunger, we talk about the millions that are dying, by the year, in South-East-Asia, India, parts of America and so on. And here are we, debating how in the name of God we are going to reduce a 2% surplus — because that is about what it is — in order to ensure that we do not have any more food to give to these people. Could we not have the political willpower to decide that we will increase food aid — not butter, of course, we can make whole milk-powder out of milk — and supply it to the world's hungry? Why do we talk continually about this problem and take no further measures to meet the demands of people who are dying by the day because of world hunger? Surely we have an opportunity for this in the European Community: we are fortunate enough to exist in a region where the climate is stable, where we have good land, where we have the technology, where we know we can produce year by year given quantities of food. Why do we not make use of that to show the human face of this Community, to show that this is not a nuclear arsenal, that we are not going to push people around with weapons, but help them by supplying them with increasing quantities of food that we know we can produce — and pay for it? We are not serious in talking about world hunger and I do not want to hear any more debates about world hunger. Words are no good to these people, they do not feed them. All that will feed them is food and we have the capacity to produce food; so, instead of debating how we are going to reduce production, could we not take the positive way out and see how we are going to supply some of this surplus to people who want it badly?

**President.** — I call Mr Blaney.

**Mr Blaney.** — May I very briefly support the authors of the question, Mr Davern and his colleague. May I say straight away that I am amazed at the manner in which the Commissioner, speaking here today, implied that the imports which are being criticized are of no consequence. 100 000 tonnes or 120 000 tonnes of butter doesn't matter; 27 000 000 tonnes of soya doesn't matter; 8 000 000 tonnes of manioc

doesn't matter! It may not matter to those who look at it, on a global scale, but to the farmers in certain parts of the Community it matters greatly. The substitution of our own production for these particular quantities, whether it be of butter, soya, protein, sunflower seed or whatever you will, matters very greatly to those who are entirely dependent on outlets which are being closed off to them because of the Community's commitments at international level.

Our responsibilities under these international agreements have been referred to. But what about our responsibilities to the farmers of this Community? What about those from the poor and disadvantaged areas who have been trying in recent years, with the assistance and on the bases of the promises made by this Community to increase production in the only way that makes sense, the only way that is viable, from their point of view, that is, in the dairy sector? Are we to disregard our responsibilities to those Community citizens while talking about our international responsibilities? Are we just to close them off and add them, as has already been said by a previous speaker, to the dole queue; shall we send them into the towns and the cities? Shall we send them from my country to some of your better off countries for you to house, educate, and school them, and pay them unemployment benefits. That appears to be your answer. But it is far from what we were given to understand would be our share of the bargain when we joined the European Community.

We have been dismantling our trade barriers to help the international and multinational manufacturing concerns of this continent and other continents. Isn't that enough for them? Do they also want, now that barriers are dismantled what Mr Curry and his colleagues have been clamaouring for, cheap food as well? You cannot have it both ways. And I say this here again, dismantle your Common Agricultural Policy, put your farmers and your people off the land, drive them into the cities of their own country and into the cities of your countries, and at the end of the day you won't have any Common Agricultural Policy at all. You won't even have Community policy, because you won't have any EEC with all its high sounding concepts which this Parliament, this Commission, this Council are trying to evaporate as quickly as they can. I am sorry my speaking time is not longer. But these are the facts.

**President.** — I call Mr Diana.

**Mr Diana.** — (I) Mr President, it is a fortunate coincidence that, this morning, Commissioner Gundelach should have described to us the Commission's proposals on agricultural prices and that, this afternoon, this House should be discussing the question by Mr Davern whose purpose is to ask for a coordinated policy in the oils and fats sector.

**Diana**

I listened with the closest attention to the points already made on this proposal by Commissioner Gundelach whose objectivity and sense of realism I must say I always appreciate. I also think that, precisely because of this sense of realism we know him to have, the Commissioner cannot fail to know about the close links there are in this sector and in the consumption of the various oils and fats. It is wrong to maintain — as has been said — that the consumption of margarine and that of butter have no effect on each other. We know that the consumption of oils and fats in the European Economic Community is about 6 1/2 million tonnes and that butter accounts for just 21 % — of the consumption of all oils and fats whilst margarine consumption is already today outstripping that of butter.

It is clear that if we follow what Commissioner Gundelach said this morning about prices, in other words if a 1 % tax mark up is applied to butter plus a supertax, again on milk-based products, without doing the same with regard to margarine we shall bring about the shift of a further segment of consumption from butter to margarine. I know there are consumer habits which affect the choice of one or the other product. Nevertheless, the Commissioner will agree with me that, beyond these problems, there is also a price factor which is continuing to steer an increasing number of consumers away from butter to margarine. Well, if we act in that direction I feel that, by the end of the year (and I hope I am wrong but I am afraid on the contrary that I shall be right), we shall find ourselves with a larger surplus of butter than the surplus we have this year.

I do not want to repeat things that have already been said but I would like to draw the attention of the Commissioner and Members to a problem that is very closely connected with this — that of olive oil and vegetable oils. In this sector the same situation prevails as in that of butter and margarine. If we increase the price of olive oil and reduce the price of seed oil we shall inevitably increase the consumption of the latter.

Now at the present moment there is no surplus of olive oil in the European Economic Community. Unfortunately this situation will change substantially when Spain joins the Community. At that time, Community production of olive oil will cover 123 % of the Community's own requirements — provided that consumption in Spain remains unchanged. In fact, Spanish consumers use olive oil not only because of their culinary traditions but also because Spain has a strict policy on seed oil imports, the practical effect of which is substantially to reduce the extent to which it can be imported into Spain. The day that Spain has to apply our own criterion under which imports of

oils and fats from non-Community countries come in duty-free I very much fear that the consumption of olive oil will fall considerably in Spain as it has, unfortunately, in our country. Italian experience teaches that, to maintain a balanced relationship between seed oil and olive-oil consumption you have to have a ratio of about 1 to 2.

So if, with the accession of Spain, the European Economic Community will have to absorb a 200 000 tonne surplus of olive oil as things stand at the moment and at a cost to the Community budget that will amount to not far short of 1 1/2 billion u.a., I am afraid that this burden could be even heavier if there were a marked shift from olive oil to seed oil consumption in Spain as well.

For these reasons, Mr President, I feel that the time has come to introduce this levy which has been proposed several times before in this Assembly and elsewhere. Commissioner Gundelach will remember how this request for a levy on all oils of animal and vegetable origin produced in the EEC or imported into the Community came up during the debate on the budget. He will also remember the estimate made at that time, namely that a 1 % levy on butter extended to all other oils and fats would yield some 538m u.a. for the Community budget. I feel that this cannot be a matter of indifference to us.

It is true that there is the problem of the consumer that no-one means to ignore. But it is also true that we cannot invoke this argument always and only when the issue is margarine consumption. For the other sectors it would seem that there are no problems for consumers, for these sectors the interests of consumers are always invoked.

Well now, I feel that the increased burden of a 1 % levy on oils and fats would have very little effect on Mr Curry's personal budget or on that of my own family. I believe that, with a levy on oils and fats, we would be able to meet the requirements of consumers with lower incomes, by supplying butter to them throughout the year at a reduced price under a programme similar to that operating in the United States of America, in other words not reductions for all consumers but only for those who really need this type of assistance.

Mr President, I feel I must not take any of the time of the speaker in my own Group who will be following me. I none the less earnestly draw the attention of Commissioner Gundelach and Members of Parliament to the importance of a common policy in the oils and fats sector which would probably help to reduce certain — not always objective — accusations levelled at the Common Agricultural Policy to their correct proportions.

**President.** — I call Mr Barbarella.

**Mr Barbarella.** — *(I)* Mr President, I would like to point out by way of introduction that there are two reasons — in my view — for the distorted situation referred to in the question and which takes the form of overproduction of certain animal fats and a shortfall in the animal feed sector.

The first reason is the Community's acceptance of a trade policy, particularly in relation to the United States, that may not be causal I agree but reflects what might — in my view — be called an international division of labour in agriculture in which the United States is the world's producer of grain for human consumption in the Third World and of coarse grain and oilseed for the European Community.

The second reason is to be found in internal Community policy which has established a price structure offering no encouragement and even, in some countries, positively discouraging — at least in certain areas — high protein produce forage crops, and the production of coarse grain in general. All this — as has already been pointed out in this House — has helped to make the Community badly dependent on imports and particularly those from the United States, to restrict its independence (and not only at the level of supplies, I would say), and to create serious trade balance problems at least for certain Member States. This is why I too feel that it is necessary to urge the Commission to rethink these mechanisms relating to trade and support for domestic production that are at the source of the blatant distortions referred to in the question.

This having been said, I would like to make two brief points with specific reference to the matters raised in this question. The first is that, though it is right to ask for better coordination of Community policy on vegetable and animal oils and fats, it is nevertheless essential to be clear about the direction in which this coordination should be aimed. In particular, if the purpose of this request is purely to ask for forms of tax on vegetable oils and fats, it needs to be pointed out that the idea of solving the problem concerned by customs treatment or para-fiscal measures is futile. Such measures would have no effect, at least no immediate effect, on the need for supplies of high-protein feed and as such would not resolve the problem of bringing product production in the Community back into balance. They would put up production costs in the animal farming sector to a very serious extent particularly for some countries such as mine for example and they would have a very bad impact on the general level of the cost of living at a time when inflation is worsening in all the Community countries and where solidarity between producers and the other working classes is more essential than ever for the joint defence of their own purchasing power. These are some of the reasons why the Italian Communists,

as they have already stressed on other occasions in this House, feel that the problems of over-production and those of the sectors not producing enough such as the one this question is concerned with, should be tackled and solved in the all-embracing context of a reform of the Common Agricultural Policy aimed firstly at steering it towards planned development of Community production and secondly at bringing in a price structure permitting the desired development of production and thus the absorption of surpluses and the necessary growth of those sectors we are discussing where there are production shortfalls.

My second and last point, Mr President, relates to the request for controls on oil imports from third countries. On this subject I would like to say that, if this means that oil imports from the developing countries should be restricted or reduced, the European Parliament that, in words at least, has shown itself to be very sensitive to world hunger problems, would be displaying very little coherence. Allowing oil to be imported from these countries means guaranteeing their incomes and thus giving concrete proof of the European Community's resolve to help them in their development.

**President.** — I call Mr De Keersmaeker.

**Mr de Keersmaeker.** — *(NL)* Mr President, my group proposes that the policy on co-responsibility should be tightened up and that it should be joined by a levy on fats and oils. You all know the reasons for this, the elimination or at least reduction of discrimination. Sufficient figures have been given on this this afternoon. This discrimination exists in the dairy sector, which is in difficulty at the moment and under considerable pressure on prices. This is a purely economic approach based on the principle of organizing competition and Community preferences. But in my view social and political motives also underlie this proposal, the feeling being namely that it is unacceptable for the burden of the reorganization of the agricultural policy generally and of the dairy sector in particular to be borne exclusively by the agricultural producers. In this respect, I naturally endorse what Mr Tolman and Mr Maher have said in a clear and even spectacular manner. But underlying the proposal there is also a budgetary motive, which at the moment is of some importance because the revenue from this levy can form a substantial proportion of the European Community's own resources. We have estimated the yield from this levy and find that a levy of only half a percent would produce about 300m EUA.

Initially there was for some considerable time a legal objection to the proposal submitted by the Commission in 1976, but since the judgment of the Court of Justice on 25 October 1978 on a proposal similar to this one, but concerning sugar and isoglucose, there has been no further objection.

**Keersmaecker**

Mr President, the object of our proposal was to make this instrument a substantial component of a package of measures for the reorganization of the dairy sector. The Committee on Budgets expressed its agreement to this through Mr Dankert, and Parliament endorsed this view. And I think I can detect that at the moment the Commission would also like to adopt this course. Hence our disenchantment at finding no mention of this in the economy measures or in the price measures we heard about this morning. Hence also the question as to the reason why. Although the Commissioner has given us a number of reasons, I have to say that they do not convince us. Mr Commissioner, you know that the farmers and market gardeners of the European Community are prepared to make sacrifices, but on two conditions: firstly, that these sacrifices, in quantitative terms, are comparable with those made by other categories of the population, and secondly — and this is not exactly the same thing — that the burden of reorganization should not be borne by the agricultural producers alone. We should be aware of this, because the Commission's proposals certainly do not come up to the mark in this respect.

**President.** — I call Mr Wettig.

**Mr Wettig.** — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the oral question tabled by Mr Davern and Mr Buchou represents a quiet attempt to acquaint the Commission with a new policy, the policy on fats and proteins. The reasons advanced seem at first sight plausible, but they do not bear closer scrutiny. The basic contention is that if imports of fats and proteins were restricted with the aid of an import levy, the surpluses in the milk sector, particularly of butter and skimmed-milk powder, could be reduced. There is only one thing right about this contention, and that is that fodder concentrates are a major cause of surplus production. But it is a fallacy to assume that raising the price of fodder concentrates, which is, after all, the purpose of the import levy, could substantially reduce surplus production. Anyone who maintains this is almost completely ignorant of the situation in major areas of dairy farming. But what would raise the price of fat and protein products is undoubtedly the following: more expensive fodder concentrates will place a substantial burden on livestock holdings, particularly those reducing pigmeat and poultry meat. As they consume almost 75% of the most important concentrate, soya cake, it is easy to see what effect an import levy would have. Either farmers' incomes would fall or consumer prices would rise. This is without a doubt not a sensible policy.

A further consequence of the policy on fats would undoubtedly be to raise the price of margarine. If the raw materials for margarine become more expensive as a result of an import levy, the price of the final product is almost bound to rise. It is occasionally

claimed — as has been done during this debate — that a higher margarine price might help butter sales and so reduce surpluses, but the considerable difference in the prices of butter and margarine that will continue to exist would not induce any margarine consumer to change to butter. All that would happen is that by paying a higher price for margarine the consumer would be making an additional contribution to the financing of the Community budget.

*(Applause)*

I do not intend to discuss the difficult problems to which an import levy would give rise with regard to the Community's GATT obligations. The Commissioner has already referred to this. Even if it was possible to solve these problems, the question remains whether an import levy would be the right course for the Community in commercial and external policy terms. Import restrictions would, after all, hit the developing countries hardest, and apart from the USA they are among the most important suppliers of fats and proteins. Any import restriction is bound to be contrary to the interests of the developing countries over a long period. That that cannot be in the interests of the Community is surely not disputed by anyone in this House.

All these objections mean for many of my colleagues in the Socialist Group that they view a policy on fats and proteins of this kind very sceptically and that very significant and convincing reasons will have to be advanced before they change their minds.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Gundelach.

**Mr Gundelach, Vice-President of the Commission.** — *(DK)* Mr President, I shall try to be brief. This debate has ranged over a long list of different subjects, sometimes connected, sometimes not. This is a sign that to some extent speakers have overlooked the hard facts. I utterly agree with Mr Maher that, in order to deal with the problem at the centre of the debate, namely, the situation on our butter market, we must look for an equitable solution which gives equal weight to the many different factors that have contributed to these problems. Therefore, I said that the amount of butter which New Zealand exports to the Community must be adjusted. I would also like to stress, more particularly in answer to Mr Pranchères' remarks, that there *is* a levy on New Zealand butter. And the cost to the Community of these imports is nothing like as much as he says. The cost is not of that magnitude. A special tax is levied on these butter imports which varies according to the state of the market and which moreover has been such that New Zealand in the present year is able to export only 80 000 tonnes instead of the 120 000 to which it was entitled.

## Gundelach

When we turn to the question of margarine I must repeat what I said earlier. The fact that there is a decline in margarine consumption at the same time that there is stagnation in butter consumption hardly suggests that margarine is taking the place of butter at the moment. It may have done so 10, 20 or 30 years ago, when margarine first appeared and began to compete with butter. But that is not so at present. Therefore, you cannot convince me that the introduction of a tax on margarine by itself will solve our butter problems; nor can you convince me that the Commission or this Parliament will find it easy, in the present inflationary situation, to persuade people that in order to solve our excess butter problem we must put up the price of margarine.

When we talk about balance, we must not forget that public funds prop up the production and consumption of butter by consumption subsidies of the order of 5 000 million units of account. The production of margarine does not cost the Community budget anything like that amount. When talking of balance we must also take into consideration the fact that there is already a colossal financial outlay in all sectors to maintain butter production, including, as Mr Diana says, subsidies for butter for certain social groups, butter for industrial purposes, direct butter subsidies. 700 000 tonnes of butter were sold on our internal market in 1979 with the help of Community subsidies. That must be taken into account when we speak of balance.

I have not said, as Mr Blaney alleged, that the volume of imports of feedingstuffs did not affect the balance in our common agricultural policy. I said just the opposite and I regard his assertion as a distortion of the facts. What I said was that these imports do not squeeze out our oil or seed oil. I also said that these imports were obviously necessary to maintain meat and milk production in the Community, for without them it would be impossible. But this was also why I agreed with Mr Davern regarding the lack of balance in a policy which, on the one hand, tries to balance and limit one section of our meat and milk production and, on the other, permits a steady increase in imports of raw materials for that production, soya, manioc or whatever. From that point of view and from the point of view of spreading the burden, which Mr Maher raised, I absolutely agree that we must try to find ways of attaining a better balance. But I just do not think that can be done by means of a levy for instance on margarine, that is, a levy on consumers. I think it can be done by suitable trade policy measures such as the talks we have provisionally concluded with Thailand. The production of manioc is not only a question of certain Dutch or German capital interests in Thailand. It is a main factor in Thailand's balance of payments and the ending of exports to Europe would be disastrous for it. But there is a possibility of reaching an understanding with regard to adjustments

to check this rise in imports, while at the same time we can offer Thailand assistance in developing its agriculture in other directions to make it less dependent on manioc than at present. Similar measures can be adopted with regard to imports of other feedingstuff substitutes. By this means we can achieve a better balance between imports, production and export outlets. This is the way to proceed and not by continually increasing the burden imposed on consumers or taxpayers by the common agricultural policy. For do not forget that we, Parliament, Commission and Council, have to explain to the people of Europe why 16 000 million EUA are needed to maintain the common agricultural policy, some 40 % of which is for the milk policy. The problem we are facing is a difficult one and cannot be disguised by diverting attention to the part played by soya imports in a small proportion of total milk production. It is the problem in its entirety that has to be dealt with.

I also fully agree with Mr Maher when he refers to my assertion that the increase in milk production was not influenced by the use of imported compound feedingstuffs. It is true that in certain areas of the Community — we are both thinking of Ireland — the increase in areas where cows are fed on grass has been from a very low level. I was thinking of the Community as a whole and there are other regions where the production based on home-grown feedingstuffs has risen very sharply, but from a much higher level. Therefore, there is not a close link between soya consumption and increased milk production. The milk problem must be dealt with directly and cannot be dealt with in a roundabout way by taxes on margarine for example. I know very well that this was included in Parliament's resolution last December. At the time I made the Commission's position clear for the same reasons I have given today, with which other Members of the House have expressed agreement. The issue is clearly not at all as simple as some of the honourable Members would have us believe.

But, as I said before, the need for a better balance between the volume of imports and consumption of them and the patterns of production that we can accept in future is a different matter. Other means must be found than imposing specific taxes on individual products. Mr Maher suggested that this talk of surplus production sounds odd in a world where people are starving. I quite agree. The world is short of food. Therefore, there can be no question, Mr Blaney, of my proposing to cut down the common agricultural policy. There is a need for our agricultural products, both inside and outside the Community. The Commission has repeatedly proposed both to Parliament and to Council that our food aid should be increased. And I hope the present political situation will open the eyes of the political authorities to the need to do something about this. But, as Mr Maher also said, this is not a matter of butter but of other foodstuffs. Therefore, when we look at it in its wider

**Gundelach**

perspective, there are alternatives to milk production. All that is needed is a little energy and imagination to get away from the false conservative attitudes whereby a man thinks he must do what his father, his grandfather and great-grandfather did before him. People need a little willpower to adapt themselves to new circumstances inside and outside the Community.

Lastly, I must thank Mr Diana, for bringing up the question of olive-oil. For that introduces a new dimension into the discussion on oils and fats which is of great importance. For the moment, we have achieved a balance, or at least a rough balance, between consumption and production of olive-oil thanks to a combination of subsidies to producers and consumers. Our subsidized stocks have been sharply reduced.

But when Spain joins the Community with a large production of olive-oil, which it uses mainly for itself because under a number of trade policy arrangements it does not import other oil products, if no special measures are adopted, Spain will then have to import other oil products and the olive-oil will not be consumed and will become a financial burden on the Community as envisaged by Mr Diana.

When we consider my first conclusion, namely the need for a better balance between the volume of imports and consumption and the next problem, namely how we are to strike a balance in an enlarged Community, with olive-oil eventually playing an almost decisive role together with butter in the whole oils and fats sector, there will have to be new solutions. Such solutions will be considered by the Commission and proposed in connection with the draft which will be submitted in the not too distant future for negotiations on Spain's entry. This will necessitate a certain switch in the Community's oils and fats policy, for, Mr Tolman, we do have such a policy. It is not true, even if we talk about various taxes, that this is something I have not given close attention to, Mr Tolman. Of course I have. In the price package of 1977, when we were trying to achieve a comprehensive milk policy, I put forward a proposal for a levy on fats, which did not find acceptance in either the Parliament or the Council, with the result that comprehensive aid measures were adopted to promote the consumption of butter and other milk products on the internal market, including milk powder for feed. I did try, Mr Tolman, so I have bitter personal experience of trying to solve these problems and failing. And I have drawn a realistic conclusion and decided that a solution has got to be found, but it must be achieved by other means than those which have been attempted before and have failed.

**President.** — I call Mr Buchou.

**Mr Buchou.** — (*F*) Mr President, we appreciate the unquestionable good intentions of the Commission as expressed by Mr Gundelach but, although the

Commissioner has given us a remarkable explanation of why many things were impossible he has left us somewhat unsatisfied as far as knowing what it might be possible to do to solve the present problem is concerned. Admittedly, as the Commissioner rightly pointed out, this problem of the oil, fats and proteins market goes back to the earliest days of the Community. It is not a new problem. So far, the Community institutions have not dared to make a genuine attempt to solve this thorny problem which has turned up year in year out, with the regularity of a metronome, and year in year out has been more or less side-stepped.

The issue involves so great a political dimension at the present time that we can no longer be satisfied with trivialities. I am fully aware of the difficulties that our proposal admittedly implies but I find that nothing has really been tried in this field since the Common Agricultural Policy was first brought in and a famous saying crosses my mind: are we afraid to try because it is difficult or is it because it is difficult that we are afraid to try? I believe the truth is that we — ourselves and the Commission — are too afraid. In the document which the Commission submitted to the Council of Ministers on the improvement of the Common Agricultural Policy to bring about better market equilibrium and rationalize our expenditure, we see in the explanatory statement that all the arguments developed by the Commission culminate in concrete budgetary decisions. Later on, on page 4, we find a long paragraph in which the Commission admits to a lack of coherence in policies followed in the field of vegetable oils and fats and in those followed in the protein sector. But this paragraph is the only one for which there are no practical conclusions at the level of the budget or in terms of concrete measures. That being so, I put the following question: Why has the Commission which, according to this report, admits the truth of a certain number of facts, done and proposed nothing for this year? When does it expect to be putting forward concrete proposals on this subject whether these be decisions with budgetary implications or decisions on quantitative restrictions? It is highly desirable that we should now have, not hopes or long-term proposals, but concrete and immediately applicable proposals.

**President.** — To wind up the debate I have received two motions for resolutions with requests for an early vote.

— by Mr Pranchère, Mrs Le Roux, Mrs Poirier, Mr Fernandez, Mr Maffre-Baugé and Mr Martin (Doc. 1-761/79);

— by Mr Davern and Mr Buchou, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats (Doc. 1-762/79).

I shall consult Parliament on these two requests for early votes at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

The debate is closed.

2. *Fight against drug abuse —  
Public health policy*

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on two oral questions to the Commission.

— by Mrs Squarcialupi and Mr Ceravolo, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection (Doc. 1-647/79):

Subject: Fight against drugs

In view of the progressive spread of drug abuse, particularly amongst young people and often involving hard drugs, which is leading to a worrying increase in the number of deaths and which calls for resolute and appropriate action by the political authorities — and whereas drug abuse can only be really countered effectively by taking measures in the social field; the Commission is asked

Whether it recognizes the need for it to take urgent measures such as:

1. A study into new forms of action to combat the traffic in drugs at every stage by means of increased coordination between the Member States themselves and with the countries which produce drugs;
2. A comparison of the experiments carried out both within and outside the Community to fight drug dependency, to assess which of them are worth following up, together with an increase in research including the development of an appropriate action programme;
3. A review of international agreements on soft drugs in order to harmonize legislation to take account of the new situation;
4. Action, using all available means, against those forms of drug dependency about which so much has been said but little practical action taken, i.e. smoking and alcoholism which are just as dangerous as other forms.

— by Mrs Schleicher, Mr Alber, Mr Ghergo, Mrs Cassanmagnago-Cerretti, Mrs Maij-Weggen, Mr Verroken, Mr Estgen, Mr Michel, Mr Mertens and Mr Nordlohne (Doc. 1-701/79)

Subject: Public health in the EEC

At the second meeting of the Council of Public Health Ministers of the Community on 16 November 1978, it was specified that the Commission should submit detailed proposals on health protection in the Community as soon as possible.

The following fields were to be covered:

- means of limiting the over-consumption of medicines;
- dangers of smoking;
- vaccinations; mutual aid following large-scale disasters;
- health cards.

Will the Commission state:

1. The practical proposals which have so far been submitted in these individual fields?
2. What studies have already been completed or are till being carried out on the abovementioned themes?

3. Whether it has already formulated measures for the improvement of public health standards in the Community?

I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

**Mrs Squarcialupi.** — (I) Mr President, I am tabling this question, as you have recalled, on behalf of the Committee on Public Health. The question received a large majority in the vote and the motion for a resolution with request for an early vote that we shall be tabling was unanimously approved when the Committee voted on it.

This question has been awaiting debate for five months and now the debate on it will be fragmentary in nature. It will be concluded tomorrow and the political groups will have had what I would presume to call a disgraceful amount of speaking time — only a minute or two. I agree that the drugs problem is a highly uncomfortable issue but we definitely cannot go on pretending that it does not exist. To remind us there are the thousands of fatalities every year in the countries of the Community and these are all young people or rather more than young and they are getting younger every day. They are young people dying in the most squalid manner for a human being, with a syringe dangling from their arm, in some public lavatory, in the gutter, on the pavement, on a park bench. It is very uncomfortable, as I was saying, to think about these dead youngsters and I too have asked myself whether we have performed our duty to the utmost as Members of Parliament. I do not know what the answer is but one thing is certain: the responsibility of the Commission and the Council is greater than ours.

As long ago as 1970, a cry of alarm on the subject of drugs went up from this Parliament and in 1972, on the proposal of the Liberal Group, what was then a scourge purely for the initiated few was studied in detail in a heavy document. Even at that time, however, the point was made that Community action was one way of making a serious attack on the problem. As I was reading the 1972 report, I was struck by this sentence:

'The question arises of whether the use of drugs does not reflect the influence on young people of elements propagating ideologies aimed at destroying our Western civilization.'

Ladies and gentlemen, a silence of over seven years on a problem like this will certainly not encourage young people to defend our society now affected, in addition to this, by unemployment, mounting marginalization, the crisis in human relations even at family level and the loss of landmarks in the form of ideals, values and hopes. Even less will these young people feel that they are represented by an institution like the European Economic Community which, in seven years, has done nothing on the drug problem, clutching at the fragile and facile argument that certain problems are not addressed in the Treaty of Rome.

### Squarcialupi

Ladies and gentlemen, how many problems are dealt with in this House about which we could say the same thing. We cannot continue to read treaties with glasses that give one reading today and a different reading tomorrow. The fact is that even though the possibility existed, no advantage has been taken of it. We know that the drug addict exists because drugs exist as a product. In the last few years, trade in hard drugs has shifted from the golden triangle — that is South-East Asia and the Middle East — to the Mediterranean, with some coming from Turkey as well. Well then, we have the necessary economic and policy instruments to use against the production of drugs as well. Next Friday, for example, a report on relations between the EEC and the countries of the ASEAN will be discussed with the conclusion of a cooperation agreement in mind, but what better cooperation than that of encouraging the productive conversion of land now used for growing opiates, as already requested by this Parliament as long ago as 1972. A changeover from growing opium and other substances would help to provide a little bread for the hungry. Hunger can be combated in so many different ways. What better opportunity, moreover, during the current reactivation of the association with Turkey, for broaching the issue of opium poppy growing, particularly now that Turkey will, by the end of the year, be formally submitting its application for accession to the Community. What is the Community doing to prevent the drug traffic invading Europe and causing so many deaths?

Unfortunately, Mr President, the minutes are going by, leaving me too little time to elaborate on the various points of the question. I am therefore forced to leave out the social and medical aspects, and the points I would like to make about what a drug addict is like, the effects of and differences between the various hard and soft drugs, the extent to which drugs are believed to be grown and the experiments which have been made in the various countries. What is important, to my mind is that, following this question and the subsequent motion for a resolution, there should develop a common determination to act in this field. There is not a moment to be lost even if only to save our international image. I am referring to the visit made by the delegation of the European Parliament a few days ago to the United States where active attempts are being made to combat drugs although, on the admission of the representatives of the American Congress itself, results do not yet appear to be satisfactory. One of the members of Congress used these words:

'The task of the European Community is vital because we cannot combat the drug menace on our own' and he added: 'it is urgently necessary for the European Parliament to play an active part and to join us in the fight against drugs'.

I will conclude by telling you that there are a thousand deaths every year. Remember, their number is

increasing and, as I said at the outset, there are more and more young people. Let me tell the Commission in advance that we do not want general words of understanding, we want judgement passed. We want effective counteraction so that hundreds of young people shall no longer die in so distressing a way while we just stand by watching syringes thrown on the pavements or stuck into the trees in the public parks where these young people go to inject themselves.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Ghergo.

**Mr Ghergo.** — *(1)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this question concerns a subject of the utmost importance — that of the Community's health policy — and certainly deserves a far broader debate than what will be possible this evening in the little time I am allowed.

The question relates to a communication which Commissioner Vredeling addressed to the Committee on Public Health in January last year with reference to the work of the second session of the Council of Ministers of Health in the Community which took place on 16 November 1978. Reading the minutes of the session, I note that Mr Vredeling gave a very clear round-up of the situation saying, clearly and succinctly, that the results achieved in health policy were very scanty but that the Council of Ministers had shown reassuring receptivity having taken a favourable view of the proposals presented by the Commission which it regarded as — I quote from the minutes — 'reasonable'. For my part I cannot imagine that the Commission could present proposals that would not be reasonable which makes me certain that the initiatives taken or planned by the Commission on this subject will be taken up with the promised readiness on the part of the Council of Ministers.

Commissioner Vredeling said that the main subjects dealt with at that session were: ways of limiting the use of unnecessary drugs, excessive smoking, vaccinations, reciprocal support in the event of major disasters and health passports.

With regard to the first point, there would seem an obvious need for Community initiatives to call a halt to the galloping increase in the consumption of pharmaceuticals that has given rise to the so-called iatrogenic disorders. Some statistics suggest that these diseases are responsible for no less than 10 % of cases admitted to hospital.

With regard to the second point, it is interesting to note that the rules with regard to the use of tobacco differ in the various Community countries. This problem ought to be tackled with the aim of reducing the damage to health caused by smoking tobacco in general and cigarettes in particular.

## Ghergo

Banning smoking in public places and the advertising of tobacco-based industrial products would be two basic rules that could be the subject of a Community directive. It would also be a good thing to make a study of national legislations on the subject, collect the main findings of research on the damage caused to health by smoking and propose such initiatives as may be appropriate at the Community level in the field of health education and as regards discouraging young people from acquiring the smoking habit.

The third subject covered by the question concerns compulsory vaccination in our various countries with an eye to harmonizing national legislations. Although this is a problem falling within the specific province of the World Health Organization, it would seem advisable to establish the necessary links with the organs of the Organization itself in order to strengthen its action in the European context through intervention by Parliament.

Again under the heading of vaccination, thought should be given to the advisability of taking initiatives under the headings of information and education in order to promote the use of vaccines that are not compulsory but to be recommended in given situations.

The third subject concerns measures to be taken in the event of major disasters whether due to natural events — earthquakes, floods, etc. — or caused by accident, presenting a danger for broad areas of territory and big populations. A typical example was that of Seveso in my country. In these cases it would be very desirable for the country hit by the disaster to be able to count on the effective fellowship and support of the other countries in the Community who should pool their available resources and the means of support necessary to cope with the primary and most urgent needs. It is difficult for one country on its own to have sufficient resources constantly available to cope with disasters and calamities beyond a certain scale and whose occurrence, fortunately, is absolutely exceptional. But if arrangements for the necessary liaison and forms of intervention on the part of other countries are made in advance, it will be easier to have available the resources and facilities required at the time of need.

The last subject in the question relates to the so-called 'health passport', a kind of personal document that ought to be used in the same form by all citizens of the Member States. This document would serve two main purposes. Its first would be to contain the most important health information necessary in an emergency such as blood group, any grave chronic disease requiring given therapeutic treatment (heart disorders, diabetes, etc.) and the second would be to constitute a kind of identity tag, possibly bearing a personal code number, which would allow the individual citizen to avail him or herself of the necessary health services during a stay abroad and the host country to be reimbursed without difficulty by the appropriate social

security institution for the cost borne by the health service.

With regard to this proposal to have a 'health passport', reservations were entered — again at the Commission meeting on 25 January to which I referred at the outset — to the effect that this was seen as a form of public interference in the private sector. In fact we are quite convinced that on such danger exists. For one thing it is felt that some of the information given in the document cannot possibly give grounds for any reservations (e.g. blood group, anti-tetanus injection, and name of doctor to be called in an emergency, etc.). Other particulars could be entered purely on a voluntary basis and with the agreement of the person concerned. All in all, there should be no problem under this heading as regards using this document as an identity tag giving right to the use of health services.

In connection with the points made above, the Members tabling the question ask the Commission of the Communities to be kind enough to say whether concrete proposals have yet been drawn up in the form of directives or other Community policy initiatives. We also ask the Commission to kindly report on any studies now under way or already completed and on the findings that such studies may have produced. More generally, the Commission is asked what measures have been taken or are planned to improve health conditions in the Member States, given the fact that this objective is, in the view of the Members tabling the question, one of the Community's priority tasks.

I would now like to supplement what I have just said, again on behalf of my colleagues, by raising some aspects of the concrete application of the principles I have set out. The first relates to possible research on the state of health of the population in the individual countries of the Community. This is a programme that should be given appropriate study by the Commission which should submit proposals to the Council of Ministers aimed at improving our knowledge of health conditions in the Community and thus leading to the adoption of suitable measures to better them. Similarly, it would seem useful to be better informed about the situation in health structures, especially as regards the effective availability of such structures and hospitals in particular, including such matters as distance from centres of population and the number of beds in relation to population figures.

In the pharmaceuticals field, there is a need to harmonize rules and regulations as regards experimentation, registration, production and distribution. On this latter point it would be useful to achieve a better understanding of the problems again on the basis of a pertinent study followed by proposals to be made by the Commission, to the Council of Ministers and to the European Parliament.

## Ghergo

One particular aspect to which I wish to draw the Commission's attention for a moment relates to the pharmaceuticals necessary for the treatment of serious, even though rare, diseases. The enormous cost borne by private industry for research, experimentation and production in the case of these pharmaceuticals is not offset by sales, which can often be counted purely in tens and are restricted to the national territory. The possibility of a Community initiative in this sector ought to be considered either in the form of aid and support for research and experimentation or in terms of free circulation within the Community at least for pharmaceuticals of this type which should be set out in a very restricted list pending the hoped-for free circulation of all pharmaceuticals.

I said at the outset that the subject was highly important and deserved fuller, far fuller, treatment because health policy in the Community is something that concerns the whole population. I believe that my Group, conscious of the importance of safeguarding the health of our citizens, will make itself the promoter of motions for resolutions through which we shall endeavour to make up for the inadequacy with which — I have to say this — this truly fundamental subject has so far been treated.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Vredeling.

**Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (NL) Mr President, for some time now there has been considerable concern in our countries about the use of drugs. This is true of all the Member States, and I do not therefore find it surprising that the subject is also being discussed in Parliament or that there should be pressure for Community action as Mrs Squarcialupi has just advocated. I would point out, Mr President that there is already some consultation at intergovernmental level. I am thinking, for example, of the Pompidou Group, to which most of our Member States belong, but which also includes a country from outside our Community, Sweden. The drugs problem generally is not simply a question of public health, although I will shortly be saying something more about this aspect in connection with the questions raised by Mr Ghergo. Apart from public health, the problem also has legal aspects, relating to public order. And so straightaway we are coming to the limits of the possibilities open to us in the Community, because, as you know, questions of public order are the very matters that — quite generally — have been left out of the Treaties. The Member States themselves remain sovereign in this field.

On the other hand, and I should like to point this out, Mr President, social aspects also play a part, and again they in many cases also have Community aspects. It is an awkward problem that coincides with the dividing line between the Treaties and national legislation.

But I believe it is in every way sensible to view the question as a whole.

This problem certainly has a number of Community aspects, and I feel that although it is difficult to outline a Community policy to deal with the drugs problem, it is in every way a good idea to discuss it in the European Parliament and elsewhere. I should also like to point out that in this difficult area there are not only differences of approach among the Member States but also differences of opinion. Even within individual Member States we often find differences of opinion on this subject. I refer in this connection to a number of interesting articles on the problem that appeared in *Le Monde* last week.

The Council of Public Health Ministers, which — I hope — will be meeting during the first half of this year, has the question of drugs on its agenda. Furthermore, this Council also consists, Mr President, of representatives of the Member States. This in itself shows that we are dealing with a mixed bag: on the one hand, aspects that concern the Community, on the other hand, aspects that concern national legislation without the Community being involved, at least in the opinion of some, and I would say most, Member States.

The question of drugs arose because the doping problem, as it is known in sport, was discussed by the Council of Public Health Ministers, but doping and drugs are also quite generally on the agenda, for example when we talk about the excessive use of medicaments, to which Mr Ghergo has just referred. Where this matter is concerned, we will have to confine ourselves to concentrating on prevention, information and social and medical assistance, and I do not think that we can ignore the fight against the illegal trade in drugs.

Mr Ghergo and his colleagues have asked, on behalf of the European People's Party, a number of questions, and I should like to make a number of comments in reply. Firstly, the question of what I will call the misuse of medicaments. As I have told you, the Council of Public Health Ministers first had the question of doping in sport on their agenda in 1977. At the second meeting of the Council of Public Health Ministers in 1978 the subject was phrased in more general terms and the question of misuse of medicaments generally was discussed, the Commission being asked to study the matter in greater detail. The Commission did this. We collected information on the use, or rather misuse, of medicaments and published the results in *Social Policy*, 1978, No 38, under the heading of 'Pharmaceutical consumption'.

The Council of Public Health Ministers also discussed the question of smoking. The Commission was asked to convene a meeting of experts to permit an exchange of views among the Member States. We were asked to establish a Community method of evaluating the information campaign against smoking.

## Vredeling

In addition, experimental information campaigns were organized. We were also asked to persuade the Council to adopt a common position on cigarette advertising, which — as you know — is completely prohibited in some Member States.

Moreover — and I am now answering Mr Ghergo's question — we are now studying the reasons why people in fact start smoking, a question which is particularly relevant in connection with young people. It is also planned to make a start this year on a study into the reasons for alcohol consumption. We hope it will be possible for the Council of Public Health Ministers to meet for a third time under the Italian Presidency.

I have already had initial contact with the Italian Presidency in this regard. The Commission is cooperating with national experts and international organizations. A number of steps have already been taken, and we hope to be able to submit practical proposals to a meeting of the Council of Public Health Ministers in the first half of this year. The question of advertising, to which I have already referred, is a very practical problem. I am thinking, for example, of advertising for smoking, for medicines and the like on cable television, which makes it possible for advertisements to be seen across frontiers from other Member States. I am also thinking of satellite transmissions and such like — in brief, all things that await the population of our Community in the short or long term. We must try to achieve a Community policy in this area by means of specific agreements. I feel that the action we can take with regard to prevention, for example with respect to smoking and alcohol consumption, must be primarily directed at young people.

As regards vaccinations, we have for the time being left this question with the appropriate organization, the World Health Organization, which is better equipped for this purpose than we are, has numerous experts and is also the competent body for the fight against epidemics and the prevention of infectious diseases. But this does not mean that we are leaving everything to the World Health Organization. We ourselves are very active in encouraging contacts, between the Member States for example, and especially on the operational side of the matter.

As regards mutual assistance in the event of disasters, the Commission convened a meeting of experts from the Member States at the beginning of December last year to discuss answers to a questionnaire that had been distributed by the Commission. The Commission has made it known that it will be submitting to the next meeting of the Council of Public Health Ministers a practical proposal on mutual assistance in the event of disasters. This proposal will take the form of a list of all the specialized centers already in existence throughout the Community which can be called upon in emergencies, so that help may be provided rapidly.

The Euro-health card was also on the Council's agenda, and this subject has two aspects. A card of this kind can be used as evidence of the type of treatment required, where, for example, a person is temporarily in a Member State other than that in which he is insured.

A second and no less important aspect of a health card of this kind is that it would contain medical information on the bearer, so that he could be given help immediately if he suddenly needed it, for example, in an accident or when his own doctor was not immediately available. This aspect and quite specifically the fact that all citizens of the Member States can make use of a document of this kind has given rise to discussions. These proposals are for the moment more or less blocked, because the Commission has proposed that social security for people who move from one Member State to another — and thus for migrant workers in particular — should be extended to the self-employed and to those not gainfully employed. As you know — I do not need to go into detail — this proposal is now before the Council of Ministers and is there encountering some difficulty, part of which has nothing to do with the subject itself. But the Council's approval of the introduction of a health card for everyone, not only workers but also the self-employed and those not gainfully employed, such as students, pensioners and so on, might be a particularly important step. As regards the second aspect to which I referred, the provision of medical information in emergencies. I would point out that two Member States have already introduced a card of this kind for people with specific medical conditions, for example: diabetics, wearers of pacemakers and some users of medicines, where it is a good thing for the doctor to know in an emergency that the patient takes such medicines, those who suffer from allergies and so on. I hope that it will be possible for the Council of Public Health Ministers to reach definite conclusions and achieve definite results in this field at their next meeting.

To conclude, Mr President, I feel that we should not approach the question of public health solely from the narrow economic angle as has hitherto too often been the case, and I am now thinking in particular of pharmaceuticals. I believe that even the Council of Ministers is now slowly coming to realize that this question cannot only be seen in terms of the costs involved — and in the Commission too it has resulted in certain steps being taken. Public health has up to now been distributed over a large number of directorates-general, in other words a large number of Commission staff. The Commission recently decided that one Commissioner should have the coordinating power in the field of public health and that he should be the Commissioner responsible for employment and social affairs, and I therefore now have the great honour of also being the Commissioner responsible for public health, although my title does not yet reflect this.

## Vredeling

Mr President, I believe that this demonstrates that the Treaties concern not only economic, commercial and other matters of a similar nature, but that they also concern the evolution of a Europe with a human face, to use a well-known expression. It is a good thing that certain aspects of public health to which more human aspects attach also form the subject of our decision-making process and of discussions in the Council of Ministers.

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Vredeling, for your last statement. We are aware that you are committed to giving a human character to Parliament's activities and to the work for which you are responsible, and we wish you every success in this new public health sector.

To wind up the debate on Oral Question on the fight against drug abuse (Doc. 1-647/79), I have received three motions for resolutions with requests for an early vote, pursuant to Rule 47 (5) of the Rules of Procedure :

- by Mrs Squarcialupi (Doc. 1-752/79), on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection,
- by Mr Newton Dunn, Mr Turner, Mr Dalziel, Mr Normanton, Mr Balfour and Mr Provan (Doc. 1-764/79), on behalf of the European Democratic Group,
- by Mrs Bonino, Mr Coppieters, Mrs Dekker, Mrs Macciocchi and Mr Pannella (Doc. 1-766/79).

I shall consult Parliament on these three requests at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

### 13. Order of business

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, we are faced with the problem that we are unable to complete our agenda. There are still 14 speakers on the list and we still have the debate on Mr von Wogau's motion to a resolution after which we have the joint discussion on the important Dankert and Jackson report. Parliament has decided that these should be the first two items on Thursday's agenda.

I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange.** — (D) Mr President, I am sorry I have to ask this question. We had hoped that the debates we have had so far would not take as long as has been the case, because we should really have debated the two reports by Mr Dankert and Mr Jackson on the temporary budgetary arrangements. The fact is that more than one-twelfth of the 1979 budget must be made available to the Council, the Economic and Social Committee, the Court of Justice and others to enable them to meet their commitments with regard to rent and insurance. As this concerns non-compul-

sory expenditure, the Council has taken appropriate decisions. The Committee on Budgets discussed the matter yesterday. We feel the question should be dealt with as quickly as possible.

Tomorrow is, of course, the Council's day, Mr President. But on Thursday morning Mr Tugendhat will be presenting the Commission's proposals for the 1980 budget. I do not intend to make any observations about Article 204 of the Treaty or Article 8 of the Financial Regulation, but simply say that if we introduce and vote on these two reports on Thursday morning — because we must vote immediately — we shall be coming too close to the Commission's budgetary proposals, which might cause us political and legal difficulties. I would therefore ask you to consider my request that, contrary to the decision taken yesterday, we take this important matter as the first item on the agenda tomorrow morning and that immediately after the reports have been presented — there is only one speaker, and the whole thing would take perhaps fifteen minutes — we proceed to the vote. Then we will have 24 hours clear before the Commission presents its proposals for the 1980 budget and need have no fear of somebody or other causing legal or political difficulties on the grounds that too little time has elapsed between the two. I am asking, therefore, that this matter be taken first tomorrow morning rather than Thursday morning.

**President.** — As you are aware, the Rules of Procedure stipulate that amendments can only be made to the agenda on a proposal from the President. I therefore feel that the matters should be referred directly to the President so that an answer can be given to your question early tomorrow morning.

### 14. Agenda for next sitting

**President.** — The next sitting will take place tomorrow, Wednesday, 13 February 1980 at 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. with the following agenda :

- decision on the urgency of one report,
- decision on the request for an early vote on 5 motions for resolutions,
- joint debate on the Fuchs report, an oral question to the Council and two oral questions to the Commission on energy policy,
- joint debate on the Council's statement on the Italian Presidency (continuation) and an oral question to the Commission on the British contribution to the Community budget.

3 p.m. to 4.30 p.m. : *Question Time* (questions to the Council and Foreign Ministers)

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 7.25 p.m.)

## SITTING OF WEDNESDAY, 13 FEBRUARY 1980

## Contents

1. <i>Approval of minutes</i> . . . . .	120	<i>Question No 62, by Mr Radoux: EEC-Turkey Association Agreement</i>	
2. <i>Documents received</i> . . . . .	120	<i>Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Council; Mr Fellermaier; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Radoux; Mr Zamberletti; Mr J.D. Taylor; Mr Zamberletti; Mrs De March; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Pannella; Mr Zamberletti; Lord Bethell; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Johnson; Mr Zamberletti</i>	157
3. <i>Order of business</i> . . . . .	121	<i>Question No 47, by Ms Clwyd: Implications to the South Wales coal industry</i>	
4. <i>Urgent procedure</i> . . . . .	121	<i>Mr Zamberletti; Ms Clwyd; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Rogers; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Marshall; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Griffiths; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Pannella; Mr Zamberletti</i> . . . . .	159
5. <i>Decision on urgency</i> . . . . .	122	<i>Point of order: Mr Boyes; Mr Fellermaier; Mr Boyes</i> . . . . .	160
6. <i>Decision on requests for an early vote: Points of order: Mr Klepsch; Mr Pannella</i>	122	<i>Mr Zamberletti</i> . . . . .	161
7. <i>Energy policy — Joint debate on a report (Doc. 1-704/79) by Mr Fuchs on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research and three oral questions with debate by Mr Müller-Hermann and others (Doc. 1-499/79), Mr Pintat on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group (Doc. 1-497/79) and Mr Linkobr and others (Doc. 1-699/79):</i>		<i>Question No 48, by Mr Sieglerschmidt: Directive on product liability</i>	
<i>Mr Fuchs, rapporteur (Doc. 1-704/79)</i> . . .	124	<i>Mr Zamberletti; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Welsh; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Fellermaier; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Hord; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Prout; Mr Zamberletti</i> . . . . .	161
<i>Mr Müller-Hermann, author (Doc. 1-499/79)</i> . . . . .	125	<i>Question No 51, by Lord Douro: Spanish entry to EEC</i>	
<i>Mr Pintat, author (Doc. 1-497/79)</i> . . . . .	126	<i>Mr Zamberletti; Lord Douro; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Pannella; Mr Zamberletti; Lord Bethell; Mr Zamberletti; Mrs Ewing; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Habsburg; Mr Zamberletti; Mrs Poirier; Mr Zamberletti</i> . . . . .	162
<i>Mr Bisaglia, President-in-Office of the Council</i> . . . . .	128	<i>Question No 52, by Mr Battersby: The Community's relations with China</i>	
<i>Mr Schmid, author (Doc. 1-699/79)</i> . . . . .	131	<i>Mr Zamberletti; Mr Battersby; Mr Zamberletti; Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Zamberletti</i> . . . . .	163
<i>Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission; Mr Linkobr (S); Mr Herman (EPP); Mr Seligman (ED); Mr Ippolito; Mrs von Alemann (L); Mr Lalor (EPD); Mr Coppeters (I); Mr Romualdi; Mr Adam; Mr Hoffmann; Mr Beazley; Mr Damette; Mr Calvez; Mr Ansquer; Mr Skovmand; Mrs Dekker; Mr Didò; Mr Pedini; Mr Almirante; Mrs Roudy; Mr Gendebien; Mr Paisley; Mr Abens; Mrs Lizin; Mr Bisaglia; Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .	132		
8. <i>Question Time (Doc. 1-738/79) (conclusion) Questions to the Council</i>			
<i>Question No 61, by Mr Fellermaier: Council policy towards Turkey</i>			

<i>Question No 53, by Mr Turner: Failure to fulfil an obligation under the EEC Treaty</i>		<i>Mr Zamberletti; Mrs Ewing; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Jakobsen; Mr Zamberletti . . . . .</i>	168
<i>Mr Zamberletti; Mr Turner; Mr Zamberletti . . . . .</i>	163	9. <i>Membership of committees . . . . .</i>	169
<i>Question No 54, by Mr Colla: Rise in energy prices</i>		10. <i>Urgent procedure . . . . .</i>	169
<i>Mr Zamberletti; Mr Colla; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Paisley; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Moreland; Mr Zamberletti . . . . .</i>	163	11. <i>Council statement on the Italian presidency (continuation of debate) — British share in the Community budget — Oral question with debate (Doc. 1-617/79) by Mr Galland, Mrs Pruvot and Mr Calvez on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group:</i>	
<i>Question No 55, by Mrs Ewing: Protection of Community waters</i>		<i>Mr Visentini (L); Mr de la Malène (EPD); Mr Pannella (I); Mr De Goede . . . . .</i>	170
<i>Mr Zamberletti; Mrs Ewing; Mr Zamberletti; Mrs Le Roux; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Prag; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Harris; Mr Zamberletti . . . . .</i>	164	<i>Mr Galland, author (Doc. 1-617/79) . . . . .</i>	174
<i>Questions to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation</i>		<i>Mr Cariglia; Mr Bersani; Mr J.M. Taylor; Mr Segre; Mr Cecovini; Mr Bonde; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Maher; Mr Paisley; Mr Romualdi; Mrs Groes; Mr Ruffini, President-in-Office of the Council . . . . .</i>	175
<i>Question No 63, by Mr Paisley: Members of the Community making claims over the territory of Member States</i>		<i>Point of order: Mr Pannella . . . . .</i>	186
<i>Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers; Mr Paisley; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Hume; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Blaney; Mr Zamberletti; Mr J.D. Taylor; Mr Zamberletti; Miss De Valera; Mr Zamberletti . . . . .</i>	165	12. <i>Provisional twelfths (debate and vote) — Report (Doc. 1-756/79) by Mr Dankert on behalf of the Committee on Budgets and report (Doc. 1-755/79) by Mr Robert Jackson on behalf of the Committee on Budgets:</i>	
<i>Question No 64, by Mr Colla: Situation in the Middle East</i>		<i>Mr Dankert, rapporteur (Doc. 1-756/79) . . . . .</i>	187
<i>Mr Zamberletti; Mr Colla; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Marshall; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Blumenfeld; Mr Zamberletti; Mrs Lizin; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Patterson; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Zamberletti; Mr Enright; Mr Zamberletti . . . . .</i>	166	<i>Mr Robert Jackson, rapporteur (Doc. 1-755/79) . . . . .</i>	188
<i>Question No 65, by Mrs Ewing: Human rights in South Africa</i>		<i>Adoption of the resolutions . . . . .</i>	188
		13. <i>Agenda for next sitting . . . . .</i>	188
		<i>Annex . . . . .</i>	189

IN THE CHAIR: MR ZAGARI

*Vice-President*

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

**President.** — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of minutes*

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

Since there are no objections, the minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. *Documents received*

**President.** — I have received:

(a) requests from the Council for opinions on:

— the proposal from the Council for a regulation (EEC) on the conclusion of the transitional protocol to the agreement establishing the association between the European Economic Community and the Republic of Cyprus (Doc. 1-757/79),

**President**

which has been referred to the Committee on External Economic Relations as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Agriculture for an opinion ;

- the proposal from the Commission to the Council for a decision applying for the second time Decision 78/870/EEC empowering the Commission to contract loans for the purpose of promoting investment within the Community (Doc. 1-758/79),

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

- the proposal from the Commission to the Council for a directive amending Directive 71/307/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to textile names (Doc. 1-759/79),

which has been referred to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs as the committee responsible and to the Legal Affairs Committee for an opinion ;

(b) the following oral questions with debate to the Commission :

- by Mr Sutra, Mr Gatto, Mr Delors, Mrs Cresson and Mr Arfè on a common wine-growing policy (Doc. 1-760/79) ;
- by Mr Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berleburg, Mr Klepsch, Mr Gonnella, Mr Janssen van Raay, Mr De Keersmaecker, Mr Ryan, Mr von Bismarck, Mr van Aerssen, Mr Hoffmann, Mr Luster and Mr Pöttering on the negotiating position of the Community at the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea (Doc. 1-768/79) ;

(c) the following motions for resolutions tabled pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure :

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-763/79) by Mr Cottrell, Mr Forth, Mr Hord, Mr Tyrrell and Mr Moreland on a postal administration for the European Communities,

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets ;

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-767/79) by Mr Sarre and Mr Moreau on the Olympic Games,

which has been referred to the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport ;

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-770/79), tabled by Mr Luster, Mr Klepsch, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Vergeer, Mr Adonnino, Mr Ryan, Mr Penders and Mr Michel on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), on the seat of the institutions of the European Community,

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee ;

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-771/79), tabled by Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Klepsch, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mrs Moreau, Mr Barbi, Mr Michel, Mr Ryan, Mr d'Ormesson and Mr Penders on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), on Community policy on the Mediterranean in the context of enlargement of the Community,

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee.

**3. Order of business**

**President.** — Following a request by Mr Lange, chairman of the Committee on Budgets, I propose that pursuant to Rule 12 of the Rules of Procedure the Robert Jackson report (Doc. 1-755/79) and the Dankert report (Doc. 1-756/79) on provisional twelfths be entered as the last item on the agenda of today's sitting and that the vote on the motions for resolutions contained in these reports be held at the end of the joint debate on this subject.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

**4. Urgent procedure**

**President.** — I have received the following requests for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure :

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-773/79) by Mr Hord, Mr Harris, Mr Tyrrell, Mr Pfennig, Mr Konrad Schön, Mr von Wogau, Mr Ryan, Mr Sälzer, Mr Langers, Sir Peter Vanneck, Mr Cottrell, Mr J. M. Taylor, Mr J. D. Taylor, Miss Hooper, Miss Brookes, Mr Simmonds, Mr Simpson, Mr Patterson, Mr Forth, Mr Normanton, Mr Sherlock, Mr Hutton, Mr Paisley, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Mrs Kellett-Bowman, Lord Harmar-Nicholls, Mr Fergusson, Mr Balfour, Mr Pursten, Mr Schaal, Mrs Rabbethge, Mr Curry, Mr Marshall and Lord Bethell on the measures to be taken by the European Community following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the outrageous treatment of Professor Sakharov ;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-774/79) by Mr Sarre, Mrs Roudy, Mrs Vayssade, Mrs Salisch, Mr von der Vring, Mr Vernimmen, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, Mr Oehler, Miss Quin, Mr Linde, Mrs Cresson, Mr Walter, Mr Gautier, Mrs Weber, Mr Motchane, Mr Schwarzenberg, Ms Clwyd, Mr Pelikan, Mr Muntingh, Mr Van Minnen, Mrs Fullet, Mr Caborn and Mr Boyes on the sentence of death passed on James David Mange ;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-775/79) by Mr Sarre, Mr Jaquet, Mrs Roudy, Mr Enright, Mr Albers, Mr Caborn, Mr Griffiths, Mr Loo, Mrs Cresson, Mr Oehler, Mr Motchane, Mr Ruffolo, Mrs Lizin, Mr Orlandi, Mr Van Minnen, Mr Pelikan, Mr Estier, Mr Didò, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, Mr Schmid, Mrs Salisch, Mrs Buchan and Mr Wettig on the events in Guatemala.

The reasons supporting the requests for urgent debate are contained in the documents themselves.

Pursuant to the second subparagraph of Rule 14 (1) of the Rules of Procedure, the vote on these requests will be held at the beginning of the sitting tomorrow.

### 5. Decision on urgency

**President.** — The next item is the decision on the urgency of the Enright report (Doc. 1-754/79) on food aid for Palestinian refugees.

I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure. Urgent procedure is adopted.

I propose that the report be placed on the agenda of the sitting of Friday, 15 February 1980.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

### 6. Decision on requests for an early vote

**President.** — The next item is the decision on the requests for an early vote on five motions for resolutions. We consider first :

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-761/79) by Mr Pranchère and others and motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-762/79) by Mr Davern and others on EEC policy on oils, fats and proteins.

I propose that there be a single vote on these two requests.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

I put to the vote the request for an early vote on the two motions for resolutions.

The request is adopted.

The two motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

\*  
\*   \*   \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the requests for an early vote on three other motions for resolutions :

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-752/79) by Mrs Squarcialupi, motion for a resolution (Doc. 1/764/79) by Mr Newton Dunn and others and motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-766/79) by Mrs Bonino and others on the fight against drug abuse.

I propose that there be a single vote on these three requests.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

Pursuant to the second subparagraph of Rule 47 (5) of the Rules of Procedure,

As soon as the motion for a resolution has been distributed, Parliament shall first decide, if necessary after hearing one of the movers, whether an early vote is to be taken.

I call Mr Klepsch.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) There is just one question I want to ask, Mr President, since unfortunately I was not here at the end of yesterday's sitting. Was the debate on this topic concluded? If so, I go along with your proposal. If the debate was not concluded, however, we should vote on these urgent decisions tomorrow morning.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella** — (I) If you forgive me, Mr President, I believe that is not Mr Klepsch's but the Chair's interpretation which is the correct one, since the wording of Rule 47 (5) is quite clear: 'As soon as the motion for a resolution has been distributed, Parliament shall first decide ...' In my view we should take an immediate vote.

**President.** — I am aware that the debate has not finished but we can nevertheless decide on an early vote.

I put to the vote the request for an early vote on the three motions for resolutions.

The request is adopted.

The three motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

### 7. Energy policy

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on :

- the report (Doc. 704/79), drawn up by Mr Fuchs on behalf of the Committee on Energy and Research, on the communication from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 211/79) on the Community's energy objectives for 1990 and convergence of policies of the Member States and on nuclear energy and energy policy ;

- the oral question with debate (Doc. 1/499/79), tabled by Mr Müller-Hermann, Mrs Walz, Mr Herman, Mr d'Ormesson, Mr Fuchs, Mr Sassano, Mr Hoffmann, Mr Sälzer, Mr Rinsche and Mr Croux on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) to the Council :

Subject: Adequate long-term energy supplies at reasonable cost

It is essential to secure adequate long-term energy supplies at reasonable cost if the European Community is to maintain and improve present living standards, safeguard its international competitiveness and restore full employment within an expanding economy. If unemployment is to be effectively tackled and social security extended, a solution must be found urgently for the energy problems.

In the long term the European Community has no significant oil and gas reserves and no new, easily accessible coal deposits. Furthermore, there is insufficient Continental shelf for oil prospecting and production.

Given the prospect of fierce international competition in the 1980s for diminishing supplies of oil and natural gas, coupled with the existence of a very grave threat to the political independence of major oil-producing countries and to the safety of sea routes used to transport energy, the Community must, as well as saving energy, as is being constantly reiterated, concentrate in the coming decades on the use of home-produced and imported coal — as far as possible using refining processes — and on

## President

the use of nuclear energy, and the development of new or alternative energy sources.

The Community must also take account of the Third World countries in its energy policy and, as a highly industrialized economic zone, ease the pressure on the world energy market by developing nuclear power and other new energy supply systems and by not depriving the developing countries unnecessarily of the more easily accessible forms of energy. This programme requires exceptionally high investment and is subject to exceptionally long lead times.

Convinced that these problems can be mastered only by a major concerted effort, we put the following questions to the Council:

1. What kind of comprehensive common energy policy does it intend to apply in order to meet the challenge presented by the problem of energy supplies? Which Commission proposals relating to the common energy policy has the Council adopted in the last two years, which has it not yet given final consideration, and which has it rejected?
2. Is it resolved and able, following the Tokyo decisions, to ensure that — in concert with the USA and Japan — dependence on OPEC oil is reduced by 1990 to a level that excludes the possibility of lasting disruptions of economic activity in the Community?
3. Can it confirm that the funds set aside for research and development in the energy sector have so far been entirely inadequate? Is it prepared to improve coordination of the large number of national programmes? What kind of safeguards does it think would be appropriate for high-risk private investment in the energy sector?
4. What are its views on the feasibility of comparable safety and environmental regulations governing the construction and in particular the siting of nuclear reactors, particularly in frontier regions, where there must not only be consultation but also an agreement supported by law? Has any consensus been reached on a Community reprocessing and disposal system available to the Member States?
5. What steps are to be taken, above and beyond the energy crisis plan, to guarantee all Member States — irrespective of their own resources — adequate energy sources in good time, where this is essential for their energy supplies?
6. Is it prepared to take measures to intensify the public relations activities and dialogue with the ordinary citizen required for energy policy in the Member States? How does it intend to counter the dangers arising from delays in taking the necessary political decisions?

— oral question with debate (Doc. 1-497/79), tabled by Mr Pintat on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, to the Commission:

Subject: Community support for energy supplies

In view of the persisting difficulties in regard to the Community's energy supplies, can the Commission:

1. Give details of the nature, scope and cost of the programme which it considers the Community would

have to adopt in order to cope with this critical situation?

2. State whether it considers it advisable to launch immediately a Community 'energy' loan and indicate in what way this could be raised rapidly and in what way it could be used.

— oral question with debate (Doc. 1-699/79), tabled by Mr Linkohr, Mrs Roudy, Mr Adam, Mrs Fuillet, Mr Griffiths, Mr Linde, Mrs Lizin, Mr Muntingh, Mr Percheron, Mr Rogers, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, Mr Schmid, Mrs Charzat, Mrs Weber and Mr Schieler, to the Commission:

Subject: Safety of Pressurized Water Reactors

The UK Central Electricity Generating Board is considering the site for Britain's first Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) while the Nuclear Installations Inspectorate has claimed that the design of the British PWR would be different from that of the stricken Three Mile Island No 2 Reactor, near Harrisburg (Pennsylvania). Following the Harrisburg accident, earlier this year, four more nuclear power stations in the United States have been closed down as a result of dangerous mishaps. Meanwhile, the opening of new PWR power stations at Gravelines and Tricastin in France has been prevented due to the action of the trade unions who revealed the discovery of cracks detected in key components of both plants. In addition, progress on the construction of certain PWR's in the German Federal Republic has been held up pending the outcome of legal action.

1. Will the Commission explain what differences in design of the British PWR would prevent the possibility of a Harrisburg-type accident?
2. Does the Commission consider that the current design of PWR's manufactured by Framatome/Creusot-Loire and Siemens (KWU) would similarly prevent a Harrisburg-type accident and, if so, why?
3. Does the Commission not accept that nuclear reactors with single-phase cooling systems based, for example, on carbon dioxide gas, are inherently safer than those with two-phase water cooling systems operating under very high pressure?
4. To what extent does the Commission consider that the cracks discovered in the Gravelines and Tricastin reactors constitute a risk to their safe operation and will the Commission consider making representations to the French Government so as to ensure the well-being of the nearby population (given especially the proximity of Gravelines to the Belgian frontier)?
5. Will the Commission state why it has been necessary to extend until 31 May 1980 the term of office of the group of high-level independent experts whose task is to review the overall current position regarding nuclear safety in the Community in the light of the Harrisburg accident,<sup>1</sup> in view of the undertaking given by Vice-President Natali to Parliament on 9 May 1979 that this group 'will submit a report to the Commission by the end of the year'?<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Commission Decision 79/828/Euratom of 2 October 1979, OJ No L 251 of 5 October 1979, p. 26

<sup>2</sup> OJ Annex No 243 (Debates), p. 132

## President

6. Does the Commission not consider that it is the duty of the Governments of the Member States to inform the public of any safety problems which arise in nuclear installations and is the Commission prepared to assume such a responsibility in case of default?

I call Mr Fuchs.

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report and the motion for a resolution on the Community's energy objectives for 1990 reflect the profound concern that the Community and its Member States are not doing all that is necessary in good time to safeguard our energy supplies. The reason for our concern is the virtually permanent inability of the Council to act on important questions of energy policy and the lack of genuine convergence of the energy policies pursued by the Member States. Our concern has been deepened by the recent developments in the Middle East. Finally, we feel that our concern is justified by the fact that the Member States have made only modest progress — if that — towards their own objectives in such matters as developing nuclear energy and energy-saving. Against this background, the Committee on Energy and Research thinks that the communication from the Commission to the Council is too optimistic, and this view is backed up by Mr Brunner's public pronouncements and the speech Mr Jenkins gave yesterday. Of course, Mr Brunner's oft-repeated public warnings and proposals are good thing in themselves, but it would be a good deal better — and more appropriate to the role of the European Parliament — if the Commission were to submit in the near future a fresh proposal setting out revised objectives and ways of attaining them. In its motion for a resolution, the committee calls for the year 2000 to be adopted as the target date on the grounds that a period of between 8 and 10 years, which is what is needed to carry out major investment projects in the energy sector, leaves practically no room for manoeuvre between now and 1990, which is the target date adopted in this report.

The motion for a resolution welcomes the Commission's communication in principle but goes on, in more than 30 paragraphs, to call for additional steps to be taken as a matter of the utmost urgency. A large majority of the committee felt that it was inappropriate now to pick and choose between a number of measures, but that the whole package would have to be implemented as quickly as possible in an attempt to deal with the threatened energy shortfall. It was felt by the overwhelming majority of the committee that anyone who thinks we can just choose those projects which suit him and leave the others till later or reject them altogether has already missed out on the future of energy. The Committee on Energy and Research has devoted four meetings to a detailed discussion of this question. Amendments which have been incorporated into the motion for a resolution have introduced fresh elements but have not altered the gist of the reso-

lution. The committee rejected by a large majority any amendments aimed principally at placing more and more virtually insuperable obstacles in the way of the development of nuclear energy, or at stopping such development altogether. The decision to reject these amendments was taken only after a conscientious and objective examination of all the facts. This being so — and allow me to make a personal observation here — I think it was out of keeping with the gravity of this question — indeed, I think it was a deplorable relapse into ideological cliché — for members of the Socialist Group to insinuate at the last part-session that Members who supported the development of nuclear energy were acting purely and simply in the interests of large-scale capitalism.

(Applause)

In my opinion this is not the kind of attitude we need. It smacks of an extraordinary degree of self-righteousness. Incidentally, the same accusation ought logically to be levelled at the Socialist members of the Member States' governments, who follow the same line as a majority of the committee. So please, ladies and gentlemen, let us hear no more of this kind of thing.

I should like to use the 10 minutes at my disposal to give you a very succinct version of the essential points of our proposals and demands.

Firstly, there can be no doubt whatsoever that the greatest danger lies in our dependence on imported oil, which is why we are calling for the Community to reduce this dependence as much as possible. The Commission's original aim of a reduction to 50 % is certainly inadequate, and Mr Brunner even referred recently to aiming for only 30 % dependence on imported oil. I hope that every effort will be made to achieve this objective. Secondly, we cannot hope to win the energy battle without more rational use of energy and maximum energy-savings. The every is therefore calling for the adoption of a 0.6 energy coefficient. We realize that this is an ambitious target, but it is one that should be attainable by 1990 if we pull out all the stops. We must realize that the price of energy is a vital factor in energy having, but we must at the same time be prepared to deal with socially unjustifiable hardship. Energy-saving will also require a high level of investment — to insulate buildings, for instance — and let us not forget that this will in itself involve additional energy consumption.

Thirdly, as a substitute for oil and to meet the additional demand for energy, what we need above all are coal and nuclear energy, which are the only high-yield sources of energy we have. Coal will have to be used increasingly for such processes as gasification and liquefaction, and as a raw material for chemical products. Increased coal production in the Community will have to go hand in hand with increased import of coal. However, these additional imports should not be allowed to jeopardize investment for the

**Fuchs**

production of indigenous coal. Imported coal should not be used to replace Community coal but to supplement it; any other policy would be totally wrong.

Fourthly, the motion for a resolution calls for the accelerated development of nuclear power with the proviso, of course, that there should be the highest possible uniform safety standard. A great majority of the committee felt that there was no viable alternative source of energy — at least in the medium term. This is something we must bear in mind and from which we must draw the right conclusions.

Fifthly, we must devote much larger sums of money to the development of renewable sources of energy like solar energy, biomass, geothermic and wind energy. But let us be under no illusion about all this — despite all our efforts, these renewable sources of energy will, in the opinion of all reliable experts, only be able to meet between 3 and 4 % of our requirements by 1990.

Sixthly, the Community has important obligations as regards energy policy to the developing countries, particularly the Lomé States. It is the developing countries whose economic and social structures are being most severely affected by the exorbitant rises in the price of imported oil. That is why the motion for a resolution calls on the Community to work together with the oil-producing countries to make the necessary investment and thus to help the developing countries gradually to become more self-sufficient in energy.

Seventhly, all these measures will require massive, almost unimaginably high capital investment. That is why we are calling on the Commission to carry out an analysis of the capital required to overcome the problems associated with energy. We expect the Commission to issue immediately, on the basis of precise programme proposals, a loan of 2 000 million EUA to finance investment in the renewable energy and energy-saving sectors.

Eighthly, this enormous challenge which is now facing us can only be met by true solidarity between the Member States. As far as the convergence of energy policy is concerned, we must practise what we preach.

We must increase public awareness on as wide a front as possible, and to do this, the Member States in particular — and this also figures in our motion for a resolution — must do much more than they have so far to point out to the public the central importance of energy in safeguarding our economic competitiveness, our social welfare systems and in maintaining peace and prosperity throughout the world.

Ninthly, the committee calls on the Commission to report to the European Parliament once every six months on the progress made in the energy sector and to give us an objective account of successes and failures in this field. That is the only way this House

can carry out its supervisory functions and take an active part in formulating energy policy.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to make the point that, although the energy policy situation is very serious, it is not hopeless. The main thing is that we should be fully aware of the gravity of the situation and draw the necessary conclusions, however unpleasant, or even bitter, they may be.

On behalf of the great majority of the committee, I would ask your approval for this motion for a resolution.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Müller-Hermann.

**Mr Müller-Hermann.** — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the oral question tabled by my Group aims in particular to bring out the Council's responsibility for energy policy and to express our concern at the fact that the Council's activities so far have been inadequate. The need to secure adequate long-term supplies of energy at reasonable cost is a matter of top priority. In the reasonably near future, we must above all bring about a drastic reduction in the amount of energy produced by hydrocarbons and restrict their use for all intents and purposes to the transport and chemicals sectors.

The fact that we are addressing such an emphatic appeal to the Council does not mean that we necessarily expect the Commission to solve our energy problems by way of centralized bureaucratic *dirigisme*. What we really need are coordinated and carefully directed efforts which bear in mind the different situations in the Member States.

Mr President, whatever decisions we take in the energy sector, we must always remember that there is generally an exceptionally long lead time between a decision being taken and its implementation — in most cases, of the order of ten years. That is why we are urging the Council to take the long-awaited decisions at last. This applies to the need to save energy, as the reductions that have taken place in consumption so far are due not to energy-saving measures but to a slower rate of growth than was forecast; it also applies to coal production and long-term import contracts. In this field, we have so far failed by a long way to achieve the aims the Community set itself. As to prospects for the development of nuclear energy, we may assume that by 1990 only half the nuclear energy capacity the Commission and the Council have been reckoning on will in fact be on stream.

Ladies and gentlemen, the urgent problems of economic growth, regional development, employment and the elimination of balance of payments deficits will remain purely academic if we fail to safeguard our long-term energy requirements. I would endorse Mr Fuchs's comment by appealing in particular to the Socialist members of the national parliaments and

**Müller-Hermann**

governments to abandon their policy of blocking the development of nuclear energy ...

*(Applause)*

... There is no justification for such a policy. None of us is taking the matter lightly, and we too demand the most rigorous safety standards. But we cannot afford to exploit the element of fear in the hope of short-term political gains. We bear the long-term responsibility for our peoples and I would call on you to accept that responsibility ...

*(Applause)*

... And the idea that nuclear energy need only be used to cover our residual requirements is essentially unrealistic and dishonest. We all know that coal has become such a valuable raw material that we can only use it in processed form. But that can only be done by using nuclear energy and coal in tandem. I have repeatedly made the point that we must always bear the Third World in mind. Anyone who calls for additional development aid and in the same breath opposes the use of nuclear energy is simply misleading himself and others. Ladies and gentlemen, the number of people in the world will have reached something like 8 000 million by the year 2 000 and the *per-capita* consumption of energy in the Third World will have quadrupled by then. This means that either we shall become embroiled in a major new conflict of interests between the highly industrialized countries and the Third World, or those highly industrialized countries will have to make use of the most up-to-date methods of obtaining energy. And for the foreseeable future that means, first and foremost, nuclear energy.

Let me appeal also to the Commission to come up with definite figures at long last and tell us what kind of capital investment will be required in the future and how these requirements can be met. I think the Commission would be better advised to address its concrete proposals to the European Parliament rather than go around making very contradictory statements in public and thus generating more confusion than light.

We also call on the Council to take more determined steps to find European solutions to the problem of the interim storage and disposal of radioactive waste. In view of the great concern felt by people living in border regions, we must make it a matter of urgency that the construction of new power stations — and in particular nuclear power stations — in border regions should be subject to a legally binding consultation procedure between the governments of the Member States concerned and the Commission, with a right of appeal against the results of this consultation ...

*(Applause)*

... I think this should be a matter of the utmost urgency if we are to check the recurrent and often perfectly justified unrest.

Finally, I would address another appeal to the Council and the Commission. I believe we must take immed-

iate steps to conclude long-term contracts and agreements with the OPEC countries to ensure closer cooperation to our mutual advantage by meeting each others needs. We may assume, ladies and gentlemen, that the United States will — in view of its own substantial resources — be largely independent of OPEC oil by the year 2000, but the European Community and Japan will for a long time yet remain largely dependent on supplies of oil from the OPEC countries. By the year 2000, however, we cannot expect the United States to have the same interest as it does today in protecting the Middle East or the shipping lanes from the Middle East. That makes it all the more urgent for us to enter into close and purposeful cooperation with the OPEC countries today.

Let us not ignore, in all this, the interests of the Third World. In my opinion, the important thing is that we should make sure that the OPEC countries' enormous surpluses from oil transactions are sensibly recycled into the world economy and that our know-how — along with the cheap and plentiful labour in the Third World — should be used to make the world a peaceful place, to promote economic growth throughout the world and to bring about prosperity in the Third World as well.

Those are the points I wanted to make on behalf of my Group to complement Mr Fuchs's report and to introduce this debate.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Pintat.

**Mr Pintat.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the price of oil is becoming totally unreasonable: before there was a 'controlled skid', but now prices are totally out of control. Saudi Arabia, which for a long time exerted a moderating influence, is now losing control of the situation. The problem of the Community's energy supplies is a crucial one. The resources of the exporting countries are increasing at a rate which bears no relation to production costs, selling price of a tonne of oil is in certain cases 50 to 100 times greater than the cost of extraction. The result is massive supplies of cash referred to for convenience as 'petrodollars'. The densely populated producer countries, like Algeria, have no difficulty in using them, but the thinly populated countries, which have the most surpluses, no longer know what to do with them. The recent increase decided on in Caracas has upset the situation still further; the amount of cash for investment has become enormous.

Admittedly the exporting countries are still able to re-invest part of this money, but the amount remaining for investment keeps on growing; a figure of 100 thousand million dollars per year, which is roughly equivalent to the budget of a country like France, has recently been quoted. They can no longer find enough safe investments and so they will clearly

**Pintat**

be tempted to cut production to a level sufficient to meet their own financial requirements. Keeping the oil underground will therefore be their safest investment for the future. Thus, contrary to our hopes and to the law of supply and demand, the increase in the price of crude oil will not mean a return to abundant supplies but will create a serious threat of an oil shortage, and this would paralyse the world economy. World energy consumption, however, will continue to grow. The advocates of zero growth are utterly misguided, and even the Club of Rome has revised its position.

There are three reasons for this. The West must continue to increase its growth to avoid disorder and unemployment. There is a striking parallel between economic growth and the growth of energy consumption. Furthermore, from now until the end of the century the world's population will soar, and as the economies of the Third World countries evolve more towards consumption, their energy requirements will increase even more rapidly than ours. The situation in the Middle East could also become more complicated: the Soviet bloc has so far been self-sufficient in energy, but according to a recent CIA report and a recent statement by Mr Brezhnev, it will be short of oil in the 1980s and will be competing with us for Middle East oil.

In view of the seriousness of such a situation, our governments must make plans to deal with this problem. We must reduce our supplies from the OPEC countries, but we must also try to secure supplies, whether of oil or any other energy source, from elsewhere. In the field of energy, however, it takes a very long time to achieve anything, for whatever form of energy is used, it takes about 10 years to produce results. This is also a very expensive process and would cost us a great deal. Western manpower and capital is to be used to produce energy which could be extracted much more efficiently, with the same capital, from the desert, but this is no longer politically possible. To encourage energy conservation, increases will have to be passed on to the consumer to ensure that alternative sources become profitable. Here are some figures which provide a striking illustration: it costs about \$20 000 to produce one barrel of oil / day per year, 5 thousand million francs to construct a 1 000 megawatt nuclear power plant, and 15 to 20 thousand million francs for a plant to produce 3 million tonnes of oil per year from coal or shale. A recent report by the Chase Manhattan Bank says that we shall have to spend a billion dollars by the end of 1990 in order to produce the energy needed for our consumption up to the turn of the century. To get things into perspective, this amounts to ten times the budget of a country the size of France.

Expenditure of this order is immense. It is on the same scale as that of the great powers or the big inter-

national companies, and could even exceed them. For this reason I feel we should seek new solutions and other means of taking speedy action and securing worthwhile resources. Europe's overriding responsibility is to take action in this sector, and it should help the Member States to finance large-scale projects for European energy installations. There are two conceivable ways of going about this — to introduce a European surtax on oil products or to set up a huge European loans system. Our initial reaction is that we are not in favour of a surtax, as we feel it would be difficult to apply. If it were applied to imports, the countries with their own natural resources would be at an advantage applied to all consumer goods, it would result in an 'energy tax', which would be an undesirable development. The OPEC countries would regard it as an opportunity to increase the price of their goods in line with the example set by the West. However, it would be difficult to get our governments to agree to the principle of a surtax. Look what problems would be created by an increase in VAT beyond 1 % to resolve the difficulties of the Common Agricultural Policy!

In our opinion, therefore, the second option, the system of loans, is the only way open to us. We believe that this new financial instrument offers the only means of allaying our fears: a loan, which the Liberal and Democratic Group has in its initial analysis estimated at 2 000 million EUA, could be issued to finance investment in energy conservation and alternative energy forms. Such a loan is not only essential, as I have just pointed out, but would undoubtedly be successful, since the Community has always enjoyed great advantages on the capital market. Moreover, it would partially solve the crucial problem of petrodollar investment which I referred to at the start of my speech, and might help to persuade the OPEC countries to increase their production. We believe these proposals could become effective in a very short time. The longer we wait, the more uncertain the future of the Community's energy supplies will be. Europe must look after its interests using its own resources! It has the know-how, and now we must give it the financial means to reduce its dependence on oil, that is to use more coal and nuclear energy, as advocated by Parliament's Committee on Energy and Research.

We too are opposed to the politics of fear, and have faith in our technologists; as was admirably pointed out a moment ago, to reject nuclear energy would be far more harmful to the third world than to ourselves. This major loan of 2 000 million EUA requested by the Liberal and Democratic Group for the first year — it might be referred to as 'Energy for Europe' — is in our view essential and should pave the way towards ultimately supplementing the work of the Coal and Steel Community and Euratom by including gas, oil and the new energy sources in what could become 'euro-energy'.

**Pintat**

We would thus achieve three objectives — jobs for our workers, increased energy potential and petrodollar investment. It is better to invest substantially in installations in Europe which will last for years than to waste our money on oil which can only be used once. We believe that our willingness to implement an effective common European energy policy is the real test of the political will of the Nine to build Europe. We feel that Parliament ought to adopt a position, without delay, whereby the most important problem of our age can be overcome: that is the aim of our motion for a resolution and of our appeal to the Commission.

*(Applause from the Liberal and Democratic Group)*

**President.** — I call Mr Bisaglia.

**Mr Bisaglia, President in Office of the Council.** — (I) First of all I should like to thank the ten Members of Parliament who have put down this question. It provides an occasion for the Council to enter into a discussion with the European Parliament on this most important problem of ensuring long-term, adequate and reasonably-priced supplies of the energy upon which our future depends.

As the Members of Parliament who have put questions have formulated them in very precise terms, I should like, if the Parliament has no objection, to deal with these questions one after the other and to give detailed replies to each one.

The first question concerns the overall policy which the Council intends to pursue with regard to energy supplies and the decisions it has taken, or intends to take on this matter.

The common energy policy is based, on the one hand, on the Council Resolution of 17 September 1974 concerning the new energy policy strategy for the Community, on the Resolution of 13 February 1975 concerning measures to be implemented to achieve the of the Community energy policy objectives adopted by the Council on 17 December 1974 and, on the other hand, on the objectives which the Community has established, in particular during the European Councils of Bremen (July 1978), Paris (March 1979) and Strasbourg (June 1979).

Apropos of this, during 1978 and 1979 the Council adopted, at the recommendation of the Commission, a series of proposals concerning:

- protection and promotion of investment in energy research,
- the rational use of energy and energy saving,
- Community projects in the field of hydrocarbons,
- location of power stations,
- nuclear energy.

Members may obtain more detailed information on these proposals if they wish.

The Council has not yet taken a final decision on a certain number of proposals which have been put to it, the list of which is also available for those Members of Parliament who wish to consult it. These proposals concern, amongst other things, new Community measures on energy-saving, energy objectives for 1990, better use of coal, supplying the Community with nuclear fuel and amending Chapter VI of the Euratom Treaty. The Council is still considering these proposals submitted to it by the Commission and has not for the moment rejected any of them.

The second question concerns the reduction of our dependence on oil. Here I should like to remind you that the European Council, in Paris on 12 and 13 March 1979 decided that during 1979, the Community and the Member States would pursue a policy of reducing oil consumption to 500 million tonnes, a reduction of approximately 25 million tonnes compared with what had been forecast. This decision was confirmed by the European Council in Strasbourg on 21 and 22 June 1979 and the information was passed on to the countries taking part in the Tokyo economic summit on 28 and 29 June 1979. In the meantime the Council, at its meeting of 17 May 1979, had asked the Commission, with the cooperation of the Member States, to look at ways of distributing the supplies corresponding to the objective of 500 million tonnes and rebuilding stocks.

Subsequently, at its meeting of 20 September 1979, the Council took note of the progress which had been achieved in pursuing the goal of reducing demand for oil. It furthermore agreed that the efforts which had been made should be continued and if necessary, intensified, during 1980, and it asked the Commission to submit new proposals for this purpose. It also asked the Commission to submit proposals on how the Community ought to prepare for the eventuality of a new supply crisis.

In another decision taken at Strasbourg and also passed on to the countries participating in the Tokyo summit, the European Council expressed the desire to maintain net oil imports into the Community between 1980 and 1985 at an annual level which would not exceed the 1978 level, which was 472 million tonnes.

The way in which this common oil import objective is to be distributed amongst the Member States of the European Community, and the manner in which the objectives for oil imports between 1980 and 1985 are to be supervised, were the subject of decisions taken by the Council on 9 October and 4 December 1979. I have the texts of these decisions available for any Members who wish to inspect them.

In reply to the Council's request, the Commission submitted a Communication on the energy objectives of the Community for 1990 and on the convergence of the policies of Member States, combined with a

**Bisaglia**

draft Council resolution. It has also submitted another Communication accompanied by a draft Council resolution on new Community measures in the field of energy saving. The Council is currently examining these two communications and intends to take a decision in respect of them as soon as the European Parliament has given its opinion.

The third question concerns research and development in the field of energy. Here the Council has hitherto adopted all the proposals for action programmes submitted to it by the Commission, both in the nuclear sector and in other sectors. It shares the Commission's view that the funds allocated are sufficient for the proper execution of these programmes that have been decided upon.

As for improving coordination between national energy programmes, the Council has not yet had occasion to take a decision on any Commission proposals.

As early as 1977 the Council took a decision authorizing the Commission to float Euratom loans, so that it could make a contribution to the financing of nuclear power stations. The value of this Community measure for the beneficiaries has been proved by the fact that the maximum sum originally allocated in 1977 was increased by the Council on 20 December 1979 from 500 to 1 000 million u.a. In other sectors, too, Community action programmes have been undertaken with a view to encouraging private investment. I now come to the fourth question concerning the siting of power stations. Apropos of this, I should first of all like to point out that the choice and approval of sites for power stations are the responsibility of the Member States.

Nevertheless, the Council adopted, at the recommendation of the Commission, the Resolution of 20 November 1978, in which it took note of the Commission's intention of organizing, by means of a group of representatives to be nominated by the Member States and meeting under the auspices of the Energy Committee, a mutual exchange of information relating to problems arising from the siting of power stations, taking due account of specifically local conditions this resolution provides for the Commission's submitting to the Council, after consulting the Energy Committee, a report on the results of this exchange of information. The Council is moreover examining a proposal for a regulation concerning the setting up of a Community consultation procedure for power stations that may affect the territory of another Member State: this proposal is especially concerned with power stations sited in frontier regions or on international water courses or lakes.

At present there are no joint plans for a Community system, at the disposal of Member States, for the recycling and disposal of nuclear waste; nevertheless it should be pointed out that on 5 February 1980 the

Council accepted Commission proposals on the following:

- a draft Council resolution on the creation of a Community action plan with regard to radioactive waste;
- a Council Resolution concerning the reprocessing of irradiated nuclear fuel;
- a Council Resolution concerning breeder reactors.

The Council intends to adopt this decision officially at its meeting on 18 February 1980.

The fifth question concerns the manner in which the Member States may be guaranteed the sources of energy necessary for their energy supplies. Here I shall confine myself to reminding you of the objectives which the Community has established, in particular at of the European Council's of Bremen, Paris and Strasbourg, which all tend towards the goal alluded to in the question.

Finally, the sixth question concerns the problem, which is far too often neglected, of informing the European public on all the questions mentioned above. At the Council of 30 October 1978 we were unanimous in that the fundamental aims continued to be the reduction of the role of oil and of the Community's dependence on imports, better exploitation of Community production, and a rational and economic use of energy, and on this occasion the Council was in agreement regarding the need to convince the public of the importance of these problems and to also to persuade it to accept any restrictions that might prove necessary.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should now like to take this opportunity, after replying, in due fashion to the question put by Mr Müller-Hermann and others, of expounding in this House the philosophy and the main themes of Community policy in the energy sector. They reflect the extreme importance which is everywhere attributed to these matters in our countries.

The fact is that economic growth, full employment, an improved quality of life and reduced social tensions all depend upon secure supplies of energy; in other words, reliable energy supplies are the precondition of an orderly development of our economies.

I also believe that the responsibility for seeing that these objectives are achieved lies with all our governments and with all the political forces represented in this House: this is a responsibility which we cannot and must not evade, because achieving these objectives is the key to the solution of a large part, at least, of the energy problem.

I believe that a decisive convergence of national energy policies in Europe is a primary means of achieving the objective of greater cohesion between our national economies, which is one of the cardinal ideals upon which the European Community is based.

### Bisaglia

The high degree of uncertainty regarding oil supplies and the price of crude oil which we experienced during 1979 — a situation which could be repeated in the future — makes it all the more necessary and urgent that we should define a Community policy which will better meet the requirements of the Member States. A lot has already been done to achieve this goal: I shall remind you, for example, of the fixing of national ceilings on oil imports for 1980 and 1985; similarly the fixing of overall ceilings for the whole of this period; the measures adopted to deal with sudden crises in oil supplies; incentives given to projects concerned with discovering and developing new sources of energy; the beginnings of a system for monitoring the free market; measures designed to make market price structures more transparent; renewed financing for research into the peaceful use of nuclear energy; the agreement on continuing and improving support for coking coal; the coordinated efforts being made by the Member States to implement national measures for reducing consumption of energy, separating, as far as possible oil consumption from economic growth. Given that there is obviously much more that we ought to do in this vital area, I think that the main lines along which Community policy should be developed in the short and medium term are as follows:

- in the first place, drawing up goals for traditional alternative sources of energy to oil in the medium and long term and for energy conservation;
- in the second place, encouraging the use of renewable sources of energy, in order to make it possible to reduce gradually the dependence of our countries on oil.

The two approaches I have outlined above are aspect of one and same problem, since we shall only be able to act consistently not merely with regard to demand for energy but with regard to the supply of energy in the medium term — that is to say, in the space of approximately one decade. The necessary efforts must however, be equally distributed amongst the Member States of the Community.

It seems obvious that the fundamental goal to be achieved by 1990 must be that of substantially reducing the Community's dependence on imported oil. But we cannot attain this objective at the expense of hindering the economic development of the Member States.

So we must, on the one hand, eliminate all forms of waste and continue to provide incentives for every form of conservation and, on the other we must increase the use of other sources of energy than oil, including renewable sources because of the importance which they may well take on at the end of the next decade.

As far as energy savings are concerned, it seems to us that we must devise common measures to encourage the rational use of the energy we have available, both

by revising and regulating the thermal efficiency of buildings and by improving monitoring systems. Attention will also have to be given to the labelling of domestic appliances in order to direct consumers choices towards those which use the least energy.

As I have already said, apart from encouraging the saving and conservation of energy, the Community must also deal with the alternative sources of energy that are capable of constituting suitable replacements for uncertain and ever more expensive hydrocarbon imports. We are all well aware that the main alternative sources of energy are coal and nuclear energy.

If we look in detail at those sectors where the much hoped-for substitution of oil by other sources of energy could be effected, we see that the electrical production could be completely converted from using oil to using coal or uranium; the industrial sector also offers many ways in which oil may be replaced by coal and electricity, but — at the present stage of technological development — it would not be possible to exclude the use of oil altogether. Substitution is even more difficult in the domestic sector, where electricity still has a role to play, whilst it is practically impossible in transport and chemicals,

The conversion to the alternative sources of energy mentioned above must obviously be carried out with most careful attention to the safety regulations and the environment. From the economic point of view, these alternative sources are already broadly competitive with both oil and methane. In the case of Community power-station coal there are some price differences as compared with non-Community coal, whilst every effort must be made to develop in the industrial sector, as in the sector for electrical energy production the transformation of plant from petroleum-product consumption to the consumption of coal which is broadly available throughout the world.

With regard to nuclear energy, efforts are being made at this moment in all our Member States to settle the safety problem: and at this juncture I should like to remind you of the particular commitment shown by Italy, which launched a broad debate on this topic at the recent conference on nuclear safety held in Venice.

I should also like to remind you of the inclusion in the multiannual research programme at the Joint Research Centre in Ispra of an interesting experiment into reactor safety, called Super Sara, to which the Italian Government attaches particular importance and for which it has shouldered particular and significant financial obligations. The experiment appears to be in line with the objective requirement of strengthening safety systems in nuclear power plants, and it is politically important that this type of knowledge should be developed within the Community.

Finally, we should also remember that during recent weeks the Community finished drawing up one or two plans of action with regard to the most important

**Bisaglia**

aspects of the peaceful use of nuclear energy. These are, to be precise the questions of dealing with radioactive waste, reprocessing irradiated nuclear fuel and using fast-breeder reactors. It would seem of vital importance that the Community should take a decisive stand with regard to these most important aspects of the nuclear energy sector, which are likely to be the subject of discussion in other, broader international forums.

I should like to conclude by reminding you also of the need to develop renewable sources of energy, such as solar energy, wind energy, geothermal energy and others, without neglecting the Community's justified interest in continuing research and development as well as pilot projects, into the gasification and liquefaction of coal. I shall also remind you, finally, of the grand aim of nuclear fusion, although this belongs to a more distant future.

As far as prices are concerned, I think it is indispensable that we should talk about the desirability of launching within the Community a process of price harmonization for petroleum products, both at industrial and consumer level, in order to obviate any possible distortions of supply which cause so much damage, particularly at times when there are already difficulties of supply.

Our aims must obviously be harmonized as closely as possible with what is decided in the other industrialized countries.

I have noted that the President of the Commission also gave particular emphasis during his speech to this Parliament last Tuesday to the importance and the urgency of energy problems, also pointing out new paths which could be explored in search of concrete solutions, which we shall definitely look at with particular interest.

In conclusion, the energy problem is a crucial factor in our economic life and in international relations: the solution to this problem demands, therefore, the coordination of our domestic efforts within the Community and a broad degree of international collaboration between both producer and consumer countries whether the latter are industrialized or developing countries.

For some time now the Community has accepted these facts. It has launched an active programme of cooperation between the Member States in energy matters and it has not neglected to make efforts towards an equally substantial collaboration in the broader international context: in this respect, as in respect of every important aspect of Community energy policy, I want to assure this House that the Italian Presidency, during the course of its term of office, will take these topics further and will give active support to any initiative put forward by the Member States.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Schmid.

**Mr Schmid.** — *(D)* Mr President, I am glad we are devoting a special section of this debate on energy objectives for 1990 to the safety of nuclear reactors in view of the new and serious incident which occurred the day before yesterday in Harrisburg. Mr Jenkins tried yesterday to equate the risks involved in the use of nuclear energy with those of alternatives like wind energy. His efforts bore more than a passing resemblance to the activities of a rhetorical bulldozer. All that was really missing from this part of his speech was the assertion that because more than one person has expired in pleasurable circumstances in bed, the activity he was engaged in at the time is just as risky as living with nuclear energy. Finally by way of introduction, let me add that the safety factor is viewed with differing degrees of concern by the various political groups in this House; as far as we Socialists are concerned, however, safety figures very high on our list of priorities.

I should like to tackle the question of nuclear reactor safety by way of the Harrisburg incident, because Harrisburg has served to concentrate our minds on what is really at stake. Before that fateful incident occurred, people basically had the choice of either believing or disbelieving the host of experts who peddled their safety philosophy by claiming that, although there was theoretically a possibility of a major catastrophe occurring, such a thing could never happen in practice.

Pre-Harrisburg, the disbelievers were in the minority. Post-Harrisburg, however — and this is the essential point — there is no longer any choice. The fateful days of April last year finally gave the lie to the line peddled by the safety optimists. And despite the attempts that are being made everywhere — including in this House — to manoeuvre the logical consequences of Harrisburg into the twilight zone of political extremism, but the truth will out, and that goes for this House as for everywhere else...

*(Applause)*

... The message is coming over loud and clear, and it is that the possibility of an accident occurring is essentially implicit in the use of nuclear energy. The experts may dismiss any such possibility, but the fact is that the effects of an incident could well reach the proportions of a national catastrophe. That is something which must be realized by everyone who casts a vote for nuclear energy in any parliament in the world — including this one. According to the nuclear energy supervisory authority in the United States, only a mixture of cool-headedness and luck enabled a catastrophe to be averted at Harrisburg. According to the tapes which are now available, there was still total confusion two days after the incident occurred as to how the highly volatile situation could be defused even.

## Schmid

The investigative committee appointed by the American president reach deadlock and eventually voted against calling a halt to the approval of more nuclear power stations by only the narrowest of margins.

Seventy-two nuclear power stations currently operating in the United States and eighty-eight for which planning permission has already been obtained must now be tested for structural faults. Does it not sound a bit arrogant for leading politicians in Europe to claim only a few days after Harrisburg that their national safety precautions and provisions would prevent any such thing occurring in Europe?

The point at issue now is whether we are prepared to take the risk I have just been talking about, and the Commission still owes us a reply on the real magnitude of this risk. As early as April 1979, the European Parliament called for a report on this question. In the course of the following month's debate, the House was presented with a scanty report which set out the essential technical facts, but which made no attempt to draw political conclusions. Mr Natali promised the European Parliament that the Commission's report would be presented by the end of 1979, as the US investigative committee's official report would first have to be awaited. The US report was made available on 30 October 1979, but we are still waiting for the Commission to honour its pledge. We are now being called upon to make a decision although we are still waiting for a reply to the question of the risk and safety factors. Surely the only people who can vote for nuclear energy here today are those who, when it comes to a conflict of interest between safety on the one hand and reasonably-priced energy supplies on the other, will always automatically vote for cheap energy.

A prominent German economist going by the name of Karl — and the person I have in mind is not our esteemed rapporteur Karl Fuchs, but Karl Marx — once said that big business would always find a way of getting round the human element. I would appeal to this House to prove Karl Marx wrong at least in this point, although I fear that he may well be proved right again after all.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Brunner.

**Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission** — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the price of oil has increased by 110 % since December 1978. Whereas in 1973 the European Community's bill for imported oil amounted to 15 thousand million dollars, that had increased to 50 thousand million dollars by 1978, and we shall reach 100 thousand million dollars in 1980, provided there are no more unexpected, spectacular

price increases this year. Inflation attributable to the increase in the price of oil was 2 percentage points last year, along with 1½ %-worth of slower economic growth which can likewise be put down to oil price rises.

How much longer are we going to wait before establishing a cohesive European energy policy? How much longer are we going to go on squabbling about this or that aspect without getting down to what is really essential? Are we really incapable of getting one simple thing into our heads? The price of oil is bound to go on increasing, and the rate of increase is bound to accelerate. If you really want to know the truth, oil is still relatively cheap today. By 1985 we shall be paying prices which will have us reeling. Is it not about time we realized that nothing we say or do here or outside this House will have any immediate short-term effect on the price policy pursued by the oil-producing countries? We can save energy, and we have done something at least in this field — between 7 and 8 % a year since 1973.

But that has not prevented prices from rising. Whatever we do, the oil-producing countries will respond by cutting back production to produce a market situation in which prices are bound to rise. That is something we simply must realize right at the outset. We must realize that we can only influence this process by bringing alternative products onto the market, which means that we must get out of this position of being dependent on oil.

That is what we must concentrate on. We must distinguish what can be done quickly and what will take rather longer, but we must do so together. We have given you details of our energy objectives for 1990, and I was pleased to hear Mr Fuchs say that we had done a useful job of work. Let me make it quite clear that our target for 1990, namely to reduce our dependence on oil to 40 %, is optimistic given the current state of affairs. Even so, it will not be enough to re-establish our freedom of action. We must really reduce our dependence on oil to 30 % by 1990. Only then will we be able to say that we can, if the need arises, switch horses and successfully deal with any situation brought about by a major cut in supplies or enormous price rises, even though this would still involve economic sacrifices.

That is what is at stake. The only question is: how do we get things moving? We achieved a great deal in the European energy sector in 1979. We formulated common objectives. We said that we intended to import a maximum of 472 million tonnes of crude oil. We established a common consumption target. We said that we intended to consume no more than 500 million tonnes of crude oil. We drew up a register and introduced more clarity into the Rotterdam spot market. We took decisions on coking coal aid and on projects for demonstrating ways of saving energy. It was not a bad year, but we did not do anything near enough. If we had done enough, we should not have

## Brunner

had a 110 % increase in oil prices over the year. So, in the final analysis, what we managed to do was insufficient. We did not manage to regain our freedom of action. And if we go on like this. I prophesy that by the end of this decade, developments in the energy sector will be at the root of the greatest social and political upheavals we have seen in Europe this century. So we must change our ways.

We cannot simply sit back and say: yes, all very well, but we must first of all work out at what point it is economically viable to embark on a project aimed at developing alternative sources of energy. We cannot just sit back and say: somehow or other, the market will react to the changed situation. We cannot just sit back and say: yes, but alternative sources of energy are fraught with so many problems. Coal-fired power stations produce atmospheric pollution, and of course there are environmental problems with the liquifaction of coal — lots of problems! We have just not yet appreciated what we have got coming to us. There are problems with nuclear energy — very serious ones, in fact. Our industries will have to undergo massive structural reorganization, and that will have to be paid for somehow. People will have to get used to the idea of changing their day-to-day habits. This will involve a tedious, long-term information campaign, and we simply have no way of knowing when enough has been done in this respect. We must introduce new technologies without knowing whether there will even be a market for them. This is no way to go about things. It is high time we got round to doing something practical, which boils down to trying to replace oil by other sources of energy in five sectors, these five being energy-saving, coal, nuclear energy, coal liquifaction and coal gasification. We must work flat-out to develop a plan to complement what has already been done at national level and to accelerate the process. And it is something that must be done now.

Yesterday Mr Jenkins outlined our thinking on this subject, and I should like now to elaborate a little on what he said. If we succeed in making these alternative energy methods of producing more viable, we should be able to carry out a lot of the projects over the next two or three years. By 1983, we could be getting about 10 % of our requirements from petrol and oil produced from coal and making anything up to a 50 % saving by such things as better structural insulation, more efficient use of household appliances, better district heating system and more efficient utilization of linked power and heat.

Not only that — we could create a large number of jobs in the process. There is scope in the insulation sector alone for the creation of 300 000 jobs a year in Europe. We could also use the situation to accelerate the process of structural reorganization in industry. We must get away from the basic industries and move more into the production of capital goods which are less energy-intensive. These things are all feasible. We

could improve the safety of nuclear power stations, and use nuclear power to generate more electricity. We could also build more coal-fired power stations in Europe. We could — at long last — make significant progress on what would be a synthesis of coal and nuclear energy technology — the production of petrol and oil from coal. As I said, all these things are feasible, but they can only be done if we all pull together.

How should we set to work? Clearly, we are going to need more money. Mr Pintat already referred to the fact that work on a number of these projects could be accelerated by borrowing money. I am all for that. I am in favour of floating an energy loan, but let me warn you — that will not be enough in itself. Borrowed money is expensive money. What we need is unsecured loan financing of some of these projects. That is the only way we shall speed up cash flow sufficiently to persuade investors to part with their money now. That is the only way we shall get these projects off the ground quickly.

So we need some other form of financing apart from borrowing, which is dependent on a certain market situation. By floating public loans, you can sometimes cause chaos on the capital market, and that is why it will not always be possible to use borrowing selectively as a means of promoting energy policy. We shall have to be sure of when and how we should intervene on the market. When you think that the Federal Republic of Germany will next year have to repay DM 36 000 million in loans and DM 16 000 million in interest, I cannot see the German Government being quick to approve a loan to be floated at short notice. We must give some thought to when the money will be available, and we are in something of a quandary here, because unfortunately time is of the essence. We cannot afford to wait, because it is not only the energy situation which is getting out of hand. The social repercussions of this situation and the adverse effects on growth are together producing a world economic situation in which we shall have rates of growth only half what we have been used to. By June of this year, we shall have 7 million unemployed in the European Community, and we shall be lucky to achieve a rate of growth of 1.7 % in the Community in 1980. As you can see, we simply cannot afford to wait.

It therefore follows that we need additional sources of revenue, but the question is: where can the money come from? I can see only one way out, and that is to consider the possibility of imposing a modest levy on oil imports, linked perhaps to a modest levy on the production of oil within the Community. A levy of 2 units of account per tonne of imported oil would bring in 1 500 million dollars per year of own resources into the Community's coffers, and we should then be able to direct these additional resources straight to this energy programme. That would be one way out which offers better prospects

**Brunner**

than customs levies or a tax on consumption, although the latter is something we can also consider.

Now you may say that the oil companies which have to pay this levy will simply pass it on to the consumer. This may well be so, so long as the market will bear it. It may not happen immediately, but even if it did, we would take the line that, if prices are in any case going to continue to rise, it is surely better to pre-empt this development somewhat and to try to use the revenue from the resultant small rise in prices within the Community to construct a price-brake which can be applied once we have products capable of competing with oil on the market some time in the future — say, in 1985 or 1987. It is surely better for us to pre-empt this development somewhat rather than paying these spiralling prices year after year and thus wrecking all our economic planning. Surely it is sensible for us not to allow things to drift on like this. We cannot expect the market mechanism to do whatever is necessary. I may be leaving myself open to the criticism that what I am planning is selective, sectoral aid. Let me say to you, though, that energy is such an important factor in our society — indeed it is of the utmost importance to our future prospects — that we must be prepared to accept sectoral aid for projects aiming to develop alternative sources of energy. This aid must be forthcoming because time is not on our side, and if we fail to act, we shall become prisoners of events outside our control.

How can the European Community do what is necessary? What we do not need is a new bureaucracy, made up of 50 or 100 engineers examining each and every project to assess its aid-worthiness. I should like to see the European Community coordinate the use of these resources with the Member States according to criteria laid down by the Community. The money should be allocated to programmes for which the national governments have established a system of priorities. We want to perform no more than a coordinating function, for one very simple reason contained in the Treaty itself. We are responsible for ensuring that competitive conditions exist throughout the European Community. In the energy sector, we already have so much price and tax distortion that we are facing enormous problems from the point of view of fair competition. We want to ensure that any additional efforts we may make toward developing alternative sources of energy will not produce additional distortions of competition on the market. I believe that this is a legitimate aim, and it is one that goes hand in hand with our basic mission to shake the governments and people of Europe out of their long sleep and persuade them to help on a massive scale to do what must be done.

Year after year, the price of energy has been handled with kid gloves in case the consumer might get annoyed and get his own back on any government which allowed the price of energy to rise. And energy

policy was of course conducted in much the same way as other aspects of economic policy were conducted. Wherever possible — and particularly in the run-up to elections — governments have tried to create as much public goodwill as possible. This method will not work any more, and will have catastrophic results for any political groups which try it out. The voters, the people of Europe are more sophisticated than many of the politicians in this matter. People know that it is not governments which are forcing prices up. They know how serious the world economic situation is. They are aware of the spectre of unemployment. They realize that more money will have to be spent on armaments in the post-Afghanistan period. They know that growth rates will not be what they once were. They know that the affluent society has gone for ever, that raw materials are in short supply and that energy is a valuable commodity. The people are prepared to do their bit. But we must give a lead. We must change our ways, more perhaps than our people in Europe. Let us get on with it then! Gives us your support in putting this idea into practice! We are working on the problem. We hope that the Commission will be able to reach its first decision next week, and we shall then pass them on to you. Please treat this idea as something which will enable the European Community to play its part in the great battle: to get away from our dependence on oil.

It is our duty to do as much. If we fail to take any action, if we allow things to drift on as before, we shall not only repent at leisure: we may have failed to shoulder the responsibility we have for the survival of our democratic way of life.

*(Loud applause)*

**President.** — I have received three motions for resolutions with requests for an early vote, pursuant to Rule 47 (5) of the Rules of Procedure, to wind up the debate on the oral question (Doc. 1/699/79) on the safety of pressurized water reactors:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-705/79/rev.), tabled by Mrs Weber, Mr Glinne, Mr Key, Mr Enright, Mr Linkohr, Mr Peters, Mr Schieler, Mrs Salisch, Mr Walter, Mr Muntingh, Mr Seefeld, Mr Abens, Mrs Vayssade, Mrs Fuillet, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, Mr Collins, Mr Megahy, Mr Sieglerschmidt, Mrs Herklotz, Mrs Cresson, Mr Schmitt, Mr Schmid, Mrs Buchan, Ms Clwyd, Mrs Hoff and Mrs Groes on behalf of the Socialist Group:
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-769/79), tabled by Mr Seligman, Mr J. D. Taylor, Mr Harris, Mr Provan, Mr Hopper, Mrs Kellett-Bowman, Mr Purvis and Mr Newton Dunn;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-777/79), tabled by Mr Linkohr on behalf of the Socialist Group

I have also received three motions for resolutions with requests for an early vote, pursuant to Rule 47(5) of the Rules of Procedure, to wind up the debate on the

## President

oral question (Doc. 1-499/79) on adequate long-term energy supplies at reasonable cost :

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-776/79), tabled by the Group of European Progressive Democrats ;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-780/79), tabled by Mr Vergeer, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mrs Walz, Mr Herman, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Estgen, Mr d'Ormesson, Mr Rinsche and Mr Fuchs on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), Mr Seligman, Mr Beazley, Lord Douro, Mr Moorhouse, Mr Provan and Mr Møller on behalf of the European Democratic Group and Mr Pintat on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group ;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-781/79), tabled by Mr Damette, Mr Ansart, Mr Fernandez, Mrs Hoffmann, Mr Martin and Mr Wurtz.

Parliament will be consulted on these six requests at the beginning of the sitting tomorrow.

We shall now continue with the joint debate. I call Mr Linkohr to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Linkohr.** — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Brunner has just spoken in highly dramatic terms of the question of energy supplies, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say, the energy shortage.

I would be delighted, ladies and gentlemen, if we were to use equally dramatic words to condemn the fresh outburst of arms spending throughout the world. Because let us not forget that the cause of this present crisis is not the energy shortage, but the arms race and the growing tension throughout the world. I rather regret all the talk about the use of commando troops in the Middle East and the pronouncement — and this criticism is addressed not to you, Mr Brunner, but to others in the Federal Republic of Germany — to the effect that we should have to learn to live with tension and that a battle for the world's oil is inevitable. These are fighting words which will only serve to increase world tension and will do nothing at all to secure our energy supplies.

I wanted to say this right at the outset because I feel that we are now in a bizarre and paradoxical situation. At a time when oil is in short supply — or when a more realistic price is being asked for it depending on your point of view — at a time when poverty is on the increase throughout the world, we are arming ourselves to the teeth, issuing threats, talking about boycotts, refusing to talk together anymore, and the world is slowly but surely heading for catastrophe. This, to my mind, is the root of the problem, and Europe must view its energy policy in this overall context.

What is the significance of all this for the European Community? I have no intention of repeating what has already been said by Mr Brunner and other

speakers. We agree on a number of things. For instance, I agree that we must pull out all the stops to secure the Community's energy supplies. But let us take a look at those points on which we do not agree, as they are probably the most interesting aspects of this debate. We do not agree on the question of energy policy priorities. As far as the Socialist Group is concerned, the point at issue is not to produce as much energy as possible to cover our extrapolated and forecasted requirements, but to reach a fundamental decision on the kind of society we want to live in in the future and what technology and what energy policy we need to make the future tolerable. That means, to our mind, that we must make enormous efforts to save energy, and we must make full use of our own sources of energy — and by that I mean coal — and we need research into renewable sources of energy, from the development stage right up to marketing the product. It is a curious fact that we have an extensive research programme on nuclear fusion — and I must admit that, as a technician, I am excited about the whole idea of nuclear fusion — but on the other hand we do not have anything like a major programme on solar energy or renewable sources of energy. There are programmes here and there in the Member States, and we do have something going at European level, but — to my mind, at least — they are not being given the same priority as other major research programmes. The vital question is whether we are prepared to upgrade these programmes. The quickest way to save energy would be to carry out a crash programme aimed at insulating buildings and the like. At least that will save us a lot of energy faster than going all out to build as many power stations as possible.

Just a brief word on nuclear energy : I would not seek to deny that there are differences of opinion on this question within our Group. Let us make no bones about that. But we want some clarity in the question of reactor safety and waste management. We tabled a question on cracks in reactor vessels — with particular reference to French reactors, but including those in other countries. The reply we received to our question was, I must say, pretty inadequate, and served only to reinforce our scepticism. We must not only keep on pressing and asking questions but also place a great many question marks over the safety and information aspects of these problems.

Let me give you a few examples. Newspaper articles in the Federal Republic of Germany and France have claimed that the French reactor vessels suffer from irregularities in the molecular lattice of the steel. This was what the EDF — the French energy agency — said on 12 October. Other reports say that 6 mm-deep cracks have been found in the reactor vessels, which is of course a different thing entirely to irregularities in the steel molecular lattice. Another report says that the problem concerns hairline cracks, an odd concept which is not defined closely.

## Linkohr

In view of all this, we may justifiably ask what really is wrong? Who knows, or who has gone into the question of how quickly these cracks develop? How were they measured, and how is the public being kept informed about these goings-on? The French Parliament's Legal Affairs Committee has refused to debate the question. Now, I have no intention whatsoever of interfering in another country's domestic affairs, but what is at stake is the safety of the people of Europe, and that is something we are responsible for. When a power station situated near a national frontier is damaged, the aggrieved parties include the people who live on the other side of that frontier. These are all questions to which we would appreciate very precise replies. The replies we have received so far have not satisfied us, and we shall keep on pressing for a satisfactory response. All this just reinforces our scepticism as regards an accelerated energy or nuclear energy programme within the Community.

On the question of the final disposal of nuclear waste, precisely where are these facilities to be found? The answer is that they will not be ready for 20 years at the earliest. In other words, until that time we shall be producing nuclear waste for interim storage, although not even all the necessary interim storage facilities are available. So, in the final analysis, we simply do not know what is to happen to all this waste.

It may be that there is a viable solution to all this, but we just do not know whether it will work and, if so, whether our people will accept it. That is why we would ask you to understand our doubts, our questions and our sceptical attitude to these matters, and our own list of priorities. By all means, do not underestimate the problems, but let us be on our guard against trying to counter fear by more fear.

Finally, I should like to say something about the Third World. We should not try to use the Third World as a pretext to justify our nuclear energy programme. I would rather see us increase our aid to the Third World without resorting to nuclear energy and not suddenly discovering the Third World when we need a scapegoat to justify the development of nuclear energy in the European Community.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Herman to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD).

**Mr Herman.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall not comment on the excellent report by Mr Fuchs. On the whole, as accepted by the Commission it represents our party's fundamental position. Neither shall I comment on the terms of our motion for a resolution, nor those of our oral question; they are very clear and straightforward. I shall not repeat the very eloquent plea made by my colleague, Mr Muller-Hermann, or his impassioned appeal to the Socialists to act more responsibly.

My remarks will be addressed mainly to the Commission. Firstly, I would like to comment on the problem of the objectives. Although a reduction in our dependence on energy, more particularly our dependence on oil, is an objective beyond dispute, the fact that it is expressed in tonnes of oil imported — 470 million tonnes were forecast for 1990 — raises three questions. Even if we managed to cut our oil imports, the price per tonne, as Mr Brunner has suggested, might continue to increase more rapidly than we can reduce our imports; thus, although we might, strictly speaking, have achieved our goal, we will have done nothing to alleviate the burden on our balance of payments or to lessen the depressing effects on our general economic activity — and therefore on employment — caused by such large resources being siphoned off to pay the exporting countries.

Since the exporting countries are virtually a monopoly, they are able to cut their production and increase the price of oil, at least as long as their revenue remains greater than their import requirements. Our targets should not therefore be expressed in tonnes of oil imported, but either in terms of its value or as a percentage of our overall exports or as a percentage of Europe's overall gross domestic product.

The second question raised by the way in which we set our objectives stems from the fact that they can be achieved very easily if economic growth is nil, as it was in 1975. No doubt you will counter this objection by arguing that the objective was expressed differently, that is, it was aimed to reduce the ratio between the growth in energy consumption and economic growth to 0.7. This in turn raises other questions. Our capacity to reduce the energy/economic growth ratio largely depends on how much the economy actually grows, since this determines the level of the industrial investments which make more efficient use of energy. The relative importance of energy efficiency in this sector also depends on the scale of this growth.

Thirdly, it is questionable whether the target of 50 % independence is realistic in view of the fact that, in the first place, the Community will need to increase its coal, gas and uranium imports and, in the second, that the Community will have to increase its imports further in the very likely event of the planned nuclear programme not being brought to a successful conclusion. It is becoming clear, moreover, that the alternative energy sources will not have any real impact until after 1990. In addition, the Community will be enlarged over the next decade, and the accession of Greece, Spain and Portugal will upset the balance between imports and domestic production in the EEC. That is why the plans to reduce our dependence to 50 % appear rather unrealistic. Nonetheless I hope we shall be able to meet this target.

I would also like to add a comment on the precise objective concerning energy conservation. The

**Herman**

Commission has stated, no doubt basing its observations on the conclusions of the Saint-Geours report, that the potential for energy conservation is considerable: 10 to 30 % in industry — 20 to 35 % in transport and up to 50 % in the domestic sector. Yesterday Mr Jenkins repeated these figures — and good for him! But either the Commission considers this feasible, in which case I wonder why it does not make a formal proposal to this effect, or it considers it impossible, in which case it should not talk about it. In either case, I feel the Commission is not living up to its responsibilities.

I would now like to add a final comment on the targets for nuclear energy production. The Member States have amended their targets from 160 to 140 gigawatts. The Commission plans for 120 gigawatts, which will entail the construction of between 12 and 15 nuclear power plants per year from now until 1990. This is clearly unrealistic. Why, then, do we adhere to this target, and why do we not take appropriate action, either to intensify the nuclear programme or to find alternative solutions?

I would now like to comment briefly on the approach to be adopted. The Commission has listed the nine kinds of measures to be taken to reach the objectives set. As they are set out, that is in extremely vague terms, they do not give rise to objections. Policies are subject to criticism only when they are precise and concrete. That is not the case here. Our criticism concerns the very principle underlying Community policy as accepted by the Commission, which, let us make no bones about it, tends to fall in line with what the Council is willing to accept, in other words very little.

Since our policies are implemented at national level, and since it is up to the Member States to apply all the measures advocated, we would like to ask a number of questions. What means does the Commission have at its disposal to ensure that the programme will be effectively carried out? What happens if a Member State — and here I merely quote the example of my own country — does little or nothing to save energy? What means do you have available, what influence can you bring to bear and what sanctions can you employ? In my opinion, apart from exhortation and fine speeches — and you do, I concede, make some very good ones — there is not much you can do.

We are also deeply gratified at the good intentions just expressed by the Council. But while it extols the virtues of harmonization, convergence and coordination, the Council is very likely to be stopped short by the uneasy inertia of the energy ministers, whose main concern is to defend the interests of their national administration, even though it is patently obvious that they are incapable, without joint effort, of achieving their objectives, or even of safeguarding the real interests of the citizens they wish to defend.

I have a practical suggestion for establishing a Community policy: the Commission should draft a document relating to some of these measures and illustrating objectively the difference in terms of cost and effectiveness between an integrated Community approach and an approach based on cooperation from a fundamentally national standpoint. If successful, this could persuade the public, at any rate the national political parties in the Community of the need for the Council to take more positive action in establishing an energy policy.

I shall conclude by making two observations, including one of a practical nature. Mr Brunner has stressed the need for measures apart from loans, and his idea of a tax may well be sound, but I must say, with all due respect, that if he had wanted to avoid this tax ever being introduced he could not have arranged things better. Why? Because — and here your fiscal experience with the Commission seems to me to be limited — you cannot announce a tax well in advance of its introduction without specifying its basis of assessment, its amount, its impact or its advantages and disadvantages, otherwise every conceivable pressure group will immediately be up in arms. Your opponents alerted can take concerted action and prepare their offensive, and you will be lucky ever to introduce such a tax. I predict that you will encounter the gravest difficulties because you have not presented your case properly. You mention this tax, and Mr Jenkins is equally vague as to the conditions whereby it will be levied, its effects and consequences etc. This is not the way to conduct fiscal matters.

I would remind you that the Commission is a collegiate body and that its members, before making any speeches, should ensure that they have the support of all their fellow members. The Commission has not adopted a position on this matter, and you are therefore doing more harm than good to the cause you wish to defend.

Finally, a very practical observation. You have little to say about the problems of gas. In many countries, when oil is extracted gas is released and wasted. Could the Commission not examine and provide the necessary funds for processes whereby such gas, which is either released into the atmosphere or burnt, may be recuperated. The oil companies are now making sufficiently large profits, and they could be obliged or encouraged one way or another to apply measures in this field which would be perfectly in line with our objectives.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Seligman to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mr Seligman.** — Mr President, I should like to congratulate Mr Fuchs on a very important and wide-

## Seligman

ranging report. I think it will be the basis of debates for many years, as he covers virtually every aspect of energy. I should also like to welcome Mr Pintat's suggestion of a European energy organization, an adaptation of Euratom. I also should like to thank the President-in-Office of the Council of Energy Ministers, Mr Bisaglia, for his very wide-ranging coverage of the whole energy field and particularly his stress on the economic importance of energy.

The new Iranian President, Mr Bani-Sadr, has stated clearly that the Iranian revolution is going to be exported. If that happens, the precarious structure of our oil supply network will certainly be at risk. We could easily lose 5m barrels a day of Saudi Arabian oil if Saudi Arabia goes that way. This is more than the difference between sufficiency and famine. Literally, at any time now our oil supplies could be cut by a political or military upheaval in the Middle East.

But it is not only the strangulation of our oil supplies that I am worried about; it is the disastrous effect that the oil price scramble is having on our whole economy. Crude-oil prices have risen, as Mr Brunner said, by more than 100 % — actually by 114 % since last year, and they have risen 15 times since the Yom Kippur war in 1973: 15 times in 7 years. We are witnessing the impoverishment and the possible collapse of the West. The hard-earned wealth built up over generations is disappearing into the hot sands of the Middle East. As much as half of our energy in 1990 will still be dependent on imported oil. I agree with Mr Herman that this is unacceptable.

We have two clear problems. One is the excessive demand for energy, and the other is the inadequate energy supply. Energy conservation is undoubtedly the quickest, the most cost-effective, the most job-creating and the safest way of reducing demand. Mr Jenkins has said that conservation can save us 100m tonnes of oil in the year 1990 — i. e., 20 %. But will it? — Not if we go on as we are now, sweating in public buildings, sitting in our shirtsleeves in offices and homes while there is frost outside. And don't forget the poor people, the less well-off; many of them sit shivering with dripping roofs and damp walls for lack of proper insulation. The fact is that private homeowners and industrialists will not spend money on insulation unless they can recover the cost in less than three years, and if the average Community rate of interest on loans is anything from 11 % to 20 % any saving by insulation is pretty well wiped out regardless of the high cost of fuel. So the best way the Community or national governments can promote insulation is by interest-rebate schemes or VAT remission, and I hope this will be studied. If we can afford to give the Russians massive low-credit loans, surely we can do the same for our own citizens.

Our next demand-reducing action must be to stop burning fuel-oil in power-stations, or at least reduce it

to 25 % of our fuel generating electricity. It is incredibly wasteful to burn oil. We have to turn it into valuable light lighter by catalytic cracking or convert it into substitute natural gas by modern gasification processes — and these are now commercially attractive owing to the high price of oil. Also we must reduce the demand for motor fuel and diesel by designing cars better, by introducing speed-limits, by converting diesel trains to electric and by re-introducing trolley-buses in cities. Why have buses pouring out smoke and using up fuel? And then we must convert domestic and industrial heating to electricity, gas, coal or wood. On the energy supply side, we must secure present oil supplies by establishing a much more understanding relationship and closer collaboration with the oil-producers. This has already been mentioned. But above all, we must create by 1990 substantial new supplies of coal, coal derivatives and nuclear power inside our Community.

Here I come to what Mr Schmid and Mr Linkohr have been saying about nuclear power. I believe personally that nuclear power is clean, safe, economical and reliable, provided that the industry is managed according to the highest standards of efficiency and safety. The Kemeny Report on the accident at Harrisburg stressed the need for more thorough training and supervision of operators, more comprehensive safety backups and more intensive maintenance schedules to avoid the malfunctioning of plan items. It is part of our responsibility as parliamentarians to satisfy ourselves that there is no complacency. That is the big danger.

Nuclear power-stations are now producing electricity at 40 % less cost than oil-fired power-stations. France has embarked on a comprehensive nuclear programme with all the drive and efficiency of a military programme. She will soon have an economy based on much cheaper energy than the rest of us. It will be very difficult to compete with France. Korea and Taiwan are investing frantically in nuclear power-stations, and they have cheap labour as well. So where will the rest of us be in ten years' time if we do not hurry up with our nuclear programme?

No one pretends that nuclear power is a hundred-per-cent safe. Nothing can be. But what I say is that we have a choice. Do we take the minute risk to life and limb and have a prosperous economy or do we derive future generations of nuclear power in order to avoid any possibility of a casualty? We must have a sense of proportion. Do we ban aeroplanes because one aeroplane might occasionally crash on a house? No. If we ban nuclear power, we are choosing poverty.

Mr Linkohr says he is worried about Britain's plan to build pressurized-water reactors. He has put a question forward on that. The combination of British standards of nuclear inspection and the long experience of Westinghouse, who have supplied 50 pressuri-

**Seligman**

zed-water reactors already and have 135 more on order and who didn't supply the Harrisburg pressurized-water reactor, will provide PWR's of British manufacture which are both safe and cost-effective. And if the French choose an American type of reactor, it must be good.

*(Laughter)*

I think the British Government should be congratulated on embarking on a 15 gigawatt nuclear programme after 6 years of vacillation by the previous government.

Mr President, I always thought the European Community would never unite properly until our very survival threatened by a common enemy or a common danger. Now the energy crisis, to my mind, is a vast common danger and we must unite to find a solution. Oil imports are now costing the Community 40 000 million units of account more than they were last year — nearly double — and yet we hesitate to spend a few hundred millions on research for new energy which we desperately need. That is only 2-3 % of our budget. It is one twentieth of what we spend buying unwanted milk supplies. So if the European Community is going to do anything important in the long term about conservation, fusion, alternative fuels, speculative investments in new sources of energy, etc., we must have money. The President of the Commission and Mr Brunner have referred to some form of oil tax or levy, suggesting that it might involve cooperation with the United States of America, a development which would be extremely interesting, since it would strengthen the whole operation. Now this is an announcement of major importance, it is headline news. This oil levy should be a dual-purpose measure, aimed both at discouraging oil consumption and at providing money for expenditure on energy projects. Whenever any novel idea comes out, the first reaction is to treat it as Mr Herman did, — with suspicion, but I think this happens to all new ideas: we just think up all the problems and the difficulties. However, I hope the Commission will not be deterred by this. I prefer their method of open discussion on such a revolutionary matter. It would be terrible if they just tucked it away and sprang it on us at the last minute. This is obviously a three or four-year project. It will take a long time to work out in detail, but I do hope the Commission will consider one or two special problems like that of chemical feedstocks, which would be damaged by a special tax — they should be treated separately, I think. Nonetheless, I regard this new idea as offering a completely new dimension to the Community, and an opportunity to break out of the financial straitjacket which the Community has been labouring under for years. So I hope this has a good passage through our discussions.

If we care to establish some independence from outside energy supplies, and arrest the decline of our

economy, we must switch to low oil strategy. If we do not do this, we shall lose control of our destiny.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Ippolito to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

**Mr Ippolito.** — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the group of Italian Communists and their Allies, on behalf of whom I have the honour of speaking in this debate on energy, has already demonstrated by its recent public statements on various occasions that it gives serious attention to energy problems. On more than one occasion I and my colleague Mr Veronesi have elucidated our position with regard to these matters, to solve which we believe that neither the Council nor the Commission has so far made any coordinated, incisive or innovative efforts of the kind that the exceptional gravity of the energy crisis requires, in particular as far as the question of full employment for the workforce in all the Community countries is concerned.

The limited speaking time which I have been given — evidence of the fact that this Parliament does not intend to devote much attention to a problem which Mr Jenkins, with all the authority of his position, has also commended to our notice — means that I shall not be able to set out all our thoughts or even outline briefly, what in our opinion should be the Community's energy policy, a policy which can definitely not be, as some people in this House have suggested, the mere arithmetical or algebraic sum of the individual policies of the Member States.

So, taking account of the limited time available to me, I shall confine myself to a few succinct remarks, giving also the fundamental principles behind our vision of an energy policy in the European Community.

First and foremost, given the continuing and worsening crisis which is sapping the foundations of future development in the European Community, which, however one looks at the figures, is at present unable to cover approximately 60 % of its needs from its own energy sources, it is of vital importance that the Community should launch a massive campaign designed on the one hand to encourage energy saving, and in particular saving hydrocarbon energy, and on the other to proceed as boldly as possible with a policy of boosting the common research policy for all sources of energy, whether renewable or non-renewable. If, as I have already had occasion to suggest in this House, it is true that there is a vital need to improve the technology of extraction and combustion of coal, in order, amongst other things, not to increase dramatically the ecological dangers of using coal and the very serious damage to the health of man

## Ippolito

and to his environment, research cannot stop here, because the nuclear sector — which, along with coal, represents and will continue to represent for at least the coming three decades the only viable alternative to the production of electricity from thermal power stations — needs to be developed further, both because of the desirability of improving and perfecting safety precautions and in order to extend and intensify studies into fuel cycles, taken as a whole, going from mining research right through to the final dumping of the radioactive waste, and finally in order to deal with the problems of the so-called 'nuclear proliferation', which deserves a much larger debate in this house.

Regarding nuclear energy and the emotional and psychological problems which its use raises, I should like to emphasize briefly two points. The first is that our party, after a long and cohesive internal discussion, which went on for several months, announced at the recent conference on nuclear safety in Venice that it was in favour of a limited, unavoidable use of nuclear energy.

The second, on which enough emphasis can never be put by national and Community organizations, consists of a wide-ranging campaign of impartial information on the basic terms of the problem, in order to prevent the whole energy policy being dominated by the misconceived problem of a rigid 'yes' or 'no' to nuclear energy, whereas the proper attitude is that of diversifying sources of energy and imposing stricter and stricter controls on all industrial activities which involve a high risk to health.

Having now clarified these notions, unfortunately in too exhaustive a form for the limited time allowed me, I want to emphasize the need for the Community energy policy to have a common form which will enable the Community to set up as soon as possible direct contacts with the oil producing countries — and not only with countries that produce oil, but also with countries that produce all the raw materials which Europe is lacking in; I should further like to insist upon the need for continuing and encouraging, with direct and indirect support from the Community, research and technological development into renewable sources of energy — solar energy, geothermal energy, wind energy, biomass energy, biogas energy etc. — on which alone, once the era of fossil fuels and fissile materials is at an end, in the energy policy of the Community must in the long term depend, when the Community, along with the remaining industrialized countries with capitalist or socialist economies will no longer be obliged — as Giorgio Amendola said in this House — to consider itself a kind of 'fortress under siege' with regard to the Third World, that is to say, with regard to three-quarters of humanity.

The reason for this, ladies and gentlemen, is that if today only 16 countries, of which three have a

socialist economy, representing only slightly more one thousand million people, have an annual *per capita* consumption of energy expressed in kilograms of coal equivalent, of the order of more than 7 000 kilograms, the other 3 000 million people of the Third World have energy consumptions which are as low as a mere 750 kilograms or so. This figure may be taken as a measure of poverty, hunger, depressed living standards — in a word, of subhuman living conditions. This is why it is up to us, the privileged and the exploiters, to become the promoters of the policy needed for the creation of a new model of world development to solve problems whose solutions cannot be put off any longer and which could otherwise lead to world-wide catastrophes compared with which those of the past would pale into insignificance.

**President.** — I call Mrs von Alemann to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mrs von Alemann.** — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in the speech he gave yesterday introducing the Commission's 13th Report, Mr Jenkins devoted a good deal of time to energy policy and economic growth. The question of secure energy supplies has featured on the agenda of almost every part-session since direct elections. And quite rightly so; after all, the need to ensure adequate supplies of energy — while bearing in mind all the safety precautions and the need to protect the environment — will remain the central problem facing responsible politicians right up to the end of this century. The point at issue is not the relative virtues of one source of energy compared with another; nor is it the question of developing new sources of energy, like nuclear energy, or concentrating on something like biomass.

The real point, ladies and gentlemen, is to rethink our policy on future economic growth and energy consumption. We need qualitative economic growth to stabilize the employment situation and to maintain our standard of living throughout the Community — and to improve it in certain regions. For this we shall need more and more energy, as Mr Pintat from the Liberal and Democratic Group pointed out earlier this morning. Over recent years, our consumption of energy has been roughly in proportion to our rate of economic growth.

Estimates and forecasts for the future are notoriously unreliable, but the Member States have come up with a new estimate of future production in which they anticipate a reduction of between 40 and 50 million tonnes petroleum equivalent between February 1979 and the end of 1979. Forecasts of future consumption were likewise cut by something like 40 million tpe, which represents a 2.9% fall over the level of consumption originally anticipated. As you can see, it is really very difficult at the moment to make forecasts

### Von Alemann

of future energy production and consumption. One thing is sure, though: however optimistic a view of the future we take, there is no doubt that we must save energy. The age of abundant energy is gone forever.

We Liberals believe there are four ways of heading off the threatened crisis in energy supplies, with all its potentially grave consequences. Firstly, we must save energy and make better use of existing energy sources. Secondly, we must develop alternative sources of energy. Thirdly, we must make maximum use of coal. And fourthly, we must make good the remaining shortfall by nuclear energy, bearing in mind all the safety aspects which have already been discussed at great length in this House.

What I mainly want to talk about today is what energy policy measures we should take to ensure that we save as much energy as we recently undertook to do at the meeting of world leaders. How can we reconcile our energy policy aims with our economic aims of creating jobs and stimulating real growth? In view of the degree of international instability on the energy markets, we cannot overstate the importance of a specific policy on energy-saving. That being so, how should we go about saving energy? The first step must be to take a look at our system of energy consumption and energy production. In Europe, the production, distribution and consumption of energy is largely in private hands, the main exception in many Member States of the Community being those sources of energy which are linked to the national grid. However, it is generally true that decisions on energy are mainly taken decentrally by reference to private enterprise criteria. For that reason, we politicians must view the Community's energy policy as a regulatory policy laying down outline conditions for decisions taken decentrally by private enterprise, whereby competition and price policy conditions are of special significance. It is also part of our mission to do something about the cases of social hardship caused by the operation of energy market mechanisms, although we must always bear in mind our energy policy aims.

As to outline conditions for competition policy, we must agree at European level — and this can and must be a genuine Community task — to ensure that the Member States of the Community do not engage in a tax-relief war over energy. We must prevent the Member States giving their own industries competitive advantages by making energy cheaper to industry. That kind of thing would falsify any outline conditions, and competitive distortions are not restricted to subsidies. There is the same temptation to create unfair advantages in setting standards for planning permission, environmental considerations and the like. We must therefore agree at European level on harmonized outline conditions, otherwise we — the authors of these conditions — will ourselves be accused of wasting energy. We must also aim to bring

the relative prices of all types of energy into line with the scarcity price of oil. We should then have a general re-arrangement of the relations between the various types of energy with the result that no energy of any sort would be wasted.

Separating economic growth from energy consumption will mean that energy consumption does not need to grow — and, indeed, should not grow — at the same rate as economic growth. We must be sure of guaranteed economic growth, and we can do that by intensifying our research effort. Energy utilization — along with other factors — can only be improved by developing our technical know-how. Research into alternative production processes is, however, likewise orientated to price differentials, which is one more reason for bringing some order into the system of prices. An intensified research effort is an essential consequence of this process of restructuring which we have always been aiming for over recent decades. When all is said and done, our prosperity is nothing more than the fruits of our research efforts, using the right inputs.

Ladies and gentlemen, I do not want to get too theoretical but I thought that it was important to make this point. Any social hardship caused by this policy cannot be tackled by general energy policy measures, but will require measures which are more of a social nature. This is a bit like walking a tightrope: on the one hand, we must alleviate the hardship — and what Mr Seligman said about the less well-off sitting shivering at home is a point which should be taken seriously — and on the other, we must make sure that everyone still has an incentive to save energy. This is a tricky matter, particularly if we want to prevent the growth of a new bureaucracy to hand out subsidies. However, I think there are enough examples in the Community of how the problem can be solved. Moving on to the various amendments and questions, the Group of the European People's Party is still banking on cheap energy to generate economic growth and solve our energy problems. But, as I said before, separating energy consumption from economic growth will switch the emphasis to other factors. We Liberals have based all our decisions in recent weeks in the Committee on Energy and Research and in plenary session on the four criteria I mentioned earlier. Let me remind you what they were: energy-saving and the more efficient use of the existing sources of energy, the development of alternative energy sources, maximum use of coal and the use of nuclear energy to cover the shortfall; and we still have to decide when, to what extent and with what technology our nuclear energy capacity should be developed.

Ladies and gentlemen, as I said in the course of the debate on radioactive waste at the last part-session, we are deeply conscious of our public's fears. We are doing our best to find some viable way of tackling the dangers which will result from inadequate supplies of

### Von Alemann

energy and which Mr Brunner has so often referred to — including his impressive speech just now. The problems of nuclear energy cannot be denied, and that is why we believe nuclear energy should be used only temporarily to cover our energy shortfall. We have not made light of this problem. We have tabled specific amendments to the Fuchs Report in the hope that they would be adopted, and that hope has been fulfilled in some cases. There were, however, a number of other points which we wanted to go into in greater detail. For instance, we wanted oil imports to be restricted to 470 million tonnes per year for 1990; we wanted to put specific figures on energy-saving, as was pointed out in the Saint Geours Report, which has frequently been referred to here. We felt that savings of around 15 % were and are possible, and we regret that this point was not included in the report. Thirdly, we wanted the report to say that by 1990, something like 75 % of the Member States' energy requirements should be met by coal, with the rest being covered by nuclear energy. As I said, some of our other amendments were accepted, which is why we voted for the Fuchs Report in the Committee on Energy and Research.

Finally, let me comment briefly on the question of a tax on oil imports and the Community's borrowing policy. I go along with Mr Pintat in feeling that there would be a good chance of covering our future capital requirements by way of a major European loan. But a tax that was announced in undue haste — and I should like to go along with Mr Herman on this — would certainly not serve to stabilize the situation. I would have preferred this discussion to have been started in the Committee on Energy and Research rather than via the press, although I assume that the Committee on Energy and Research will have a chance to discuss the whole thing in detail. In conclusion, I should just like to say that the energy problem is too serious to be discussed again and again very briefly at every part-session by reference to one single aspect of the problem. We should adopt the Fuchs Report, and I believe it will be a very good basis for future cooperation, and we should discuss the various aspects at some later date and continue in this right direction.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Lalor to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

**Mr Lalor.** — Mr President, my group welcomes this important debate today, although we regret that there is not sufficient time to deal adequately with the Fuchs report.

The common economic and social objectives of the nine Member States of this Community are increasingly conditioned by the supply of energy. Even if the European Treaties do not formally confer on the EEC the responsibility for conducting a common energy

policy, inactivity at Community level will lead to a worsening of the economic situation as Europe falls behind in the provision of energy. It took the 1974-75 energy crisis to awaken the Community to the need for coordinated action, but one wonders whether the crisis has had a lasting impact. I personally do not think so, because I feel our citizens are not aware of the cost of the different fuels. Are they aware of the present state of energy supplies? Oil will last for only 30 years, natural gas 50, uranium 90, coal 235. These are just estimates and, I think, in fact that the overall picture shows that the prospects are diminishing. In any event, it is a fact of life that until alternative sources of energy are developed, energy is going to be in short supply and get increasingly more expensive.

Mr Fuchs in his excellent report correctly refers to the close relationship between energy, growth, employment and the quality of life in our Community. Efforts should be made to link a policy of growth which favours the low energy consuming sectors with more secure employment. However, with the present growth in GNP, it must be concluded that, at the present rate of demand, energy requirements will rise by nearly 100 % over the next 10-year period. The question is, therefore, whether increased economic growth will result in increases in imports and raise the ceilings laid down internally in the EEC for oil imports, and in the possibility of these ceilings being exceeded.

One of the main objectives of the Commission's communication on energy is to reduce dependence on its imports to 50 % by 1990. My country, Ireland, is currently dependent on imports for 80 % of its energy requirements. Europe, at present, imports 54 % of its energy requirements, mostly in the form of oil. Therefore, there is a considerable gap between the Member States themselves on this question. As the declaration of the European Council states, all factors must be borne in mind to ensure that each Member State obtains fair supplies of all products, taking into account the differing patterns of supply and the economic situation of each Member State. The Community should encourage the creation of additional oil-storage facilities in those Member States where such needs exist. Member States must be in a position to expand their refining capacity so as to meet their basic strategic needs. In this connection, Ireland is dependent on another Member State for the refining of the major portion of its imported oil. Ireland's refining capacity can only meet approximately 40 % of its overall requirements. The main object of any energy conservation programme must be to eliminate, as far as possible, the wasteful uses of energy and to ensure that our energy resources are used with maximum efficiency without generally impairing overall economic growth.

I was very pleased to hear President Jenkins inform the House yesterday that the wider use of energy-

## Lalor

saving equipment could, by 1990, result in a saving of 100 million tonnes of oil. This would mean a saving of over 20 % of our imported needs. The Commission must press ahead with its programme of energy conservation. It should continue and intensify its discussions with the Member States and the sectors, particularly the building sector. There is a need to provide an energy advisory service for the building industry which would provide technical support to contractors, architects and engineers in the implementation of new thermal performance standards for buildings. I was extremely pleased to note from the 1980 Commission memorandum that the Commission will set up a data-bank later this year to supply technological information in this regard.

The European Investment Bank has an important role to play in helping the Community to achieve a more efficient use of energy. Recently we saw how the Bank has provided a loan of £ 2.5 million to the Irish Industrial Credit Company, which will itself on-lend the sums to small and medium-sized manufacturing firms undertaking projects that yield significant energy savings.

With regard to exploiting our native energy resources, let me say that the Council must act on the Commission's proposal to encourage exploration for hydrocarbons in areas of unusual difficulty. This is a further example of the Council's inactivity and hesitancy with regard to energy. In view of the encouraging results which have been obtained in the past few years, exploration for hydrocarbons off the West Coast of Ireland will remain an important element in Ireland's energy policy in the 1980's. It is regrettable, however, that despite the considerable potential of this particular area, the Council has still failed to take a decision, despite the fact that this proposal has been before them for a number of years. I would strongly urge the Commission to press again, and more strongly, for the adoption of this measure.

I was also pleased to hear President Jenkins refer to exploiting native resources. I feel that the development of native resources must also embrace the question of developing peat resources in those countries where such development is possible. Indeed, as a result of the sharp increase in oil prices in recent years, peat has become a very competitive fuel. Parallel to this is the present research into the use of biomass, to which reference has been made by a number of speakers here today. May I say to the Commission that we cannot spend too much on expanding background research into this fuel and energy source.

With regard to coal, further investment will be conditional on coal production reaching something near the 1973 level. However, we must press ahead, making greater use of coal rather than oil in generating stations. When such stations are in place, the demand

is automatically created for further coal. The Community should be assisting the construction of new coal-fired stations and the conversion of oil-fired stations back to coal.

The provision of energy now requires enormous capital expenditure and corresponding long-term loans. Europe has the capacity to develop its own energy resources, but we must ensure that far more than 2 % of the European Economic Community budget is spent on this vital sector. The Community has, for too long, merely reacted to external events in the energy sector when it should have had the foresight to adopt decisive measures, thus avoiding a repetition of the 1973 oil crisis. The absence of decision-making by the Council is largely due, as I see it, to the selfish short-term attitudes of certain Member States who would prefer to pursue bilateral arrangements rather than rely on the pooling of resources at Community level.

Finally, let me say, Mr President, that nuclear energy would seem to be the only long-term solution. The Commission has calculated that the capacity would need to be in the region of 140 GW. There will have to be greater investment in the associated technologies, and particular attention will have to be paid to the arguments used by the anti-nuclear lobby.

To maintain economic growth and development and to secure employment, the measures of which we have spoken will have to be fully coordinated between the Member States, and initiated and pursued simultaneously.

## IN THE CHAIR : MR ROGERS

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Coppieters.

**Mr Coppieters.** — *(NL)* Mr President, as long ago as its first part-session, in July 1979, Parliament rejected a request for urgent procedure for a motion on nuclear energy, with the result that months and months went past before we had an opportunity to hold this debate. In the meantime, however, we have had occasion to see how much power the nuclear lobby really wields. We have seen that all critical comments were excluded from the Weber report on the storage of nuclear waste, that our proposed amendments to the Ghergo report, calling for health checks in areas around nuclear power stations, were rejected, and that the supporters of nuclear energy even went so far as to assert that there was absolutely no danger to health. Anyone who joined us in expressing the public disquiet was dismissed as a naive extremist, and in the Committee on Energy my motion calling for a moratorium was even regarded as somehow breaking the rules.

## Coppieters

Ladies and gentlemen, no matter what side you are on, you cannot deny that there is a great deal of public concern. I would like to point out that I am speaking today not only on behalf of my own party and my colleagues in the Partito Radicale, the Democrazia Proletaria and the PDUP, but also on behalf of the 'green' movement in the Federal Republic of Germany, which should have had two seats in this Parliament on the basis of its 943 000 votes, as well as on behalf of the French 'Europe Ecologie', which would have won four seats here if the electoral system had not discriminated against it. In addition, I am speaking on behalf of the Dutch Radical Party and the Flemish AGALEV, both of which campaigned on an anti-nuclear platform in the European elections.

I also know that I am speaking on behalf of millions of people throughout the Community who are following our nuclear adventure with increasing concern, not because they are extremists, fanatics or obscurantists, but simply because, as normal, free citizens, they feel they have reason for concern over the risks, the danger to health, the enormous costs and the threat to liberty involved in the use of nuclear energy. It might do some of you good to read a few pages of Garaudy's 'Appel aux vivants' and see what he says there about the attitude of the major parties on all this.

Ever since the accident on Three Mile Island, there has been a constant stream of reports about accidents with nuclear reactors and structural defects, and only this week the newspapers have been full of stories about nuclear power stations being shut down. Even more alarming is the growing scientific evidence pointing to the dangers to the health of people living near nuclear power stations — dangers deriving from the radioactive radiation which you officially maintain is harmless. More and more radioactive waste is now being stored without a satisfactory solution having been found. That is why so many of our fellow citizens are opposed to the construction of nuclear power stations near where they live. That is the reason for the tragedy at Plogoff, and before that at Wyhl, Brockdorf, Grohnde, Malville and Le Pellerin, to name only a few. Parliament must express our concern. It is not a question of allaying justified fears. What we want, what many of our fellow citizens want, Mr President, is a genuine alternative, and this is totally lacking in the communication from the Commission to the Council on the prospects for 1990. It is also lacking in Mr Fuchs' report, and unfortunately also lacking in the motion for a resolution, which is why Mrs Bonino and I have tabled a number of amendments.

We are faced with a twofold myth, which is unfortunately being perpetuated by the Commission: on the one hand, that nuclear energy, although dangerous, is indispensable, and on the other hand that renewable

energy sources cannot be regarded as a valid alternative.

In its communication, the Commission speaks of the need for efforts to investigate the field of alternative energy. Since my time is unfortunately now coming to an end, I should like to conclude by quoting only a few figures to show that what is happening is the very opposite. Between 1978 and 1990, the proportion of EEC energy requirements met by nuclear power will rise from 3 to 15 %, while the proportion met from other sources will fall from 4 to 3 %. If we are to proceed further along this road, we must issue a warning before it is too late.

**President.** — I call Mr Romualdi.

**Mr Romualdi.** — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, any discussion of energy — which is the problem of problems at the present moment and which concerns in particular the energy supplies of the European countries, which obviously cannot deal with this problem in any other way than with a single mind and with common plans — necessarily leads to a discussion of international developments and the balance, or imbalance of political and military power in the world, and inevitably it then leads on to the need to diminish our dependence upon the energy resources in the hands of the Arab countries, the routes to which are more and more threatened as time goes by and more and more difficult to control and to use, whether as regards the safety and the certainty of continuing supplies or as regards the question of prices, which are already sky-high and likely, as has already been said here today, to go higher and higher.

The cheap-energy economy has already been a thing of the past for some time now. The reasons justifying and recommending the rejection of any project for basing energy production on the promotion of research into and production of nuclear energy — reasons recalled only a short while ago — are well known, and, apart from one or two propaganda aspects, are also serious reasons: in particular, they are concerned with safeguarding the environment and safety. But what alternative do those who reject nuclear energy put forward, other than 'non-development' and alternative sources of energy?

As regards savings — or at least savings which would not have distinctly negative repercussions, not only on the industrialized countries, but also on the underdeveloped countries which need our help and our collaboration, which if we ceased our own development they could no longer have — a reduction in energy needs to 30 % of present day consumption has been forecast for 1990. This seems to us a target which is going to be very difficult to achieve, but it is clear that if we want to achieve, or get anywhere near, a result of this sort, we must find some substitute for the oil-derived

**Romualdi**

which we intend to save, and there can be no doubt that amongst the alternative sources of energy, the main one, unfortunately remains nuclear energy.

We must face up to all the risks typical of the age we are living in with serenity and courage: this has been said by many people and we were reminded of it yesterday by Mr Jenkins. In our opinion these risks are not so very large if we act with a sense of responsibility. Of course, there is also coal and there is also peat: we must make the maximum use of these energy sources, but we must also improve the research into ways of doing so. There are also three other alternative sources of energy, such as solar energy, wind energy and biomass energy, which people have already spoken of — but in our opinion all these alternative sources provide no guarantee that we can maintain the level of economic development which we have at present attained. I must repeat: we need to face up to the risks of the times we are living in. And I should like to hope that the same nuclear energy which in 1945 caused the instantaneous deaths of many hundreds of thousands of people may now become a source of life and happiness for everyone.

Of course, every effort must be made to improve safety and to improve the way the power stations work as well as to improve storage of the waste, an obligation which necessarily engages the responsibility of all of us, and of the Council and the Commission, much more than has been the case hitherto. All of us must answer responsibly for our own obligations.

**President.** — I call Mr Adam.

**Mr Adam.** — Mr President, Mr Brunner said in his opening remarks that the targets for 1990 were optimistic. Mr Fuchs says in paragraph 7 of his motion for a resolution, that it is unlikely that the Community will be able to achieve its objectives. We hear a great deal about the energy crisis, but what we actually have is a political crisis. The political will to do anything about the policies that are indicated is lacking. I want very briefly to examine the current situation, particularly in relation to the need to expand the Community's own coal industry.

The Commission's analysis of the situation shows that the energy demand can only be met if indigenous resources are increased, if we accept that more than 50 % of our total primary energy is imported, if more than 30 % of these imports come from one particular source, or if we have more than 30 % of nuclear power. Now, listening to the debate this morning, I am quite sure that the only one of these options that is really acceptable is the proposal to increase our own indigenous resources, particularly coal. It makes no sense to me that, at the same time as we are trying to reduce our dependence on imported oil, we should be considering increasing our dependence on imported coal.

The coal industry is undergoing expansion in every major coal-producing country. In the next 20 years, Canada and Australia are planning a five-fold increase in production, while the output in China and India will rise to 3 times and 2.5 times the present level respectively and that of the USA and the USSR will double. But in Britain and Germany we are only talking of a one-and-a-half-fold increase. We cannot expect that the big increases in output elsewhere will provide a source of imports for us. Taiwan's imports of Australian coal have increased sevenfold in the last two years. Furthermore, the demand for energy from developing countries is bound to increase. Their consumption per person per year currently stands at about 1 % of our own consumption in the Community. We cannot expect those countries to be using cow-dung for ever.

Very briefly, there are four other reasons why we should be giving priority to expanding the Community's coal industry. Firstly, we have assumed that there will be a reduction in the ratio between GNP and energy consumption. An improvement in the region of 25 % is planned for 1985. The ability to achieve this target has not been proved at all. Secondly, we shall not know for 10 years what can be expected from alternative sources such as solar, wind, wave or geothermal power, and thirdly, as far as nuclear power is concerned, the problems of reactor safety and nuclear waste disposal have not yet been solved in a way that makes further expansion acceptable. After all, we do not want another incident such as that of Three Mile Island, where it was only through the good fortune that a consultant happened to be at home when telephoned that a disaster was averted.

These are four additional factors which merely add weight to an already proven case for expansion of the Community coal industry. The potential is there to increase the output not only by conventional means, but also by developing the technologies of gasification and liquefaction, which will enable us to exploit areas which have already been abandoned and other unworked seams which cannot be economically worked by conventional means. These are the opportunities which the Community must grasp and it must grasp them now.

**President.** — I call Mr Hoffmann.

**Mr K. H. Hoffmann.** — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my colleague Mr Herman has already given our views on the Fuchs Report and the Commission's proposals. I should like to make a few comments on the question of nuclear energy and the safety factor. The political decision to adopt nuclear energy as part of the European Community's energy supply system was taken more than 10 years ago in

**Hoffmann**

the Member States and in many other industrialized countries. In the European Parliament too, the major political groups take the view that nuclear energy can be used for peaceful purposes. This could be a good common approach to the Community's future energy supplies, but unfortunately we have seen too many attempts recently — particularly in the Socialist Group — to bring about a shift in these common energy policy aims.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, my Group is not prepared to go along with such a change in policy. We are in favour of a clearly-defined energy policy which includes the use of nuclear technology. My Group is not a blinkered advocate of nuclear energy at any price. We respect the fear and concern felt by many people about the peaceful use of nuclear energy, and it is precisely for that reason that we insist on safety guarantees for the people working in nuclear power stations and for the population in general. I would stress this point because we realize, in view of the uncertainty in the European Community's energy supplies, that we cannot do without nuclear energy for peaceful purposes in the foreseeable future.

I have no intention of trying to play down the problem of nuclear energy. It is true that the risks involved in nuclear technology are perhaps greater than with other modern technologies, but on the other hand, no-one in this House can stand up and claim that there is such a thing as a risk-free technology. Such things simply do not exist, and that is why we must be prepared to put up with a reasonable level of risk in using nuclear technology. Have you ever heard anyone refer to the maximum credible accident to beat all maximum credible accidents that has been going on now for something like 30 years in the German coal mining industry? 16 000 miners have lost their lives underground in those 30 years, but no-one mentions this fact. But I think it is something we should bear in mind when advocating the use of coal and nuclear energy.

It is precisely because we take the problems of environmental pollution, reactor safety and radioactive waste disposal seriously that we have the right to reject all these insinuations and polemics aimed at the EPP group's policy. Our policy aims at full employment and protecting the population in general and the interests of the consumer in particular. That is why we agree very largely with the trade unions — and in particular with the German Trade Unions Federation — on energy policy, and particularly the peaceful use of nuclear energy. I think it is pure hypocrisy for a politician like Rudi Arndt to call it an environmental scandal when a majority of this House declares itself in favour of instituting safety measures which are technically feasible and which, above all, can be applied in practice by people working in power stations and in the storage of radioactive waste.

The real environmental scandal of the first order was perpetrated not here in the European Parliament but by 'dynamite Rudi' who, in his capacity as Mayor of the City of Frankfurt, presided over the destruction of Frankfurt's West End district.

Ladies and gentlemen, what we need is a safe and secure plan for dealing with radioactive waste. The politicians responsible — and this appeal is addressed particularly to Mr Brunner — should therefore see to it that a suitable plan is put into practice as soon as possible. However, we reject the Socialist Group's amendment seeking to impose a moratorium on the development of nuclear energy until such a system exists. In my opinion, that would be a sure-fire way of jeopardizing our future energy supplies. That is something we cannot go along with. In this respect, we agree with the trade unions that interim storage and compact storage are reasonable solutions. We are in favour of secure energy supplies based on coal and nuclear energy. We believe in a peaceful future for the European Community and we are committed to full employment and the creation of secure jobs.

**President.** — I call Mr Beazley.

**Mr Beazley.** — Mr President, I welcome the presence of Mr Bisaglia, the President-in-Office of the Council of Energy Ministers, at our debate today, as I do that of the Commissioner, and I would like to start by congratulating Mr Fuchs on his excellent report, which I support in its entirety. I also support the oral questions and resolutions of the European People's Party, of the Liberal and Democratic Group and naturally of our own group. I have read very carefully the Socialist question and resolution, and I strongly support the Socialist desire for full clear, definite information on these subjects, because it is essential to base one's judgement on accurate knowledge. Ignorance will lead to prejudiced and emotional judgements, which are extremely dangerous for the security of our Community. I would, however, like to point out that it is extremely difficult for non-technical people to understand such technical problems, although it is clear that politicians must make judgements on these matters whether they are technically trained or not. But I do urge Members to remember their full responsibility in expressing opinions on these matters without a sufficient study and understanding of the technical processes involved, the safeguards undertaken and the quality of technical competence and responsibility which the technicians and the governments concerned apply to these matters.

Why is this Parliament concerned about the 1990 Community energy objectives and the extent of convergence of Member States on energy? Firstly, the main point is that the basis of these estimates is the addition of the individual Member States' own estimates. In this addition, we believe that there are much

## Beazley

wider margins of error than appear to be the case when they are seen from the point of view of the individual Member States only.

The second point is that without convergence the Community cannot possibly benefit from the great opportunities of synergy which exist in such a situation if it is approached on a Community basis. We have made a good start with regard to taking joint action on oil imports to reduce our dependence on external, incalculable and very unstable elements in the energy balance; but this is only a start and we have got a very long way to go.

I also congratulate the Commission on having had the good sense to set up additional econometric modelling systems. We are fully aware that many Member States have good econometric models, not only of their own energy problems, but of those of Western Europe and the world; but we are also aware that certain Member States do not have such comprehensive models and therefore have to use the Community model if they are to learn the options which are open to them in the particular circumstances they find themselves in and if they are to understand the various scenarios which the Community must work out in view of the fast changing nature of the situation.

But I must say it would be too late to try to take joint action at some later date when the danger arises. The plans must be drawn up now. The hardware must be put in place on the ground and the coordination for its operation must be in full working order long before the necessity arises to use it. So this Parliament has the concern as to the extent to which the objectives for 1990 are too optimistic or are just plainly based on wrong premises. Let us inspect them.

**Oil.** The forecasts state the European Community's economy in 1990 will be 44 % dependent on oil, of which 33 % will be imported. This alone places the Community at much too high a level of risk *vis-à-vis* the unstable parts of the world from which oil is imported.

**Coal.** EEC-produced coal represents 14 %, imported coal 4 %. Total coal consumption in 1990 is expected in these forecasts to be 18 % of total energy sources. We have not achieved the coal production forecasts for 1977, 1978 and 1979, not even brought it to the level of coal production in the Community in 1973. We have no Community agreement regarding coal imports. This, gentlemen, is an unacceptable position.

**Gas.** By 1990, 9 % will be EEC-produced and 9 % imported gas, including, I might say, a substantial quantity imported from the Soviet Union, the rest supplied by numerous other countries, no doubt in ships and possibly in due course by pipeline from North Africa.

**Nuclear energy.** Nuclear energy in 1990 will represent, it is hoped, some 15 % — a rise from 2 % in

1973. That means 150 nuclear power stations to be built between now and 1990. This target, I submit, is unlikely to be achieved, but what are the alternatives? — More coal, more gas, more oil?

Energy-saving will certainly have to bear the brunt of filling the gap. There are two sorts of energy-saving: first, doing the same job but using less energy to achieve the same result; secondly, approaching the problem from the point of view of completely changing the Community's dependence on energy used in present production systems to produce current products. Now, I think that if we are going to achieve one of the objectives, which is to change the growth-energy ratio from 1:1 to 1:0.7, then it is this latter area of energy-saving which will have to take up our main attention. I have no time to go into details, but without doubt anybody who has studied this problem will see great advantages to the European Community in treating energy as a very expensive product, just as they did when they treated labour as a very expensive resource.

But where is the money to come from? People have spoken about other means of raising funds, which I have no need to speak of. But I do wish to impress on this House, the Council of Ministers and the Commission the necessity of raising loans from Member States, or preferably from the European Community, so that those companies and individuals who are hard pressed by inflation but recognize the need for investments in order to achieve energy-saving may be helped to do so.

But what we are really talking about, gentlemen, is the need for convergence. I will therefore start where I began, with the necessity for the Council to communicate to us the extent to which it is willing to adopt joint policies and communicate these policies, not only to this House, but to their own general public. We have the estimates for the year 1990, which were updated in 1979. I wonder what a similar exercise undertaken in 1970 for 1980 might have shown — for Western Europe, for the Western world, for the Third World. At least we know that a 38 % dependence on imported oil in 1990 is too dangerous a situation to accept today. We also know that the West is totally unprepared for the risks in all the areas it faces and that there is very little time to set this situation to rights. Let us be clear about the extent to which the 1990 energy situation will be dependent on the USSR.

**Oil.** The USSR is the world's biggest oil producer, and I just do not accept the American CIA's estimates of the speed at which the resources will be depleted.

**Gas.** West European supplies are dependent to a substantial extent on imports of gas from the USSR and, no doubt, in due course from at present friendly but — who knows? Perhaps in 1990 less friendly nations in North Africa and elsewhere.

**Beazley**

Minerals. What is the interest of the USSR in Africa but minerals? It is not aid to Third World countries. Why do the USSR and the West have to devote so much political activity to these new areas of the world? It is not primarily for religious reasons, it is not because of racial problems. It is part of the big struggle for energy and security in the future.

So let me finally just draw attention to what has been achieved in the Comecon bloc ...

*(The President asks the speaker to conclude)*

May we not ourselves set out a European electricity grid? May we not have European gas supplies coordinated between countries? May our Council of Energy Ministers not see the advantages of putting electric power-stations on the borders of countries to avoid having to set up dual sources of supply for the same reserve quantities?

Gentlemen, I will close. I would like to thank the President of the Commission and the Energy Commissioner for their statements. This House now awaits the Council's statement on the subsequent actions which this House would like to approve to assure the security of Western Europe in the future.

*(Applause)*

IN THE CHAIR: MR ZAGARI

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Damette.

**Mr Damette.** — *(F)* Ladies and gentlemen, there is no doubt a great deal to say about the documents before us, but I feel that what they omit to say is even more telling. They are extremely discreet and contain no 'awkward' references to oil majors or cartels.

This kind of document has to be read on two levels: the real political options are concealed amid Community jargon which needs to be deciphered.

However, the formula is extremely simple and familiar and is based on two ideas: the well-known interests of the multinationals wrapped up in high-sounding principles, and the desire for supranationalism beyond the objectives of the Treaties, as Mr Davignon made quite clear yesterday in his reply to Mrs De March.

Obviously, these two ideas are closely linked, since supranationalism is merely the political garb of the multinationals.

Let us examine this more closely. With due deference to the powerful, I shall begin with oil. The guiding

principle of the oil policy is expressed in the Commission communication:

To be fully effective, this policy should be combined with an approach coordinated at Community level and with a coherent overall view of the Community's relations with the energy-producing countries.

What do we really mean, in broad terms, by coordination and integration? These terms reflect first and foremost, the desire to eliminate any national oil policies which could stand in the way of the omnipotence of the cartels. We are aware of the pressure exerted by the Commission to get France to rescind the law of 1928, which permits a certain amount of State intervention and, in particular, international agreements.

Primarily, integration means the removal of such obstacles to the freedom of action of companies. It means the removal of the only genuine arrangements which are mutually beneficial — international agreements. Instead, what is being proposed in reality is the dominance of the cartels and concerted pressure on the producer countries. Do I need to remind the House of Chancellor Helmut Schmidt's belligerent references to OPEC?

I should add to this the question of refining, which is dealt with in other documents. We all know that the Commission is actively engaged in trying to reduce refining capacities; this would mean the complete redeployment of European industry to the detriment of the publicly-owned companies. In the case of France, the company under attack is clearly Elf-Aquitaine. Truly, the interests of the cartels are being well defended.

This is the reality behind all the vague statements.

As for coal, you proclaim two objectives — to maintain production and increase consumption.

The first is untrue, and the second merely a ploy.

With regard to coal production, you are well aware that the French Government, with the full agreement of the ECSC, is cutting its production capacity by a million tonnes every year. You are well aware — and this is stated in black and white in the report by Mrs Hoff — that the Commission is very much in favour of this, since the French market is thus opened up for German exports, which have, moreover, recently benefited from further Community support.

However, according to Mr Fuchs' report, the Commission is getting ready to offer complete justification for its policy of recession. I quote from page 14 of the report: 'The Commission takes the view that even if large financial subsidies were granted, it would probably be difficult to maintain coal production at the 1973 level because of the technical problems raised by the expansion of coal production, particularly in connection with the opening up of new deposits, and because of the shortage of labour in this sector.'

**Damette**

Every kind of weak excuse is being used to justify a policy which is unsound. There is something ludicrous and inappropriate about this kind of debate at a time when the Faulquemont pit in Lorraine, with its 150 million tonnes of coal readily exploitable, is shut down and when the French authorities are preparing to close down the Sabatier pit, with its 50 million tonnes of anthracite.

As far as coal consumption is concerned, what we really need to do is develop a coal import policy! As we know, South African coal is being sold in European ports at under 40 dollars a tonne, or 2 cents a therm. This is really very cheap!

So you are proposing to increase these imports. But we all know that the present price of coal on the world market is abnormally low and that it will shoot up in a few years' time, when the planned thermal power plants become operational.

The thinking behind this is patently obvious: the multinationals are now manoeuvring to secure coal deposits throughout the world, and low coal prices are clearly in their interest, as they can thus buy up the mines very cheaply. But in three or four years' time, when they control these deposits they will be able to bring their prices in to line with oil prices. Once again, the interests of the multinationals are being well safeguarded.

As for nuclear power, you appear to attach great importance to safety — but who could fail to share such noble sentiments? The rapporteur dogmatically asserts that we need stricter and more uniform safety standards worked out at Community level. One wonders to what extent Community standards can improve safety. However, since safety standards relate to a given system, laying down safety standards in fact implies that this system has to be used.

The fact that the Franco-Belgian nuclear power plant at Chooz was promoted by Euratom, which imposed the use of pressurized water reactors — which subsequently superseded the French reactor — suggests that Community nuclear policy is closely linked to Westinghouse. In other words, safety is a pretext concealing something quite different — the multinationals once again, in particular the American multinationals.

Energy conservation is yet again being used as a pretext for supranationalism. The Socialist Group has gone so far as to propose in its amendment a policy which is binding on all the Member States. We are told that we must reduce the consumption/energy ratio, but what types of consumption will be reduced? The plan is already clear: this will be mainly domestic consumption, which will be hit by rising prices.

You are also proposing a policy to increase the price of petroleum products, but you do not mention electricity prices. However, it is a fact that in France electricity costs 13 centimes per kWh for the major industrial consumers, while Electricité de France has to pay at least 17 centimes. But this is beyond dispute. The interests of Pechiney-Ugine-Kuhlman are being well protected.

I shall conclude by saying that the French Communists will, needless to say be voting against this policy, which is entirely geared to the interests of the multinational concerns. We shall resolutely defend the French coalfields, our government and the ECSC, and we shall resolutely defend the law of 1928 in defiance of the Commission.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Calvez.

**Mr Calvez.** — *(F)* Mr President, in the minute and a half remaining to the Liberal and Democratic Group, I would like to point out that we will still need oil as a raw material for the refining industry up to the end of the century. We should therefore try to obtain it as cheaply as possible.

But there are in the world, and even in the Member States, huge amounts of crude oil referred to as 'heavy' on account of its density. It is less expensive than normal crude oils, but its extraction and processing require particularly large capital outlay. I propose that the Commission should draft a programme to encourage prospecting and the extraction and processing of heavy crude oil in the Community countries and that it make provision for the necessary funds in the forthcoming budgets. Proposals for studies and projects have been submitted to the Commission; they should not be allowed to gather dust but should be implemented until such time as nuclear energy replaces existing sources. The years are passing and 1990 is just around the corner, but the problems remain, since we shall have to make allowance for delays, for various reasons, in the programmes for nuclear power plant construction in the Member States.

To conclude, it is therefore essential that we conduct experiments without delay to determine the most suitable methods of processing heavy crude oil for the consumer. I submit this proposal to the Commission in a spirit of solidarity.

**President.** — I call Mr Ansquer.

**Mr Ansquer.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of my Group I would first like to congratulate Mr Fuchs on his excellent report, which was drafted with competence and accuracy.

**Ansquer**

The report and the oral questions by Mr Pintat, Mr Müller-Hermann and Mr Linkohr give us a further opportunity to repeat our warnings to the Member States. The upheaval which followed the oil crisis of 1973 and 1974 was hardly constructive. It caused great anxiety in the West, and should have highlighted Europe's solidarity. Today, seven years later, the ever worsening problems of the Community's energy supplies have still not stirred the spirit of Europe or persuaded the Member States to embark on a coherent energy policy.

Despite the unswerving efforts and cooperation of the Commission and Parliament, progress has been slow and our achievements are very incomplete. The Member States have not succeeded in providing the necessary impetus for establishing a genuine common energy market.

Several basic objectives have, however, been unanimously supported, for example the need to reduce Europe's dependence on imported energy, the need to develop alternative energy sources, to cut oil consumption, and above all, to reduce wastage. But the Member States, enslaved by their own interests, have been unable to launch a real Community programme. Despite the energy crisis and the increasingly menacing political situation, the Member States are still lacking in political will. For this reason the Group of European Progressive Democrats is tabling a motion for a resolution emphasizing certain fundamental problems: the need to pursue economic policies aimed at renewed growth, which should be sufficient to combat unemployment and maintain employment levels, while drawing its strength from sectors and processes which use as little energy as possible; the need to establish an energy policy based on genuine Community solidarity and the pooling of world energy resources; the urgent need to reduce oil consumption and the need for the Member States to control the multinational oil companies.

The Community urgently needs to shake off its lethargy. Let us hope, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, that this appeal will be heard, for in view of such an obvious lack of political will, what is the point of continuing to quietly fashion plans for Community programmes which will never get off the ground? The companions of Ulysses were enticed by the chanting of the sirens, but our chants are not as alluring. We do not appear to have the same power over the leaders of the Community.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Skovmand.

**Mr Skovmand.** — *(DK)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the document under discussion today contains many sensible ideas. After all, it is in the interests of us all, whatever country we come from, to

save energy, and particularly oil. For this reason, we must support the work being done in, for example, the OECD with a view to ensuring that all countries will play their part in these efforts so that the savings which are patently being made in a number of European countries do not come to nothing as a result of unreasonably high energy consumption on the part of America. Within certain limits, pressure on the individual Member States might presumably also produce results, provided this does not lead to a situation whereby the individual countries run out of steam as regards their initiatives and sit there twiddling their thumbs waiting for a stroke of genius from the Community. However, the report by the Committee on Energy is going much too far in paragraph 17 of the motion for a resolution, which directly advocates the further development of nuclear energy. I should like to point out that the Danish Government stated a few weeks ago that, for the time being, it was obliged to disregard nuclear energy in drawing up its policy as no solution had yet been found to a number of problems. It has not yet been conclusively proved that nuclear power stations can be made sufficiently safe. We have no guarantee that it will be possible to store radioactive waste safely in Denmark.

If a Member State has made a decision of this kind, a decision which it is perfectly entitled to make, it is misplaced and unreasonable interference on the part of the Community to be preaching the development of nuclear energy. For this reason, we in the Danish Peoples' Movement against the EEC must oppose the motion for a resolution.

**President.** — I call Mrs Dekker.

**Mrs Dekker.** — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in view of the limited time at my disposal I shall have to discuss this tremendously vast topic by outlining my views very briefly. When setting our energy objectives it seems to me to be a reasonable approach first to determine our objectives for consumption, then the way in which they can be achieved and, finally, the opportunities open to us. The Commission — and now the Committee on Energy and Research with its report — has adopted a different approach. The primary objective is to limit oil imports. To this end three measures are proposed, to be supplemented by one or two other measures designed to ensure adequate energy supplies. What is utterly lacking is a target for growth, that is a forecast, on the level of energy consumption to be aimed at. Admittedly, the Commission does provide an estimate of the Community's energy balance up to 1990, but this is merely the total of the Member States' own estimates. It does not even specify the assumptions concerning economic growth on which these estimates are based. It is therefore not possible to gauge the efforts made and results achieved and thus to

## Dekker

assess the policy being carried out. Instead of a definite policy in which our targets are dictated by the limitations imposed by the availability of energy, the present approach is based more on statistics. This — in my view, at least — is the fundamental flaw in the policy being pursued. What is also sadly lacking is an alternative policy to be applied if it looks as though the objectives are not going to be achieved. In particular, the implementation of the nuclear energy programme, which is necessary if we are to achieve these objectives, should be viewed with scepticism, to say the least. The Commission intensifies this programme whenever it feels that the contribution of nuclear energy is likely to fall far short of expectations, which is now in fact the case. Commissioner Brunner raised this point this morning. He also commented, in a article which appeared in the Netherlands in the *Internationale Spectator* at the end of 1979, that the target capacity of 12.7 gigawatts planned for the Community for 1990 — this means 14 new nuclear power plants a year from 1978 — can only be achieved if there is wide public support. He was in favour of continuing the discussions on both the use of nuclear energy and the consequences of our abandoning it, in order to secure adequate support for the decisions to be taken. This is also the basis of the resolution by Mr Coppieters, the signatories of which include my colleague, Mr De Goede, and myself and in which we referred to the premature nature of the conclusions reached last year by the European Council concerning the application of nuclear energy, since these conclusions anticipate the outcome of the discussions in the national parliaments and among the general public on nuclear energy policy, which in several Member States are either still in progress or have not yet begun. Although the Fuchs report is based on this resolution, the fundamental aspects are not dealt with; instead, the motion for a resolution advocates an extension of nuclear energy. True, it does add that stricter and uniform safety standards must be laid down and that the necessary arrangements should be made, but the other, still more important problem connected with nuclear energy, namely nuclear waste, is mentioned neither in the report nor in the explanatory statement. When we discussed the nuclear waste programme at our last part-session, it was strongly emphasized that waste is the most serious problem of nuclear energy production and that a satisfactory solution is still not in sight. For the current of political opinion which we represent here this is an essential prerequisite for the continued use of nuclear energy; if this is not met, we cannot agree to the proposed conclusions.

Finally, energy consumption is determined not so much by reduced dependence on oil imports, which is desirable for the Community, but on the physical depletion of dwindling energy sources, by political, economic and geographical factors, by damage to the environment and health and by safety hazards and potential international tension — factors which are universal and call for a different approach to energy,

in which conservation and rational energy consumption must have absolute priority.

**President.** — I call Mr Didò.

**Mr Didò.** — (*I*) Mr President, this serious energy problem really boils down to the ability of Member States to define a real and genuine Community energy policy, based both on the co-ordination of national policies and on Community programmes and devices. I support the priorities which have been indicated here — in particular by Mr Linkohr — and which must be clearly set out in the resolution passed by Parliament.

The main point is energy saving, which represents beyond any doubt one of the most substantial sources. This means taking decisive steps and introducing obligatory measures in various fields such as the insulation of houses and the replacement of private transport in cities by public transport, but above all it requires a fundamental restructuring of the productive apparatus, directly linked to a different quality of economic development.

The second point concerns Community control of the petroleum market, using appropriate devices. The existing Euratom Agency could be used for this purpose by extending its terms of reference, or alternatively a Community agency could be created specifically for this purpose, thereby creating the right conditions for controlling investment in the sector and establishing direct relations between the Community and the oil-production countries, by-passing the multinationals, and against a background of economic cooperation. What is more, it is possible to boost the use of methane gas to a much higher level than obtains at the present moment by various means, including the setting up of consortia in the Member States for the construction of methane pipelines.

The third point concerns the adoption of common measures — particularly in the field of research — for the development of Community sources of energy based on coal, geothermal energy etc. right up to renewable sources such as solar power. For this purpose the Community allocations must be considerably increased, and it is a matter of urgent importance that the Commission should put forward concrete proposals, as the present situation in which only 2% of the budget is devoted to this heading is absurd, and the indications we have received both from Mr Jenkins and Mr Brunner have been too vague.

I shall stop for a moment here to deal with the question of coal, in spite of the fact that Italy — my country — is devoid of these resources although it is making a great effort to construct new coal fuelled power stations and convert others which at present are fuelled by oil.

**Didò**

It is expected that in 1986 approximately 20 million tonnes of coal a year will be used for this purpose, representing approximately 20 % of the present national consumption of energy. This is a target which will not be easy to attain. We are, of course, interested in giving a new impetus to the mining of Community coal, but it is not acceptable that a country such as ours should take on the burden of the higher costs involved in using such coal, as compared with coal prices on the international market. For this reason we agree particularly with the adoption of measures designed to provide incentives for experiments into the liquefaction and gasification of coal, an aspect of present day research which more than anything else would open up the possibility of exploiting some of the coal reserves in Sardinia.

As regards nuclear energy, which we must consider as providing what we cannot get from the various energy sources, the central question is that of safety and the dissemination of the appropriate detailed information to the public. We cannot plan the construction of other nuclear power stations before we have found more convincing answers to the problem of safety and the huge problem of what to do with the waste. We seem now to be heading towards the use of one type of reactor only, namely the pressurized water reactor, even though, frankly, I do not understand why we can not use much less dangerous kinds of reactor.

But, anyway, we are going to concentrate on so-called PWR stations, and so safety research should be concentrated on this type of station.

It is here that we come up against a paradoxical situation within the Community, which must at all costs be eliminated and which derives from the inability of the Member States to make full use of the facilities offered them by the Euratom Centre at Ispra; here I am thinking in particular of the SARA programme, which Mr Bisaglia spoke about this morning. This programme, the scientific value of which has been largely established — so much that it has aroused a considerable amount of interest in the United States and Japan — is particularly well suited to provide us with answers to the questions arising from the kind of accidents which have taken place in the United States and to help us to deal with the defects which have appeared in one or two power stations built in France. It is quite inconceivable that, in the name of some incomprehensible national interest or other, there should still be some Member States who oppose the implementation of this programme.

For this reason I believe that Parliament must adopt an extremely clear and determined attitude on this matter, not only in the interest of European cooperation in nuclear research, but also in the interest of the safety of our peoples.

**President.** — I call Mr Pedini.

**Mr Pedini.** — *(I)* Mr President, Minister, I shall confine myself to one or two non-technical remarks because this is a political forum. First of all I wish to offer sincere thanks for the sense of commitment manifested in the speech by the President-in-Office of the Council and equally sincere appreciation for the work carried out by Mr Brunner in the vast field of the common energy policy.

In a few days time an important meeting of the Council of Ministers responsible for scientific research will be called. I attach a great deal of significance to this. We shall not be able to ensure the future development of our continent in energy matters if we do not boost scientific research, in particular, into this very area of energy. Ispra and its programmes constitute an important focus for energy research; the SARA project, which has already been mentioned, may be of importance for calming public fears with regard to the safety aspect of nuclear energy. Research is under way at Ispra which is of immense interest — including important experiments into fusion materials and hydrogen — and there is the JET experiment at Culham, which may be of decisive importance for the future. I think that this Parliament must act as a stimulus so that our Member States, above all through joint efforts, give greater prominence to this and other scientific research programmes concerned with energy. And since, speaking of research, our rapporteur has emphasized the importance of energy research for developing countries as well and since it is obvious that the future energy situation will require a balanced use of the energy resources of each country, I should like to remind you that topics such as wind energy, the direct conversion of solar energy into electric energy, geothermal energy etc. must be taken further by us in our own interests and in those countries with which we have association agreements.

I therefore hope for a cohesive programme for scientific research policy. But, as I was saying Mr President, this is a political forum; and just as, when we were speaking of world hunger, we realized that the problem of aid to developing countries had to be put into the context of a new kind of economic policy to be pursued thanks to a new division of labour amongst developed countries, the topic of energy, in just the same way faces us today with fundamental economic decisions. We are in the middle of an economic down-turn because various negative factors have coincided. This is a different situation from what happened in the past, when for a period of 20 years we took advantage — to tell the truth, rather badly — of positive factors. Do we therefore think that the future of nuclear STET or coal-fuelled power stations can be paid for by inflation? Facing up to the energy needs of our continent reminds us of the fundamental theme of our economic policy and its aims. It is time to limit the amount of non-essential consumption,

**Pedini**

and it is time to encourage investment — can a market in which investment is declining hold together? We cannot spend all our income on non-essential expenditure, thereby compromising the future of coming generations. So there is a whole aspect of economic policy which also requires the transfer of resources from the richest areas of the Community to the poorest, so that, also using the energy factor, we can achieve a harmonious development of our society. Our Parliament although it lauds the virtues of the commitment to science, must also declare the problem of energy to be a vital aspect of the economic approach of our Community, of spending policy, of investment policy, of the policy designed to limit non-essential expenditure, which is the truly far-sighted king of austerity.

Ever since I had the honour to be Chairman of the Committee on Energy here, we have never made a secret of the need for a European energy policy which would take all the various sources of energy into account. I think that this principle is more valid today than ever before. But can we for example, boast of achievements in the field of solar energy, in our Community, comparable to what has been achieved in domestic consumption by the Nordic countries and by the countries of North America? Here we have another sector where we must work to catch up, on the basis, as I said, of a far-sighted economic policy. This, Mr President, is in truth what counts, because when public opinion becomes aware that, by adopting an energy policy, we are facing up, not merely to a vital need, but also to an entirely new way of pursuing economic policy, public confidence in the new economy will then be greater. It will be easy to introduce into this new economy another factor to which I shall only allude in very brief terms namely, the development of a large community, associated — like our own — with developing countries, with continents which are rich in raw materials and energy resources. Has the moment not perhaps arrived for us to start to consider whether it is not possible to develop our association agreements into genuine common agencies for the development of natural resources and for the pooling of the resources of human intelligence? STET is not the future of Lomé, is not the future of Yaoundé, is not the future of our association agreements to be found in the creation of development agencies equipped to deal with energy and other questions?

The energy question — like the question of economic development — is moreover a complex one. This is why I am sorry, Mr President, that along with the various questions which have been put before this House today, there was no room for a question signed by myself and by Mr Ghergo, in which we took the liberty of asking the Council of Ministers and the Commission what steps they intended to take to see that something was done in European schools to set about organizing effective education in energy matters

— if I may put it that way — and in the wise use of energy resources.

Mr President, the future of the energy-based civilization will be ensured only if we understand that, by using energy, man is administering nature and the things that nature has given us. This is why the moment has perhaps arrived for us to start coordinated action with the aim of informing the man in the street, so that he regards energy as a greater reason for solidarity with other men and with other peoples, and as a greater reason for the correct use of intelligence and nature. I suppose that our question was not considered to be of an economic nature.

But Mr Brunner, ladies and gentlemen, even if we do succeed in speeding up the Culham experiment by 10 years and bringing even closer the age of fusion, what will be the use of all that if there is no-one capable of making wise use of the energy of the future?

Speak, if you like, of the energy problem today as a problem of research and energy saving. But let us ask ourselves whether it is not also a problem of science and culture and therefore a problem relating to the level of human civilization.

**President.** — I call Mr Almirante.

**Mr Almirante.** — (*I*) Mr President, I would just like very quickly to express our political viewpoint. In the light of what is certainly a well balanced view of the situation, as put forward in the Fuchs report — I refer in particular to point 33 — and also in Mr Müller-Hermann's question, the purely ecological stance of the various 'green' movements which have been referred to here and more specifically the attitude of the radical socialists — I won't mention the communists since they have obviously taken sides and with a side which has no place here in a free Europe — is either dreadfully naive and misinformed or it constitutes a clumsy attempt to deceive the peoples of Europe by reducing their standard of living, lowering the rate of their progress and placing them at the mercy of the economic imperialism of the United States of America and the atomic imperialism of Soviet Union. We need to achieve a serious Community energy policy, and it pains me to perceive that the statement of the Council of Ministers — all the more so coming from an Italian Minister — is so evasive, hesitant and laborious.

**President.** — I call Mrs Roudy.

**Mrs Roudy.** — (*F*) Ladies and gentlemen, since 1973 Europe has been faced with a tremendous challenge — that of meeting its energy requirements. As long ago as 1974 the Community set itself four objectives to attain this goal: to save energy, to resume the use of coal, to develop new forms of energy and, lastly, to embark on a nuclear energy programme. Six years later, we are forced to admit that we have failed. There

**Roudy**

are two main reasons for this: the utter lack of solidarity between the Member States and the maintenance of too many structural class inequalities which remain unassailable as a matter of policy.

Energy conservation obviously does not have the same meaning for a farmer in the south of Italy as for a top executive with a multinational concern with his own private plane. On the one hand there is scandalous waste and, on the other, a scarcity which is equally scandalous.

The Community does have resources, however, but here again there is inequality: Germany and Britain have coal deposits, while Italy, as has just been pointed out, has none. Ladies and gentlemen, surely this is the time to make an appeal for solidarity which is a little more positive than mere words? Admittedly, those who venture to appeal for solidarity sometimes require a great deal of optimism. The United Kingdom exports half of its oil production to the United States. As for nuclear energy, there are clearly real and practical problems in this sector: no-one knows what to do with nuclear waste. It is therefore highly unwise and irresponsible to develop nuclear energy so intensively when we still do not even know how to process the waste.

This brings me to the question of safety, to which we Socialists attach enormous importance. We believe that safety goes hand in hand with information and control. There can be no real safety unless we are fully informed of what is going on and can exercise effective control.

For this reason we Socialists propose the establishment of a European information agency and the setting up of joint committees on health and safety in nuclear power plants to help put an end to the policy of silence and secrecy which, as we know, all too often leads to certain police practices. It is high time that the national governments, spurred on by a Community spirit, consulted the people and their elected representatives in order to conclude formal agreements between them concerning the problems of constructing nuclear power plants in frontier regions.

The much discussed road to self-sufficiency in energy, is not without its pitfalls, and unless we really come to terms with the situation, we may end up in a blind alley.

**President.** — I call Mr Gendebien.

**Mr Gendebien.** — (F) Mr President, Mr Simonet, the Belgium Minister, recently states 'if Europe had a common foreign policy, we would know about it.' And he might well have added 'if Europe had a common energy policy, we would know about that too'.

For my part, I would like to suggest a radical solution involving the setting up of a European energy agency

with powers to conduct a common policy on energy supply and production, on seeking alternative energy sources as well as on finding ways of rationally using and saving the energy we have. This agency should strive to establish what I would call a public European pool for the purchasing of energy-producing raw materials. It would have to negotiate long-term contracts on behalf of the whole Community.

In this way we could finally break the quasi-monopoly of the large multinational oil companies and achieve tight control of the free market. Contracts of this sort could of course only be effective if coordinated with a direct dialogue between the Community and the groups of producing countries, in other words only if we had a common and independent foreign policy. Within this framework, these contracts would have to be reciprocal, whereby the producing countries would be sure of receiving industrial technology and foodstuffs. This would of course necessitate a genuine common foreign policy on agricultural produce.

Everything is thus interconnected, just as there is a connection between decisions made on energy and the type of society we want.

The energy consuming policy of quantitative growth which remains the political creed in Europe has committed almost all our governments and the Commission to what amounts to a race towards nuclear power. Our increasingly large appetite for energy is leading us to what I might call the 'all-nuclear' civilization.

We know, however, that in this respect countless problems remain to be solved, and that, what is more, it has become standard policy to keep projects secret until they are completed. Public opinion, peoples and parliaments are all disregarded by the economic and administrative authorities. Who takes the trouble to inform or consult them?

The choice of sites is an especially explosive issue. The most recent example is the plan of *Electricité de France* to build four power stations at Givet, 2 kilometres from the Belgian frontier. I recently tabled a motion for a resolution on this subject, calling for the correct application of Article 38 of the Euratom Treaty, for the establishment of a Community consultation procedure, and for no nuclear power stations to be built in the Community's frontier regions.

This is an urgent matter, because it is likely to affect relations between the Member States and to shake peoples confidence in the Community institutions' effectiveness and impartiality.

To sum up, Mr President, I would like to restate just how far the nuclear option is from being neutral. The decision which has to be made is just as much political as technical, because it inevitably leads to an increase in the strength of one sector of the economy,

## Gendebien

and to the growth of industrial concentration, surveillance, the powers of the police and of central government. This is a great danger. Europe deserves better — she deserves a different society, and as a result, a different sort of growth and a different sort of energy policy. As far as we are concerned, we can but say 'no' to the all-out race towards the 'all nuclear' civilization. We say 'no' to the worshippers of this 'golden calf' of energy policy, and 'no' to the supporters of a society in which central government is more and more powerful and the people are less and less free, for these are the real stakes in this debate. It is time everyone stated their position clearly in the interest of all our peoples.

**Mr Paisley.** — Mr President, energy is the most important subject to which this Assembly could turn its attention. There can be no growth in the Community unless there is a viable, realistic, adequate and accessible supply of energy. In the time that is available to me today I should like to emphasize that the first priority of the Council of Ministers should be an agreement whereby each Member State of the Community would be solemnly obliged to share its resources of energy amongst the entire population of the Community and not limit them to any favoured section. The gas industry in Northern Ireland is to be closed down and many hundreds are to be made workless. The people of Northern Ireland are at the moment paying three times as much for their gas supply as the rest of the United Kingdom. Now, the United Kingdom has an adequate supply of natural gas. The natural gas industry is the most viable of all the energy industries in the United Kingdom. Its profits this year will be in the region of £ 600 million yet the last Labour administration and the present Conservative Government have not been prepared to construct a gas pipeline across the 20-odd miles from Scotland to Northern Ireland. I would call on the Commission and Council to take this matter up urgently with the United Kingdom Government. Surely, if a way is genuinely being sought to offset the overpayment of the United Kingdom to the Community budget, then a natural-gas pipeline to Northern Ireland is a project which could be financed by Community funds.

Northern Ireland is one of the most depressed areas of the Community. It has the highest level of unemployment and must be given preference in the energy sector.

**President.** — (I) I call Mr Abens.

**Mr Abens.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, after all the speeches we have heard today, allow me to concentrate on one aspect of energy policy which is of supreme importance for the country which I represent here. I refer to the construction of nuclear power stations on the frontier of Luxembourg, a country whose area is only 2 587 km<sup>2</sup>.

If we take into account its limited size and the fact that its population is at its densest in the centre and south, then the setting up at Cattenom, only a few kilometres from the frontier, of nuclear power stations of the type which the French government intends to build — and this without the agreement of Luxembourg — poses a serious problem for the Community.

I ask myself where the Community spirit and true solidarity which Robert Schuman referred to in 1950 have gone, when large countries, in order to make nuclear sites more acceptable to domestic opinion merely export the problem towards the smaller states, that is to say the ones which have the least economic and diplomatic influence.

Mr President, the vast majority of the people of Luxembourg are deeply shocked — and I would go as far as to say revolted — by the behaviour of the government of a friendly and partner country. This is why we welcomed with such optimism the news in May 1979 that a proposal had been put forward on the subject of Community consultation on the siting of nuclear power stations. The introduction to this Commission proposal aimed at setting up a Community consultation procedure on nuclear power stations in frontier regions contain the following paragraph, and I quote :

Since then it has become urgent to introduce a consultation procedure between Member States when power stations are to be sited near frontiers. Existing bilateral consultation arrangements have proved inadequate in certain cases and public awareness of the ecological aspects of siting power stations has increased.

The Commission goes on to assert, and I quote again :

In the densely populated countries of the Community there is generally a shortage of sites suitable for nuclear power stations. A certain number of power stations are or will be sited near frontiers or on international waterways. There are 33 nuclear power stations alone, i.e. approximately 25 % of all those on stream, under construction or planned, which are or are to be sited within 40 km of national frontiers. Of these, 15 are sited less than 10 km from the frontier.

After what happened at Harrisburg, these reflections take on an even greater importance, both as the need for urgent action is concerned and inasmuch as it has become absolutely essential for Member States to comply with common rules in these matters, so that as far as humanly possible ecological or economic catastrophes may be averted. In the spirit of solidarity between the countries of this Community we must avoid Member States trying to export each other's problems, in the form of any dangerous 'fall-out' nuclear power stations might produce. Stringent rules must be observed as far as siting, protection of the environment and safety are concerned.

**Abens**

It is quite unacceptable for Member States to try to set up their power stations on the frontier of other Member States, thereby causing great difficulty to the latter, when we are all agreed that nuclear power stations must be sited as far as away as possible from areas of high population density. It is obvious that, for a procedure in this field to be effective to provide maximum guarantees for the whole population of the Community, it must be applied throughout the Community and be obligatory. It must provide for any aspect of the problem which might affect the population or the environment to be taken into account and monitored.

Determined use of this new Community instrument, as well as of those which the Community already has available will make it possible to combine the aims of securing energy supply with those of the safety of the population. That is the underlying meaning of the motion for a resolution which I have signed with other socialist Members and which Madame Beate Weber will be tabling tomorrow morning. The final adoption of a satisfactory consultation procedure, which is becoming more and more urgently needed every day, will make it easier, I solemnly promise that here, for a just solution to be found for the people of my country in a field which still holds untold risks for their safety and health.

**President.** — (I) I call Mrs Lizin.

**Mrs Lizin.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, since it is as one might say my privilege to close this debate, I would like to concentrate on one specific problem, and perhaps counter the pessimism of Mr Brunner's statement with the positive desire that he will at last adopt a more dynamic policy on the question of safety. I think that the best answer to pessimism is to try at least to take some action.

My case in point is that of the Tihange nuclear power station. Mr Brunner's reply to me on Monday was that it did not fall within the scope of his powers to deal with the technical problems of nuclear safety. I fear that Mr Brunner may be too modest when defining his powers, and that he might do well in this case to interpret his terms of reference as freely as possibly.

As for the Tihange nuclear power station, one of the Ministers of the Belgian government responsible for this matter admitted that there were in fact cracks and some danger. This is why an enquiry is now taking place. This enquiry is restricted to one part of the power station, and does not involve the unit already in operation, since the Framatome Company does not as yet possess any system for inspection without stopping production.

We must secure the promise from the Commission that it will demand an end to such practices, and that

it will take part in consultation and enquiries on such safety matters.

Mr Brunner in his reply, told me that he has been receiving voluntary information from the Belgian Government which reassures him about the safety of these power stations. I hope that he will no longer be content with the reports supplied on the subject — reports which are themselves contradicted by various other statements — and that he will at last assume his responsibilities in this affair and pester the Belgian Government, until he can discover what type of enquiry it intends to set up and what sort of measures it will apply.

I in fact believe, and I will close with this point, that it is impossible, as far as enquires are concerned, to reach any degree of independence at national level. It is at the European level that we must assume our responsibilities on what needs to be done, since it is only at this level that we will be able to have complete freedom of action.

**President.** — I call Mr Bisaglia.

**Mr Bisaglia, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (I) Mr President, I wish to thank sincerely all those who have taken part in this debate, which has impressed me by the variety of the contribution it has made on this issue, and above all because at least 24 Members have had the opportunity to express their opinion.

I will go back over only one point of the debate. I am sure that everyone — at least so it seems to me — is aware of our Communities' unavoidable and continuing dependence on oil for its energy production. The major problem to which we will devote our energy is that of reducing and containing our dependence on oil, whilst at the same time guaranteeing the development of our countries which already have widely differing levels of development.

I believe it is possible to state here and now that the work of the Commission — which I take this opportunity to thank — over the last few months has had some effect: we have succeeded, as a direct result of the Commissions' intervention, in reaching agreement in the Council of Ministers, and we have drawn up a 5-year programme on how to contain oil consumption in the Community and guarantee development; from this point of view, we have made progress which has impressed countries outside our Community

I can assert that in the next six months the Council, working with the Commission and, I hope, with this Parliament, will try to work in full awareness of the seriousness of the problems facing us, so that our peoples can be sure that they can live in safe environment, where human life is defended and guaranteed, because this is the main function of our governments.

(Applause)

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, in my capacity as rapporteur, I should like to offer my thanks for the wide measure of agreement expressed by the many people who have spoken on my report on energy objectives for 1990. I was not surprised to hear that the Socialist Group rejects the report's conclusion, but what did surprise me was the fact that their amendments go far beyond what was said in committee. I should like to point out to the German members of the Socialist Group that they are apparently on a collision course with the SPD-led government in the Federal Republic of Germany and with the energy policy espoused by the German trade unions. But that is their problem. I hope that the adoption of my report will create a very solid basis for the European Parliament's future work on energy policy.

(Applause)

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution and the amendments which have been tabled will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

The proceedings will now be suspended until 3 p.m.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 1.25 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR : MR DE FERRANTI

*Vice-President*

**President.** — The sitting is resumed.

May I, on your behalf, welcome the Turkish Delegation, whom we are very pleased to see amongst us.

(Applause)

### 8. Question Time

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is the second part of Question Time (Doc. 1-738/79).

We begin with questions to the Council. Because of the presence of the Turkish Delegation, I would like to take first :

— Question No 61, by Mr Fellermaier (H-454/79) :

What measures does the Council intend to take to revive the relationship between the Community and Turkey ?

— and Question No 62, by Mr Radoux (H-455/79) :

What are the Council's current objectives within the framework of the Association EC-Turkey, and what were the results of the meeting of the Association Council on 5 February ?

**Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (I) With your kind permission, Mr President, I should like to join you in welcoming the Turkish Delegation on behalf of the Presidency of the Council and to reply simultaneously to the questions by Mr Fellermaier and Mr Radoux, which — as you have pointed out — deal with the same subject.

In view of the current international situation, the Council is fully aware of the importance of the relations under the Association between the Community and Turkey and of the political need to give them a fresh impetus after a long period of stagnation. This is the spirit in which the Council defined the Community's position at the Association Council Meeting at ministerial level held in Brussels on 5 February last, which was entirely devoted to the revitalization of the Association and the development of relations between the Community and Turkey. At the end of that meeting, the two parties adopted joint conclusions, the text of which is available to the Member of the European Parliament.

**Mr Fellermaier.** — (D) Mr President of the Council, I am very disappointed at your answer, which was extremely vague. I should therefore like to ask you the following specific question. Paragraph 6 of the Communiqué issued after the meeting of the Association Council states :

Furthermore both parties will seek ways and means of developing the Association in order to facilitate Turkey's ultimate entry into the Community in accordance with the Ankara Agreement.

I should like to ask you quite specifically, what is the Council of Ministers' contribution to the ways and means of developing this Association ?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) This undertaking is precisely what the Council intends to consider.

**Mr Radoux.** — (F) On the day following 5 February, a statement was made and reported in the Turkish press. Can the President of the Council say whether the Council has already adopted a position on the statement according to which that Turkey might apply for membership of the Community in the course of this year ?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) The Council has no direct information regarding this matter to which the honourable Member has just drawn our attention. Obviously any application for accession will be examined by the competent Council departments according to the procedure provided for in the Treaty.

**Mr Taylor.** — Is the Council aware that many Members of this House welcomed the decision by Turkey to apply for accession to the Community and

**Taylor**

will the Council assure the House that there will be a positive response to this application by Turkey?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) The Council has not received any such application and — I repeat — any application received to this effect would be examined by the competent institutional bodies according to the provisions of the Treaty.

**Mrs De March.** — (F) Does the Council intend, within the context the EC-Turkey Association, to draw the attention of the Turkish Government to the serious violation of human rights, such as arbitrary arrests, outlawing of trade union and political organizations and the fact that certain extreme right-wing terrorist groups guilty of hundreds of murders are allowed to go unpunished, which could be prejudicial to the development of cooperation between the Member States and Turkey? I too am concerned about this question of developing relations which would be to our mutual advantage without affecting the independence of each party. Does this question of cooperation involve the integration of Turkey into the western European bloc?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) This matter is not within the institutional competency of the Association Agreement.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) As a number of our colleagues have reminded us, on 6 February the press contained a statement of which the Council does not appear to have any direct knowledge.

I should like to ask whether, quite apart from an intolerable bureaucratic dilatoriness on the part of the Council, it is conceivable that after an official statement by Turkey had appeared in the international press, there was no way in which the Council could have obtained some direct information on this matter in the course of the following week.

I should also like to ask the President of the Council...

**President.** — Mr Pannella, you are only allowed one supplementary question. I am sure that with your ingenuity you will be able to perhaps wrap two questions into one, but I must ask you now to stand with the rules for the convenience of the House.

*(Laughter)*

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) The Council cannot base its work on statements made to the press. The Council has not received any informal proposal of this kind, in spite of what is claimed in a press statement which, like all press statements, in no way constitutes an official commitment on the part of the Turkish Government.

**Lord Bethell.** — Would the President-in-Office agree that the improvement in relations between the Community and Turkey, which we all greatly welcome, would be tremendously helped by the withdrawal of Turkish troops from a fellow associated state, the Republic of Cyprus, and the restoration of sovereignty and independence to that associated state?

Will the President-in-Office, in his discussions with our Turkish associates, do his utmost to restore relations with Turkey on the basis of security and prosperity for all people of Cyprus within the bounds of one independent republic?

*(Applause from certain quarters of the European Democratic Group)*

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) This is a different subject which is not covered by the question. I should like to quote, in this context, paragraph 3 of the joint conclusions of the Association Council:

The Community welcomes Turkey's decision to withdraw its request to suspend application of the additional protocol.

I think this answers the honourable Member's question.

**Mr Sieglerschmidt.** — (D) Is the President of the Council aware that of the many meaningless answers which the Council has already given Parliament, this was one of the most meaningless? Would he not in this situation be prepared to do more than merely refer to a communiqué and tell us something more specific about the measures with which the Council intends to extend and intensify the Association Agreement?

*(Applause)*

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) The passage I have just quoted refers to the Council's commitment as regards the Association. The Council will of course look into this matter with the Commission with a view to obtaining, over and above formal statements, concrete results.

**Mr Johnson.** — Does the Council recognize that, in view of the recent political situation in the Middle East, it may be necessary to review the date for ultimate Turkish accession to the Community, specified in the Ankara Agreement, that is to say 1995, with a view to advancing it by a considerable margin?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) What we are at present discussing is the Association Agreement. As regards the possible accession of Turkey, this is not a question which we can examine, since no application for accession has been made.

**President.** — Question No 47, by Mrs Clwyd (H-326/79):

Is the Energy Council of Ministers aware of the implications to the South Wales Coal Industry of BSC's recently announced commitment to import Third Country coking coal into their works and are they taking this new development into account in reaching the decision they have promised, before the end of 1979, on the continuation and adjustment to new circumstances of the existing scheme to provide aids to the production and disposal of Community coking coal for the steel industry?

**Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (1) The specific problem referred to by the honourable Member was not discussed by the Council at its meeting on 18 December 1979, at which it gave the assent requested by the Commission, pursuant to Article 95 of the ECSC Treaty, to the draft Decision on coal and coke for the iron and steel industry in the Community.

However, the Council has no doubt that the Commission has taken into account the effects that imports of coking coal from third countries may have on the South Wales coal industry.

**Mrs Clwyd.** — I am astonished that the Council should give an answer to a question of that sort when it adopts a cavalier approach to a very serious problem. In the meantime, BSC imports of coking coal, coupled with the closures mean that in the South Wales area alone 14,000 jobs could be lost and 21 pits will be closed.

Would the Council agree that the EEC should immediately grant £33 million to the National Coal Board to eliminate the need for additional imports of coking coal, in the knowledge that such a grant would reinforce the EEC strategy of developing conventional energy resources and would be a modest step in the direction of reducing the British financial contribution to the Community budget?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (1) I should like to point out to the honourable Member that she has drawn attention to a very major problem. It is first and foremost for the Commission, which has at its disposal adequate means of investigating the situation, to assess in its draft decision the effects of the measures proposed either at Community level in general or at the level of a particular sector or of the industries concerned.

**Mr Rogers.** — May I say that I agree with Mrs Clwyd that that was a non-answer to the question. Talk about Rome... or Nero fiddling while Rome is burning, or whatever happened to it!

*(Laughter)*

I am not as cultured as my Conservative colleagues.

*(Cheers and applause from the European Democratic Group)*

I hope to God that Rome is not going to fiddle while South Wales is burning!

I would ask the Council whether it is aware that the policy of Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom — which is not likely to remain united or a kingdom for very long if present policies are maintained...

*(Protests from the European Democratic Group)*

... by pursuing vicious anti-worker monetary theories is destroying Europe's most viable energy resource, whilst the USA and Europe are importing subsidized Polish coal. This is something which my Conservative friends presumably do not like when they sit on their backsides in their offices in London!

Go out into the coal and steel areas and see what you are doing! You are destroying the Community!

*(Protests from the European Democratic Group)*

We wouldn't have you in South Wales! You ought to be ashamed of yourselves!

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (1) All I can say is that the Council has no doubts that, in its decisions regarding these imports, the British Government will take full account of the possible consequences of such imports on Welsh industry.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the left)*

**Mr Marshall.** — Would the President of the Council not agree that the problems of the South Wales coal industry are partly a result of some workers pricing themselves out of a job; that far from being the most viable industry in the world, using South Wales coal rather than imported coal is costing the British Steel Corporation £130 million a year, and that the time has come for introducing common sense into collective wage-bargaining in the public sector throughout the Community?

Moreover, is it not disgraceful that a Vice-President of this House should behave in a way that brings this House into disrepute?

*(Mixed Reactions)*

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (1) Mr President, as I am sure you will understand, this is an internal problem of one of the Member States and the Council cannot therefore answer this question.

*(Laughter from the right — Protests from the left)*

**Mr Griffiths.** — It is clear that the Council is aware of this peculiar British problem, but what is the Energy Council of Ministers doing to review the way in which the steel industries of Europe are subsidized by their national governments in what is supposed to be a common market? I appeal to the Council that, if there is to be a Common Market, then there ought to be a common consideration of the steel industries and the coal industries of the whole of Europe, including South Wales.

**Mr Zamberletti.** — *(I)* A debate on energy problems was held this morning and the Council took due note of this appeal. The Council has briefly, within the limits of Question Time described Community policy on this question which was required of it.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(I)* In view of what has been said, does not the President of the Council realize that energy problems and the interests of South Wales workers cannot be dealt with in the same way as the Italian Government is dealing with the interests of Sardinia where investment, or the attempt to invest, in alternative energy sources has resulted in a crisis in the mining industry and the employment situation in general?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — *(I)* As regards the energy problem, this was, I think, amply discussed this morning. As regards the question concerning Sardinia, the honourable Member can table a question on this matter.

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, this is a most important question. I understand how strong feelings are on the subject, but this is Question Time and many honourable Members wish to ask questions. I really think it would be in the best interests of you all if we proceeded to the next question.

I call Mr Boyes on a point of order.

**Mr Boyes.** — Mr President — or Acting President, or whatever you want to call yourself up there...

**President.** — I am sorry, I am responsible for the presidency of this House and I will not have the good name of the presidency called into account by any Member.

*(Applause from the centre and from the right)*

**Mr Boyes.** — Mr President, the last thing I want to do is insult the Chair. I was simply trying to make a joke concerning our friend who is not here this afternoon.

My point of order is this: I noticed during Question Time that you called a Member who indicated from

the floor that he wished to speak. Although I put down my name very early this afternoon to ask a supplementary question, I was not called to speak. Does this mean you intend to ignore requests to speak submitted before Question-time and to call instead Members who, from the floor, ask to speak? As you know, I represent a coal-and-steel area. I do not wish to turn Question Time into a party-political battle with our colleagues on the other side of the House, but this is a very serious problem for the people in my area. Will you just let us know how you are going to proceed; and will you let me put my supplementary question?

**President.** — The President obviously wishes to call Members from all sides of the House in reasonable sequence. But you did put your name in earlier. I am sure it will help everyone if the President is reasonably flexible. Once I have heard Mr Fellermaier's point of order, I shall invite you to ask your supplementary question.

I call Mr Fellermaier on a point of order.

**Mr Fellermaier.** — *(D)* Mr President, you were no doubt right to criticize a member of my group just now for having called into question the authority of the President as a result of an unfortunate choice of words. However, if you do this I think for the sake of impartiality it is only reasonable to expect you to reprimand our friend from the Conservative Group too since he should not be allowed to get away with accusing Mr Rogers as Vice-President, of behaving, in a way that brings this House into disrepute when he was speaking in his capacity as a Member of this House and not as Vice-President. At present, Mr Rogers is sitting on the benches as a Member, whereas on other occasions he sits in the chair which you, Mr President, are currently occupying. There can only be talk of impartiality if you reprimand both sides alike.

**President.** — Of course we have a high regard for your experience, Mr Fellermaier. I will do my best to guide the proceedings according to the best traditions of the House.

**Mr Boyes.** — Before I start, Mr President, could I make sure that it is clear to you and to the House that I apologize for what I said to the Chair?

I support all the people who spoke about South Wales. It is a serious problem. But it is also a serious problem in the North of England too. The last time I talked to Mr Davignon about the problem of coking coal, he was on his way that very same day to Italy to talk about a particular problem with the Italian Government, and I am wondering if Mr Davignon has in fact reported to the Council on his talks in Italy, and if the Minister would tell us what was the outcome of those talks in Italy at that time.

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) The problem to which the honourable Member has just referred has been satisfactorily resolved. However, this matter is outside the scope of the question tabled.

**President.** — Question No 48, by Mr Sieglerschmidt (H-239/79):

In view of the importance which the Council has recently attached to the expeditious adoption of certain regulations and directives what progress has it made in its negotiation on amended proposal on product liability submitted by the Commission on 26 September 1979, and when does it expect to adopt this directive?

**Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (I) As the Council has already stated in reply to Question No H-181/79 put by Mr Geurtsen, now that the European Parliament and the Economic and Social Committee have delivered their opinions on the amended proposal for a directive on product liability submitted by the Commission on 1 October 1979, it proposes to begin examination within the next few weeks.

At this stage it is not possible to give any indication of how long proceedings within the Council will last.

**Mr Sieglerschmidt.** — (D) I think I can safely assume that the Council shares my conviction that this directive is one of great significance to all 250 million citizens of the Community. I feel sure I can also assume that the Council will complete the work on which, it is gratifying to note, it is about to make a start, i.e. the examination of the directive, with all due speed and, if possible, by the end of this year at the latest.

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) I thank the honourable Member for this request to the Council which takes account of the great significance of this matter for the consumers and the economy of this Community. The Council will do all it can to meet as soon as possible the wishes expressed by this Parliament in the opinion it has issued on this matter and elsewhere.

**Mr Welsh.** — Would the President-in-Office of the Council accept that by no means all of us in this House agree that this particular directive, with its insistence on strict liability for development risks, is in the interests of the consumer and that it certainly does not necessarily favour the development of new products? Would he therefore re-examine the directive with that in mind? Would he bear in mind that the Commission, when discussing this directive earlier this year, pointed out that they were not necessarily committed to development risk; and as it is rather a bad directive, would he use his best endeavours to return it to Parliament for further consideration as quickly as possible?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) The Council is perfectly aware that this is a complex problem which not only involves the legitimate interests of the consumer but is also of significance to the industrial situation in Europe. It will therefore take account of all the observations made by this Parliament and will assess all these problems with all due speed, but also with all due attention, so that the results of our work may be as positive as possible.

**Mr Fellermaier.** — (D) Since we are already familiar with the phrases you have just used i.e. that the Council will do all it can to do something as soon as possible etc., and since we know that ultimately they are meaningless, I should like to ask whether you are prepared, after a discussion in the Council of Ministers, to tell this House during the next Question Time precisely when work on this directive will finally be completed, since this will, I am sure, be easier for you to do after you have come to some agreement with your colleagues.

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) I would very much like to be able to give a positive answer, but it is not possible for the President of the Council to predict the speed at which the Council will be able to deal with this matter. In spite of the fact that I, as President of the Council, am greatly concerned about this matter, it is not, I repeat, possible for me to give a one hundred percent positive answer to your question.

**Mr Hord.** — It seems to me inappropriate for the Council to be pursuing this particular issue when the matter, as is stated in the original question, was brought before the old, indirectly elected Parliament, and I would therefore return to the point which my honourable friend Mr Welsh raised, that since the suggestions and proposals put forward by the old parliament are not being invoked by the Council in its current directive, this proposal should now be discussed once again by the new, directly-elected Parliament.

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) I confirm that the Council intends to examine the amended proposal for a directive in the course of the coming weeks. This means that the Council has made this undertaking. It is not, however, for the Presidency to make predictions regarding the results of the Council's work on this matter and the time it will take.

**Mr Prout.** — The Council will be aware that the Legal Affairs Committee has tabled a question to the Commission concerning an undertaking given by Viscount Davignon to this House about this proposal. Will the Council undertake not to deal with the Commission's proposal before the oral question concerning it has been answered in Parliament?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) Parliament's Opinion is before the Council, which is therefore under an obligation to examine this matter.

(Cries from the European Democratic Group)

**President.** — Since the author is absent, Question No 49 will receive a written answer (\*). At its author's request, Question No 50 is postponed until the next Question Time.

Question No 51, by Lord Douro (H-375/79):

When does the Council expect to conclude the negotiations with Spain about its accession to the EEC?

**Mr Zamberletti.** *President-in-Office of the Council.* — (I) The negotiations for Spain's accession to the Community are at present in the phase in which the parties are jointly conducting an *overall survey* covering the main negotiating topics. In accordance with the procedures followed to date in all previous accession negotiations, this overall survey will then serve as a basis for *substantive* negotiations by sector. You will therefore understand that it is not yet possible to forecast the date by which the accession negotiations can be concluded.

**Lord Douro.** — Would the President-in-Office of the Council agree that a certain momentum has been lost in the rate at which Spain is managing to negotiate its entry to the EEC and that the political importance of Spain joining the Community as soon as possible far overrides the many economic difficulties which exist, and will he give us an assurance that these negotiations will be conducted with all possible speed?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) The Member States meeting in the Council and, in particular, the Presidency, with the help of the Commission, will do all that is necessary to ensure the best possible progress in questions of this kind of which we all appreciate the political importance.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) In view of what the President of the Council has just said, could he give us a rough idea of how long it is likely to take to arrive at the conclusion Lord Douro wishes to see?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) I think it should be possible to complete the overall examination of the problems during the Italian Presidency, after which — as I have said — we will move on to the more specific, sectoral phase.

**Lord Bethell.** — Will the President-in-Office bear in mind the fact that the 20,000 people of Gibraltar are the only Community citizens who are not represented in this Parliament and that they also have no representation in the Commission, and will he therefore consider that the Council has a special

responsibility to protect the rights of these 20,000 Community citizens, particularly in view of the fact that they are at present blockaded from Spain?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) This has no bearing on the specific problem of the negotiations with Spain.

**Mrs Ewing.** — Will the Council tell this forum what stance it has taken regarding Spain's fishing-fleet, the third largest in the world and its access to EEC waters in general and to the North Sea in particular?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) This is a typical sector which will be discussed in the course of the negotiations.

**Mr Habsburg.** — (D) I should merely like to ask whether the Commission is not also having to contend with difficulties from a certain political group which is currently trying to delay the negotiations with Spain, and what it plans to do about this?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) Unless I am mistaken, Mr President, the questioner referred to the Commission. I am here to answer questions on matters concerning the Council. I can, however, tell you in a personal capacity that I do not think there is any question of difficulties of this kind.

**Mrs Poirier.** — (F) Commission document No 630 has shown the dangers which enlargement, particularly under present circumstances, could represent for the economies not only of the existing Member States, and especially France, but also of Spain. Has anything new come to light, or do you intend to conclude the negotiations however much unemployment this would entail and regardless of the risks to industry and agriculture, particularly in the South West of France?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) The very purpose of the procedure being followed in these negotiations, i.e. an overall study followed by a specific, sector-by-sector study, is to avoid risks of this kind, i.e. insufficient attention being devoted to the problem of the new and existing Member States. I should like to point out to the honourable Member, however, that if the Community has not had faith in its own future, not only would we not be considering enlargement but we would possibly not have set up the Community in the first place.

**President.** — Question No 52, by Mr Battersby (H-353/79):

Following the visit of Chairman Hua Kuo-Feng to four Member States, what steps is the Italian Presidency taking in order to intensify the Community's relations with China?

\* See Annex.

**Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (I) As the Council has already pointed out on several occasions to the European Parliament, it attaches very special importance to relations with China.

These relations are developing in the context of the trade Agreement concluded with that country. The first meeting of the Joint Committee was held in Peking in July 1979. At that meeting various measures were agreed by both sides in order to translate into practical terms the objectives set forth in the Agreement.

As regards trade in particular, the Community has included China in the generalized scheme of preferences as from 1 January 1980 (in accordance with special arrangements) and has also taken a number of measures to make the existing import measures more flexible. China, for its part, has explained the arrangements under which it would give practical favourable consideration to Community exports covered by the Agreement.

It is now for the Commission, in consultation with the Chinese authorities, to ensure the follow-up to the first meeting and, if necessary, to propose to the Council the additional measures which it considers appropriate, in particular to the second meeting of the Joint Committee scheduled to be held in Brussels in autumn 1980.

**Mr Battersby.** — Can the President-in-Office assure this House that the Presidency during its term of office will make every effort to encourage the expansion of both Community industrial exports and Community technical assistance to China in order to modernize existing plants and improve industrial management in that country? China has considerable needs in this second area, and I consider that the Commission should bear this in mind in its future meetings with the Chinese.

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) The Presidency will endeavour to follow up, as far as possible, the suggestions made by the honourable Member.

**Mrs Kellett-Bowman.** — Is the Council aware of the difficulties which have been caused to certain Community chemical industries by the abolition of the 13.6 % duty on sodium benzoate and benzoic acid from China and will it look into this matter since certain companies are liable to go into bankruptcy because of this particular provision, which came into operation on 1 January?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) I take due note of the points made by the honourable Member and should like to

point out that special measures for the exemption of certain sensitive products have already been adopted. The treatment accorded to China can, therefore, be regarded as fairly advantageous, particularly in view of the fact that we are at the beginning of a process to which the Presidency will continue to devote considerable attention, while taking account of Community interest in this field.

**President.** — Question No 53, by Mr Turner (H-391/79):

What practical steps are open to the Council to ensure that France, which has failed to fulfil an obligation under the EEC Treaty in that it has not adhered to the Order of the European Court of Justice of 25 September 1979, on sheepmeat, will be required to take the necessary measures to comply with the Order pursuant to Article 171 of the EEC Treaty?

**Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (I) It is for the Commission and not the Council to ensure that there is compliance with the provisions of the Treaty, particularly Article 171 thereof.

**Mr Turner.** — Might I point out that on Monday Mr Gundelach said that the possibility exists for the Commission to exert political pressure if the Court's decision is not complied with? Does not the President-in-Office of the Council agree that the Council is the primary political authority of the EEC and that, as such, it should face up to its responsibilities and guide the Commission in what it should do under the powers which it agrees it has under Article 155?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) The Council is the guide in political matters. However, it is the Commission which is the watchdog of the Treaties.

**President.** — Question No 54, by Mr Colla (H-393/79):

Does the Council not think that if the increase in energy prices is not taken into account or only partially taken into account in countries with automatic indexation, the lower income categories will be particularly hard hit by the additional burden?

**Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (I) Wage-indexation mechanism must be considered not only in distribute terms but also from the point of view of their effects on general price levels.

In its decision of 17 December 1979 adopting the annual report on the economic situation in the Community and laying down the economic policy guidelines for 1980, the Council recognized as a 'priority and immediate requirement the prevention of a secondary increase in the rate of inflation' as a result of the increase in the price of oil.

**Zamberletti**

With that end in view, it adopted as a general guideline the principle that 'in countries with generalized and rapid-acting wage-indexation mechanisms it is necessary either to block part of future index-linked adjustments so as not to pass on recent energy price rises or, alternatively, to make equivalent reductions in claims for increases in real purchasing power.'

The Council is, however, aware of the problems involved in applying these guidelines.

**Mr Colla.** — (NL) Does the President of the Council realize that I am extremely disappointed with his answer as I could have read something similar in the press following the Council meeting of 17 December 1979. I should therefore like to repeat my question, which is very specific. Does or does not the Council think that it will be primarily the lower income categories which are affected by the proposed system in view of the fact that expenditure on energy accounts for a larger proportion of their incomes? I should also like to ask very briefly whether the Council is aware that in a country such as Belgium where the system which is clearly under attack is in force, inflation was very slight over the last year and that *de facto* wage restraint is in operation in that country. Does the Council not think that there may be other methods which have more effect on prices and, finally, could not the proposed measure be psychologically dangerous and be playing into the hands of the professional organizations which are currently using the Council's arguments in their negotiations with the employees?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) In view of the fact that the rise in oil prices will affect the consumer, the Council has made the prevention of a secondary increase in the rate of inflation one of its immediate and priority objectives. This means that until the middle of the 80s, adjustments will have to be made in the development and distribution of incomes, either by means of more moderate claims as regards real incomes — I should like to stress this point — or by temporarily modifying the way in which the indexing system as a whole operates. This method would clearly have to vary from one country to another. The Council has developed the basic strategy. However, in view of the major problems which this will entail, it leaves it to the individual Member States to decide on the best ways of achieving this objective.

**Mr Paisley.** — Is the President of the Council aware of the effect of increased energy costs in Northern Ireland, where people are paying three times as much for gas as the rest of the United Kingdom and almost twice as much for electricity, and has he any plans to cushion the effects on the lower income groups in Northern Ireland?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) I think this problem has been recognized and covered in the Council's guidelines.

**Mr Moreland.** — Does the President-in-Office not agree that unless the Council shows greater vigour in this field and develops a Community energy policy, the energy situation over the next few years is likely to be so serious that substantial rises in the prices of a number of energy sources within the Community will be inevitable?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) In drawing up its guidelines and its decision of December 1979, the Council took account of the very considerations underlying the supplementary question.

**President.** — Question No 55, by Mrs Ewing (H-404/79):

What initiatives does the Council propose to take to ensure that Community waters are protected against the possible dangers caused by substandard tankers and tankers flying flags of convenience?

**Mr Zamberletti.** *President-in-Office of the Council.* — (I) The Council shares the honourable Member's concern that greater protection be afforded to Community waters. In this context it has already adopted various measures including that on the pilotage of vessels in the North Sea and the Channel and that on the minimum requirements for certain tankers entering or leaving Community ports.

The Council intends to pursue this objective by giving careful examination to the dossiers before it, which include in particular two draft decisions, the first of which is designed to render mandatory the procedures for the inspection of ships and the second concerning the mutual recognition of approval of items of safety equipment for sea-going vessels.

Moreover, the Council has requested the Commission to prepare a draft directive on maintaining compliance with international conventions for vessels entering Community ports.

**Mrs Ewing.** — I thank the President-in-Office for that very encouraging answer. It looks as if we are indeed moving forward in this field. However, I would ask him to remember that we are still a long way from the code of conduct recommended by the committee chaired by Lord Bruce and that the facts are there: the fact that flags-of-convenience ships are responsible for four-fifths of disasters and collisions, some of them in this Community — Brittany, Ireland and the Shetlands have already had their fair share of disaster and are at risk every day — the fact that rogue tankers, despite what the President has said to the House, are still jeopardizing coasts, environment and fishing grounds every moment of the day because the Member States, including my own, are allowing companies to employ these tankers, and the fact that Greece is about to enter with a fleet which is in no

**Ewing**

way subject to its merchant shipping regulations. I therefore wonder whether the President could not say to the House now that in his six months of office this is one thing he could undertake to accomplish: the finalization of all the recommendations before him, the code of conduct for rogue tankers and flags-of-convenience tankers, the minimum standards — since with his goodwill all these things could be accomplished in his six months of office.

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) The Council is aware of the views just put forward by the honourable Member. In order to assure you of the speed and commitment with which the President intends to work on this matter, I should like to inform you that at the meeting of 17 December 1979 the Commission informed the Council that the studies to which I referred in my original answer had been concluded. The Commission will therefore submit as soon as possible considerable proposals on the basis of the results of this study. I think, therefore, that considerable progress has already been made in this matter.

**Mrs Le Roux.** — (F) Does the Council not think that the Member States should take steps to ensure that the relevant legislation is applied so that these ships can be immobilized and all the necessary checks carried out with a view to protecting the crews as well as Community waters and the adjacent coastlines?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) The Council will receive the Commission proposal in the course of the next few days and will be able to assess the situation on the basis of this proposal and the opinion of this Parliament.

**Mr Prag.** — I received a similarly legalistic reply when I raised the question of pollution of Community waters by tankers illegally discharging waste. When is the Council going to realize that what the public expects from the Community on common problems of this kind is action and not, promises of more voluminous legislation, which it is virtually impossible to enforce without a sufficient number of properly equipped aircraft?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) The Council is fully aware of the seriousness of this problem and of the relevance of the points made by the honourable Member. I take due note of the proposals made in this House and the Council will bear them in mind when considering the Commission report.

**Mr Harris.** — I support all that has been said and for once I am very happy to join with my colleague from across the English Channel, Mrs Le Roux, since Cornwall and Brittany have a common interest in this subject. Does not the President of the Council agree that this is just the sort of subject on which we in the

Community should be concentrating, because there are particular advantages to us in safeguarding our territorial waters? And could I also ask him to take particular note of the increased danger posed by Greece's very large tanker fleet?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) I am pleased to note the considerable extent of the agreement in this House on this major problem, and I think this will encourage the Council to reach a swift and effective decision.

**President.** — We now proceed to questions addressed to the Foreign Ministers of the nine Member States of the European Community meeting in political cooperation.

Question No 63, by Mr Paisley (H-379/79):

In view of the fact that the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic are both members of the EEC and in view of the fact that the Constitution of the Irish Republic claims jurisdiction over Northern Ireland and in view of the fact that a parallel claim is made by Spain over the Rock of Gibraltar, what steps are they prepared to take to require members of the Community to cease making claims over the territory of Member States?

**Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.** — (I) The problem of territorial disputes between Member States has not been discussed within political cooperation. Consequently, the Presidency is not in a position to reply to this question.

**Mr Paisley.** — In view of two facts, firstly, that Articles 2 and 3 of the Irish Republic's constitution claim jurisdiction over Northern Ireland, which is part of the United Kingdom, and Spain makes a similar claim over Gibraltar, which is British, and secondly, that the Foreign Ministers are on record as being committed unreservedly to the principle of self-determination and both these areas have democratically made known their will, does the President-in-Office not think that in the interests of harmony Member States or those states making application for membership should cease forthwith making claims over the national territory of other Member States?

(Laughter)

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) I am afraid I can only repeat what I have just said, namely that the Presidency is not able to add anything on the question of territorial claims between Member States, as this question has not been discussed within political cooperation.

**Mr Hume.** — In view of the fact that the Council of Foreign Ministers have not discussed this matter and are not likely to do so, would the President-in-Office agree that the proper course of action for the Honourable Member is to raise this issue directly with the Irish Government and to enter into discussions with

## Hume

them on this and all other matters of difference between North and South, with a view to creating circumstances in which all the people of Ireland, North and South, can live together in peace, harmony and agreement? Would the President-in-Office further agree that in view of the state of affairs obtaining in Ireland such discussions are long overdue?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) I am sorry, but the Presidency cannot comment on this matter.

**Mr Blaney.** — Might I address to the President-in-Office the request that, instead of talking about the claims of the Irish Republic to the territory of Ireland, the Council and indeed this House might address themselves to the question of the occupation of part of our country by the forces of another Member State?

(Laughter)

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) I must repeat yet again that the question of territorial disputes between Member States has not been discussed within political cooperation and that the President-in-Office regrets that he cannot comment on the matter.

**Mr J.D. Taylor.** — Are the Foreign Ministers aware that this offensive claim by the southern part of Ireland to jurisdiction over the people of Northern Ireland against their expressed democratic wishes at every election to remain within the United Kingdom is claimed by the IRA, the Irish Republican Army, to be their main moral and political support for their campaign of violence and murder against the Northern Irish people, and will he acquaint the Southern Irish Government that it is the will of this House, consistent with the terms of the treaties of accession, that no Member State should seek territorial expansion into the territory of another Member State of this Community? Are the Foreign Ministers aware that the people of Northern Ireland are proud, privileged and determined in their conviction to remain British?

(Applause from certain quarters of the European Democratic Group)

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) I regret that I must remind the honourable Members yet again that the Presidency cannot answer questions relating to matters which have never been discussed by the Nine within political cooperation. I must therefore, I am afraid, disappoint a questioner for the umpteenth time, but this is the only answer which the Presidency can give.

**Miss De Valera.** — Is the President-in-Office aware that the root cause of the violence in the northern part of my country is the existence of partition, which was forced upon the Irish people under the threat of

an immediate and terrible war in the 1920s by the then British Government, as a result of which the Irish constitution recognizes the just claim of the Irish people to be reunited? Is the President-in-Office aware that if a referendum on the reunification of Ireland was held in the whole of the island of Ireland the vast majority of the Irish people would vote in favour of the reunification of Ireland?

(Protests from certain quarters of the European Democratic Group)

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) As President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers, I reaffirm the statements I have already made on this question. As regards the statements made by the honourable Members, it is clearly up to each questioner to form his own opinion of the statements made by him.

**President.** — Question No 64, by Mr Colla (H-394/79):

What steps do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation intend to take to study in depth the idea of granting development aid to Palestinians in Israeli-occupied territory as a means of breaking the deadlock in the Middle East?

**Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.** — (I) The situation of the Palestinians in Israeli-occupied territory cannot possibly be a matter of indifference to the international community, and hence the Member States of the European Community, by virtue of its implications for the solving of the Middle East problem, particularly because of the substantial contribution which an improvement of infrastructures and the economic and social conditions of the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza would make towards the establishment of peace in this region.

The question is currently being studied by the Nine within political cooperation. However, it seems that more thorough examination of all the various aspects will be necessary in order to establish whether in practice the necessary conditions exist for an initiative on the part of the Member States taking account of the political legal and administrative problems in connection with the conditions under which the Palestinians are living in the occupied territory.

**Mr Colla.** — (NL) Am I to conclude from the answer given by the President of the Council that the Foreign Ministers take the view that, faced with a conflict on this scale, the European Community must not only play a secondary role, but should finally take an initiative and thereby play the role which the European Community should rightly be playing?

May I also conclude from the answer that the Foreign Ministers indeed feel that the Palestinian problem is also a socio-economic problem and intend to work towards finding a political solution by means of

## Colla

improving the socio-economic situation of the Palestinians in the occupied territory? Thirdly, may I conclude from the answer that the proposal which has clearly already been discussed, will not end up by being shelved, but that the Foreign Ministers will continue to examine ways in which it could be put into practice?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — *(I)* The Nine are permanently committed to doing whatever they can to promote progress towards an overall solution in the Middle East. As regards the specific problem mentioned in the question tabled, I repeat that the Nine are currently examining all the various aspects with a view to establishing whether or not the necessary conditions exist for an initiative on the part of the Member States. I think, therefore, I have already replied to the honourable Member's question, both as regards the general political initiative and as regards the specific problems.

**Mr Marshall.** — Can the President-in-Office assure us that when the Foreign Ministers are discussing Middle Eastern matters they will be willing to consider taking action against the Arab boycott of some Community firms, which is against the principles of this Community, since Community-wide action is especially necessary as this is much more likely to be effective than action by a single nation?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — *(I)* I do not think this point is relevant to the question in hand.

As regards the situation in the Middle East, the Nine reaffirm that they are constantly striving to establish a just and lasting peace — overall peace — which takes account of all the guiding principles and statements which underly the political initiative of the Nine and result from our political cooperation.

**Mr Blumenfeld.** — *(D)* Would the President-in-Office of the Council be prepared to inform Parliament in due course of the economic situation of the Palestinians living in areas which have been occupied by Israel since 1967 to the present day, and whether development aid is called for? Secondly, can the President inform us whether the areas neighbouring on the Palestinian areas of the West Bank and Gaza would not also be suitable candidates for development aid? I am thinking, for example, of Saudia Arabia and Kuwait etc.

**Mr Zamberletti.** — *(I)* It will certainly be possible, as soon as the assessment of all the elements currently being studied by the Nine is completed, to have a complete picture within the context of political cooperation of all the elements mentioned regarding the economic situation on the West Bank and in Gaza. Clearly, however, it is not possible at present, while we are still at the stage of studying this situation, the

possibilities of intervention and the theories which are still being developed, to make any advance statements since these would be based on insufficiently substantiated information.

**Mrs Lizin.** — *(F)* Can we conclude from the positive reply given by the President-in-Office that the many statements made by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation to the effect that they are in favour of relaunhing the Euro-Arab dialogue will finally be put into practice — which is what we have been waiting for two months — particularly as regards introducing a political element into this dialogue so that it would no longer be restricted to the economic problem?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — *(I)* The Euro-Arab dialogue is not relevant to the question in hand. I cannot, therefore, comment on this matter here.

**Mr Patterson.** — In view of the statement contained in the report from the Court of Auditors for 1978 that funds which are already made available from the Community through the United Nations for Palestinian refugees are not subject at the moment to Community audit, can we have the assurance from the President-in-Office that some safeguard may be made that any new funds that may be discussed are expended for the purposes for which they are made available — namely, the relief of refugees and not other purposes such as the purchase of arms?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — *(I)* The proper utilization of the funds is indeed a point which should be covered by the Nine in its current study of the legal, political and administrative aspects which the search for a solution to this problem involves. Obviously, therefore, the administrative aspects of the entire question should also receive the Council's close attention.

**Mr Sieglerschmidt.** — *(D)* I had also intended to ask the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers whether or not the fact that the situation of the West Bank Arabs had substantially improved from the material point of view would be taken into account in his further study of this matter, but this question has already been answered in the reply to Mr Blumenfeld.

**Mr Zamberletti.** — *(I)* I should like to repeat that these matters will be examined within the context of political cooperation on the basis of the undertaking on the part of the Nine to carry out a careful study into the possibilities of Community action. Clearly, therefore, in this study we must, in addition to solving a whole series of political, legal and administrative problems, try to assess the real needs which the Nine must take into account if our action is to be really effective.

**Mr Enright.** — Is the President-in-Office aware that in fact a report will be brought before this House on Friday morning which will allay many of Mr Patterson's fears, and will he assure the House that the Foreign Ministers will take speedy action so that the money which has been owing over the past to the United Nations Works and Relief Agency can be speedily dealt with?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) As I have already pointed out, this administrative problem is currently the object of careful study by the Nine.

**President.** — Question No 65, by Mrs Ewing (H-447/79):

In view of the replies repeatedly given by the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation condemning the violation of human rights involved in the *apartheid* policies of the present South African Government, in reply to questions in the European Parliament, is it not hypocritical that legislation permits South African companies, practising *apartheid*, to establish and operate financial companies and other bases inside the Community, and will the Foreign Ministers bear particularly in mind, when coordinating their position on these matters, the case of Mrs Winnie Mandela, repeatedly imprisoned and now subject to severe harassment by the South African Government in flagrant violation of the European Human Rights Convention, which the Foreign Ministers are pledged to uphold?

**Mr Zamberletti, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers.** — (I) Since South Africa is not party to the European Human Rights Convention, the repeated violation of human rights in that country resulting from the *apartheid* policy cannot constitute a violation of this Convention. Nevertheless, the Nine have always emphatically condemned violations of this kind and have repeatedly approached the authorities in Pretoria on the question of political prisoners in the same situation as Mrs Mandela. As regards economic measures aimed at inducing the South African government to abolish its *apartheid* policy, the honourable Member is, I am sure, aware that a code of conduct has been adopted for Community companies operating in South Africa. The Nine are continuing their study of other means which might help us to achieve the common objective of exercising a greater influence on South Africa with a view to bringing about the abolition of the system currently in force. However, I do not think it would be appropriate to go into the details of this study as it is of a confidential nature.

**Mrs Ewing.** — Once again I must thank the President-in-Office for his answer, which seems to go a bit of the way that I would have him go. But is there not something very hypocritical indeed in the commercial

and industrial and banking sectors? After all, the planes which go to South Africa are full of businessmen plying their business; the banks are full of South African accounts in the City of London, and in South Africa the banks are full of moneys placed there by citizens of my Member State and other Member States. Could the President-in-Office perhaps go a little further along the road he has taken to see if we couldn't end this obvious hypocrisy, because it doesn't impress the citizens of Europe when they see these things on their television screens, it doesn't impress the youth of this Community, who are idealistic. Could he say what further steps he would take and remove the veil of confidentiality which he mentioned?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) The answer I have just given, in which I mentioned the decision to study proposals and measures other than the existing code of conduct, reflects, I think, a clear political resolve of the part of the Nine to come up with genuinely effective measures of applying pressure with a view to achieving the abolition of *apartheid*.

I can inform you in a personal capacity — in order to stress the attention which the Presidency is devoting to this problem — that I went to Brussels last week to address on behalf of the Presidency the International Convention of the ICFTU, which was on this occasion studying the problems of the implementation of the code of conduct for companies operating in South Africa. I must inform you that the main point which I tried to make when opening this Convention was the political importance which the Presidency attaches to solving this problem.

**Mr Jakobsen.** — (DK) Will the President of the Council assure us that in dealing with this extremely delicate question the Foreign Ministers will not allow themselves to be influenced by various forces in such a way as to force South Africa into an area which would not be in the interests of either the Nato countries or the countries of the European Community, not least in the light of the most recent developments in world politics? Will the minister assure us that they will stick strictly to the fields mentioned here today and in no way go any further?

**Mr Zamberletti.** — (I) I have already, I think, answered this supplementary question by mentioning the importance of achieving effective and viable results clearly aimed at bringing about the abolition of *apartheid*. For this reason, the Nine are currently examining the question carefully and thoroughly and my reticence on the results which might be expected as regards the new measures for applying pressure is due to the very need to attain the objectives which we have in view.

## IN THE CHAIR : MRS VEIL

*President*

**President.** — The second part of Question Time is closed.<sup>1</sup>

9. *Membership of committees*

**President.** — I have received from the Socialist Group a request that Mr Estier be appointed to replace Mrs Roudy as member of the Delegation to the Joint Parliamentary Committee of the EEC-Greece Association.

Since there are no objections, Mr Estier's appointment is ratified.

10. *Urgent procedure*

**President.** — I have received the following requests for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure :

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-778/79/rev.), tabled by Mr Blumenfeld, Mr Lecanuet, Mr Penders, Mr Michel, Mr Klepsch, Mr Ryan, Mr Bersani, Mr Pöttering Mr Diligent, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Simonnet, Mr von Hassel, Mrs Walz, Mr Antoniozzi, Mrs Moreau, Mr Beumer, Mr Henckens, Mr Aigner, Mr d'Ormesson, Mr Malangre, Mr Jonker, Mr Dalsass, Mr Estgen, Mr De Keersmaeker, Mr Herman, Mr Lucker, Mr Vandewiele, Mr Habsburg, Mr Seitlinger, Mr Pfenning, Mr Notenboom, Mr Fuchs, Mr Vergeer, Mrs Gaiotti De Biase, Mr Janssen Van Raay, Mrs Boot, Mr Helms, Mr Fruh, Mr Alber, Mrs Lenz, Mr Luster, Mr Majonica and Mr Schall on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), Mr Scott-Hopkins, Lady Elles, Mr Normanton, Mr Prag, Mr Seligman, Lord Bethell, Mr Fergusson, Lord Douro and Mr Møller on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Bangemann, Mr Haagerup, Mr Irmer, Mr Jürgens, Mr Maher, Mr Nord, Mr Nielsen, Mr Damseaux, Mrs Pruvot, Mr Rey, Mr Rossi, Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Combe, Mr Pintat, Mrs von Alemann, Mrs Scrivener, Mr Calvez, Mr Delatte and Mr Baudis on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Mr de la Malène on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, Mrs Bonino, Mrs Macciocchi and Mr Pannella, on the arrest of the scientist, Andrei Sakharov,

which replaces the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-753/79/rev. by Mr Alber and others on the same subject which had been placed on the agenda of the sitting of 15 February 1980 ;

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-779/79/rev.) tabled by Mr Blumenfeld, Mr Vergeer, Mr Ryan, Mrs Maij-Weggen, Mr Lucker, Mr Alber, Mr Penders, Mr Martens, Mr Habsburg, Mr Zecchino, Mr Aigner, Mr Janssen van Raay, Mr Notenboom, Mrs Walz, Mrs Lenz, Mrs Boot, Mr Majonica, Mr Jonker, Mr Pursten, Mr Wawrzik, Mr Bocklet, Mrs Rabbethge, Mr Lemmer, Mr Luster, Mr Pfenning, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Nordlohne, Mr Hoffmann, Mr von Hassel, Mr van der Gun, Mr Goppel, Mr Scott-

Hopkins, Lady Elles, Mr Prag, Lord Bethell, Lord Douro, Mr Normanton, Mr Møller, Mr Fergusson, Mr Seligman, Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Nord, Mr Haagerup, Mr Irmer, Mr Jürgens, Mr Maher, Mr B. Nielsen, Mrs Pruvot, Mr Rey, Mr Rossi, Mrs Scrivener, Mrs von Alemann, Mr Bangemann, Mr Damseaux, Mr Combe Mr Calvez, Mrs Chouraqui, Mr Remilly, Mrs Ewing, Mr Gillot and Mr Deleau, on the Moscow Olympic Games,

which replaces the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-716/79) by Lady Elles and others on the same subject which had been placed on the agenda of the sitting of 15 February 1980 ;

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-782/79), tabled by Mr Fanti, Mrs Baduel Glorioso, Mrs Barbarella, Mr Bonaccini, Mr Cardia, Mrs Caretoni Romagnoli, Mr Carosino, Mr Ceravolo, Mrs Cinciari Rodano, Mr D'Angelosante, Mr De Pasquale, Mr Ferrero, Mr Galluzzi, Mr Gouthier, Mr Ippolito, Mr Leonardi, Mr Pajetta, Mr Papapietro, Mr Segre, Mrs Squarcialupi and Mr Veronesi, on the measures taken against Andrei Sakharov ;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-784/79), tabled by Mrs Macciocchi, Mr Donnez, Mrs Bonino, Mr Arfe, Mr Bangemann, Mr Berkhouwer, Mrs Buchan, Mr Calvez, Mr Cariglia, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mrs Chouraqui, Mr Combe, Mr Coppieters, Mrs Cresson, Mr de la Malène, Mr Delatte, Mr Delorozoy, Mr Estier, Mr Ferri, Mr Galland, Mrs Gaiotti De Biase, Mr Irmer, Mr Lezzi, Mr Linde, Mr Martinet, Mr Pannella, Mr Pelikan, Mr Percheron, Mr Poniatoski, Mrs Pruvot, Miss Quin, Mr Ripa di Meana, Mrs Roudy, Mr Sable, Mr Schmid, Mr Schwartzberg, Mrs Scrivener, Mr Seal, Mrs Weber, Mr Wettig and Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, on the tragic situation and the threat of starvation in Cambodia.

The reasons supporting the requests for urgent debate are contained in the documents themselves.

Pursuant to the second subparagraph of Rule 14 (1) of the Rules of Procedure, the vote on these requests for urgent debate will be held at the beginning of the sitting tomorrow, Thursday, 14 February 1980.

12. *Council statement on the Italian presidency — British share in the Community budget*

**President.** — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on :

- statement by the President-in-Office of the Council on the programme of the Italian presidency ;
- oral question with debate (Doc. 1-617/79), tabled by Mr Galland, Mrs Pruvot and Mr Calvez on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, to the Council :

Subject: The European Parliament's contribution to finding a solution to the British share in the Community budget

- In view of the anxiety engendered in the nine Community countries by the present disagreement between the Government of the United Kingdom and the other eight Member States on the question of Britain's contribution to the Community budget ;

<sup>1</sup> See Annex

- noting that this situation threatens the smooth functioning of Community institutions in the future ;
- anxious to preserve European unity ;
- the authors would ask the Council to reply to the following question :

Does not the Council consider it necessary to initiate a general debate so that, avoiding polemics and all spirit of partisanship, the Parliament may thus assist the Council to find a lasting solution based on general agreement ?

Before I call the first speaker on the list, Mr Visentini — Mr Galland is not present — I should like to express on Parliament's behalf the indignation and horror of the House at a new act of terrorism. I am sure that I am speaking for everyone in the House when I say, once again, that we condemn violence of every kind, from whatever source. Our sympathy goes out to the victims.

I call Mr Visentini to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mr Visentini.** — (*I*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to acknowledge the breadth and the diligence of the exposition which the president of the Council of Ministers of the Community, Mr Ruffini, gave us during our previous part-session on 16 January.

Nevertheless, I cannot help pointing out that this detailed and analytical exposition of the numerous problems hindering the application of the Treaties was unaccompanied by a political synthesis, which is what was needed.

During this very part-session of 16 January, the President of the Council's declarations were preceded and then followed by a debate, which was intense and at times even strained, on the Russian invasion of Afghanistan and the problems which this event, and Russian imperialism, pose for the free development of the European economy — in connection with the risks that may arise for our energy supplies and for our very security.

As we listened to the statement by the President of the Council of Ministers we waited in vain for any unequivocal reference to these events, which were shortly afterwards followed by further internal political repression in Russia itself. And even if the President of the Council of Ministers was not in a position to give us a common line for the nine Member States, he ought at least to have reminded us of the dramatic nature of recent events and the need for a common Community line.

What is more, even in the field of purely economic matters there are problems which cannot be solved by any of the nine Member States on their own, without the help of the others. I am not just speaking of the problems which have already been mentioned relating to industrial restructuring in one or two sectors such as textiles, shipping and steel making. The need for a

common uniform approach also arises — and I might even say particularly arises — in the case of certain essential matters, such as scientific and technological research, for two development of one or two sectors which produce technologically advanced goods and services, such as computers, and for aid to the public and private sectors in support of exports — not to speak of the fundamental problem of energy sources.

New initiatives are needed, not just coordinated initiatives but common and integrated initiatives, even involving the creation of new Community bodies ; nor does this mean an infraction of the Treaties, but rather the effective, and not merely formal, application of the Treaties against a changing background, because otherwise none of the aims of the Treaties will be achieved.

Consideration of these problems and of the realities that arise from them should have given vigour and political sense to the statement by the President of the Council of Ministers, whereas in fact his speech nowhere got beyond the purely bureaucratic level, as if Europe was not faced, politically and economically, by exceptional situations, for which a mere economic union is not enough, which may rather, render it pointless and impractical and which, for the very purposes of this same economic union, require a uniform presence in the face of international political events and the creation of common bodies for economic defence, balance and development.

This is the spirit in which we wish the commitments of the Council, the Commission and our Parliament itself to be carried out. In conclusion, I should like to remind you of one or two fundamental assertions in the speech which the President of the Commission, Mr Roy Jenkins, made yesterday, a speech which we shall look at carefully tomorrow, examining it in detail and with regard to one or two interesting and significant proposals which he put forward.

For ten years we have been faced — as Mr Jenkins reminded us yesterday — with a crisis of the economic and social order on which post-war Europe was built. This economic order has created a greater and greater interdependence amongst the various countries and in such a situation the Community should be capable of facing the world with a common line, not only at the technical level but also at the highest political level.

It is here that we find the historical and political meaning of the numerous difficult and varied problems which arise in so many different areas today, as also the meaning of those that will arise in the immediate future : it is here that we find the historical necessity of the Community.

**President.** — I call Mr de la Malène to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

**Mr de la Malène.** — (F) Mr President-in-Office, last month you outlined an ambitious plan of action. This is what always happens. During the many long years that I have been privileged to sit in this Parliament, I have heard the Presidents-in-Office of the Council come and set out their plan of action for the six months to come. I listened to yours with fellow feeling and I hope you won't mind me saying, a little scepticism. It is doubtless by virtue of my experience that I can speak to you of scepticism.

You have become President of the Council at a time which in many respects, and definitely from the European point of view, can be termed a crisis period. Indubitably, international events have somewhat blurred, if not totally blotted out, both in our minds and on the international stage, the true nature of the European crisis. This does not alter the fact that for several weeks now, and perhaps for several months, we have been going through a crisis in Europe, and it is that crisis I would like to talk to you about in the few minutes allotted to me.

The crisis bears the name of 'common agricultural policy crisis', or of 'European budget crisis' or of 'crisis of our British friends contribution to Community expenditure'. These are three subjects, Mr President-in-Office to which you will have to apply yourself during these six months, and if at the end of the six months you come and tell us — and no one will be more pleased than I if you do — 'I have resolved the three European crises' then in that case, Mr President-in-Office you will have served Europe well, and I will be happy to grant you my warm thanks and congratulations.

As a result, I will stop to ponder only these three subjects: European agricultural policy, the European budget, the British contribution to it. These three subjects have been intermingled at will, with one being played off against the other. The budget against the common agricultural policy and the British contribution against the budget. And yet, although there are no doubt links between these three problems, they none the less differ greatly from one another and must be tackled separately.

In the case of the Common Agricultural Policy it is no doubt its irregularities and excesses which we must try to correct. As for the budget, its problem always has been, and still is, one of demands for more power, for change, and for a balance of power between the institutions. In the case of the British contribution, the problem is that our British friends find it difficult to accept the rules on 'buying European' and on European trade. In the six months we have before us, Mr President-in-Office, you must devise a new common agricultural policy, and a new budget, and you must solve the problem of the British contribution.

First let us consider agricultural policy. There are two ways of destroying it, and we have seen them both used alternately in the last few months. First there is

the head-on attack, which means stating that the basic principle of this Agricultural policy is harmful.

I even heard yesterday one of our British friends say that it was a cancer eating away a Europe, whereas I had thought up to now — and continue to think — that it was the major and fundamental achievement of our Community. That then is the head-on attack. Then there is the attack from within, more subtle and also no doubt more dangerous. In this case, the basic principle is heartily approved and it is stated that we must continue along the lines of the Common Agricultural Policy. Once the basic principle has been reaffirmed, they then keep this shell, having first emptied it of all it contained. They suggest — as happened with sheepmeat — that we should open our frontiers, and then leave the final decision to our national governments. Call it what you will, that is not the Common Agricultural Policy. It is a free trade area. It is whatever you want to call it, but it is not a common agricultural policy. So much for the attack from the flanks.

I am sure we can all agree that, as a result of the huge progress made on agriculture in Europe and of the exceptionally high productivity of our farmers, we are faced with a new and different problem, since our continent has reached a point of self-sufficiency in supplies in the various areas of agriculture.

So it is that we are faced with a new problem: that of surpluses in one area or another. However, these surpluses must be seen in perspective, because they are of no great size. The whole European budget represents only 0.8 % of the gross national product of the Community as a whole. And spending on agriculture, to which Mr Gundelach drew our attention, represents only 70 % of that 0.8 %. This shows just what a tiny proportion — or at least what a relatively small proportion — of Community revenue is allotted to the agricultural question, and this proportion is our farmers' income. What we must decide is whether we are prepared — we the Community — to devote the share I have just described to giving an income to our farmers.

Mr President-in-Office, that our plans for the common agricultural policy we wish to regain would rebuild are ambitious ones. There are several reasons why we see them as ambitious. First of all, we are ambitious for our farmers. We are ambitious, too, because we do not want a narrow view of economics to put our farmers out of work. Lastly, our plans are ambitious, because we believe that in tomorrow's world we absolutely must give the more than 250 million Europeans guaranteed food supplies. What have we in fact done, beyond mere words? Together we have achieved one, and only one, common policy, and that is the Common Agricultural Policy. It is the true Community spirit of this agricultural policy which led us to found a Community and not a free trade area. This is a vital point.

## de la Malène

So, we are ambitious for the Common Agricultural Policy because it is the pillar holding up that Community-spirited Europe we thought we were building. We are also ambitious for this policy because we believe that the agricultural sector can provide one of the major sources of Europe's wealth. We see everyday that Europe has not many such sources of wealth. Of course, it has in people, in know-how and in intelligence, but its wealth in terms of raw materials and commodities can only come from agriculture, and we would not like any narrow view of the Common Agricultural Policy to lead to a reduction in one of the few basic sources of wealth which the countries of Europe have at their disposal. Thus it is, Mr President-in-Office, that in the six months to come you must rebuild a Common Agricultural Policy on ambitious lines.

You must also, Mr President-in-Office, provide us with a budget of sound conception; I have already had occasion to draw this House's attention to this question. Some people have spoken of a budgetary imbalance. They say 'imbalance' because 70 % of expenditure goes on agriculture. Why? Because this is the only area in which we have a common policy. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that there be some 'imbalance'. But there is no imbalance! The imbalance is in our policies, because we only have the Common Agricultural Policy. If we had managed to establish other common policies — in aerospace or any other field — then our budget would perhaps show a better balance.

Besides, there is a misapprehension in this House about the true meaning of the budget. Our budget is not like a national budget; we use it to finance our policies, and this is not the same thing. We should remember what the conception behind our budget was, when it was being drawn up at Community level. The problem was to establish policies. We established a Common Agricultural Policy which we must build on and improve. To finance this policy, we drew up a budget. Our budget did not come 'before' the Common Agricultural Policy, but 'after' it. Our budget was devised to finance the Common Agricultural Policy. So let us not put the budget before the Common Agricultural Policy, it comes after it. It is this latter view of the budget, Mr President-in-Office, which you must establish as the correct one.

Lastly — but I see that my time is unfortunately almost up — I would like to touch on the problem of the British contribution. I have already had occasion to mention it. It is a problem which has no connection whatsoever with the previous two — the Common Agricultural Policy and the budget. The latter are Community achievements. Together we made them and together we will keep them. Our British friends' problem — that in spite of agreements they have signed, they are not happy with the outcome — has been tacked on to them later.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Madam President, I have at my disposal only 6 minutes out of the 10 allowed, and I would ask you to let me know when I have used them up.

Mr President-in-Office, nothing in your speech of last month encourages us to have high hopes of the Italian Presidency. You are President of the Council, an institution which over the years has been responsible for the European institutional crisis. And it bears the mean share of the responsibility — more than the Commission or Parliament. It is responsible for the budgetary crisis and for a serious and bitter confrontation with Parliament which may go on for months, for what you said on the subject may mean anything or nothing. Nothing leads us to think that you, the members of the Council, intend to go back on the positions you have adopted on regional policy, development policy and agricultural policy, which are the main cause of the crisis and also, if I may say so, of the low moral standing of the Europe which you represent — the same Europe which, in this Parliament, approved by a majority last November the proposal to give at least 0.7 % of GNP to the vast concentration camp to which you have reduced the Third and Fourth Worlds, in which 30 or 40 million people a year are starving to death. Moreover, you have proposed to reduce further the funds by which you seek to some extent to salve your consciences, if not to save lives in today's world.

You are therefore entirely responsible, and we regard you as opponents. We had asked that 0.7 % of the GNP of the Nine be devoted to this end, and in Italy, Mr President of the Council, you responded in a revealing way: you allocated 0.12 % — little more than 0.1 % — showing how much respect the Christian Democrat Party which you also represent has for the decisions of this Parliament. Instead of 0.7 %, 0.1 % is the extent of your human, Christian and European credibility.

On this occasion we began our debate with the well-chosen words of the President, who deplored yet another tragic and barbaric event in Italy. But let it be very clear that the barbarism of these infamous and despicable terrorists, Mr President of the Council, has developed and grown because of the lack of moral, political and civil reliability which you typify. The collapse of the institutions, the collapse of an Italy based on law, and partly of a Europe based on law, was brought about and is still being brought about mainly by you and the likes of you. Death is rampant both outside and within our frontiers, Mr President of the Council.

In conclusion, I would like to give an example of the abilities of the Council of Ministers. Now, as a result of the tense situation resulting from the advanced age

**Pannella**

of a Head of State outside the Community, you have finally realized that 'baby beef' was not sufficient reason for the lack of an agreement with Yugoslavia. You have at last realized! Medical bulletins were required to make you realize this. Indeed it is these medical bulletins which make everyone afraid.

Well, you are now proposing to negotiate with a country which is a buffer state between us, the Europe of the Nine, and the potential (in your view) enemies of peace, justice, freedom and our independence — agreements creating infrastructures which you — and it is not by chance that it is precisely you, the Italian Presidency of the Council — have not even analyzed. You are setting up these infrastructures in the buffer state, although you are not setting them up on the Eastern frontier of the Europe of the Nine. You are leaving Trieste, Bari, the North-South Adriatic line, which are within the Community, uncovered, while investing everything in infrastructures in a buffer state which could, however, turn out to be the focus of a frontier clash between the Nine and those who do not belong to the Nine.

This is an example of your lack of foresight and of your makeshift and slipshod way of proceeding which is also very frequently shown by the indifference with which you treat Parliament and its direct requests.

Madam President, I wish to ask you if I have used up the 6 minutes available to me. Very well then, since the caricature of a debate which this Parliament imposes — with allowances of 3, 4 or 5 minutes to those who are supposed to make serious analyses in order to propose serious policies, if possible, as an alternative to those put before us — now requires me to end my speech, I will do so by saying that I increasingly believe that it is outside the institutions that Europe can develop — even the Europe of law, of peace, of freedom and of order — that order which you in the Italian Government have dismantled over the past 30 years.

**President.** — I call Mr De Goede.

**Mr De Goede.** — *(NL)* Madam President, in the six minutes available to me by arrangement with the other non-aligned Members, I would like to say that the Italian presidency is in an unfortunate position and that it is facing great problems. Mr de la Malène has already mentioned some of these, the most important being the budget for 1980. Its rejection appears to have prompted the former President-in-Office of the Council to say that Parliament is rapidly losing its sense of responsibility. I hope that the new President will not be making any such extraordinary assertions. Indeed, I hope that the Council, Commission and Parliament will exchange constructive ideas so as to produce a new budget without delay, in which the perfectly reasonable wishes of this House — Europe's Parliament, which quite rightly does not want to see

its position undermined — are met. The Community after all deserves a budget which meets the needs made manifest in the European election campaign. We need a Community approach to such problems as unemployment, inflation, energy, agricultural surpluses, monetary imbalances, environmental pollution, etc. I look forward with great interest to the Commission's statement on the budget next Thursday. Perhaps the Council can already give some practical suggestions for a solution.

With regard to the problem of Britain's contribution, the situation has improved little since Dublin. Is it true that the European Council meeting has been postponed to March? It is perhaps as well not to be too hasty, but a solution must be found. I also hope that our British friends will want to clean their 'European spectacles', for without clear vision, that is if they are too shortsighted about their own interests and those of the Community, the increasing flow of European economic exchanges cannot be enjoyed without conflicts which are harmful to everyone. But the question which we are now entitled to put to the Council and the Commission is what new facts have been taken into account in? How does the budget relate to convergence? How will the Commission's new draft reflect the wish expressed by Parliament for the Community to devote more attention to the problem I have just mentioned? To what extent is this reflected in the Gundelach proposals and the new agricultural prices? It is a great challenge for the Italian presidency to provide the Community institutions and also the main political centres in the Member States with a fresh impetus to seek satisfactory solutions.

The third problem is the agricultural policy, which is no longer regarded by anyone as sound. If in the coming year the Council does not pay sufficient attention to the reasonable requests, proposals and suggestions put forward both by the Commission and Parliament, a serious crisis in the Community seems practically unavoidable. This would mean that other problems would continue to be neglected, and I have only to mention the word 'unemployment' to show that this must not happen: we would come to a complete standstill as regards financing. It would also be absurd for the Russian soldiers in Afghanistan to help us clear our butter surplus. We can put our taxes to better use.

The fourth problem is that of energy, which was discussed here this morning. Although till recently we devoted all our attention to the question of how we could secure adequate energy supplies, now an almost completely new question has confronted us with greater problems: how can we avoid a serious economic decline as a result of the recent oil price increase? This is already costing the Netherlands alone an extra 7000 million guilders. Drastic cuts in government spending, increasing budgetary deficits,

**De Goede**

threats to social benefits, the deterioration of company profits and the closure of business are aspects of a gloomy situation which the Community must try to resolve in the context of EPC, as well as the Afghanistan question and our relations with the OPEC countries. We can add to this the question of Iran, the Palestinian problem and relations with China. I would appreciate a reply from the Council on the question of how we can achieve greater coordination in foreign policy.

The North-South dialogue also needs to be considered. The President-in-Office referred to this matter last month at the United Nations General Assembly. The 'new round of global negotiations' is now starting. It is of great importance how we, as a Community, tackle the five problems of energy, raw materials, trade, development cooperation and monetary issues.

The sixth problem — the enlargement of the Community to include Greece, Spain and Portugal — is a further challenge for the Italian presidency. But we should also continue in our efforts to consolidate the Community. Parliament should therefore discuss the Spierenburg report and the report of the Three Wise Men, and the Council should also take positive decisions on these reports.

Madam President, I shall conclude with the following question: how can Parliament ensure that it has a greater say in affairs? I would appreciate a reply from the Council. What part can Parliament play in the appointment of the new European Commission, which must emerge by the end of the year? I would like to warn against a repetition of the clashes which have occurred between the Council, Parliament and the Commission. We should behave more sensibly, and the Commission, Council and Parliament should cooperate in discussing this matter reasonably and should be receptive to each other's views concerning the formation of the new European Commission during the course of this year.

**President.** — I call Mr Galland to speak.

**Mr Galland.** — (*F*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to apologise for being late. As a result of an inadmissible oversight on my part, I thought I only had to speak at 5 p.m. whereas I should have spoken at 4.30 p.m.

Mr President of the Council, what a surprise to see three French people — Mrs Pruvot, Mr Calvez and myself, and what is more, three members of the government majority in their own country — ask a question on behalf of the Liberal Group about the European Parliament's role in finding a solution to the British contribution to the Community budget.

This, ladies and gentlemen, immediately caused a spate of questions such as 'What is behind it all?', 'Is it wise to discuss such a problem?'. In January, people were saying 'Isn't it too early?'. In February, I hear them saying 'Isn't it too late?'.  
 Must I remind you all that our question is addressed to the Council and that we have an effective contribution to make, which, as long as the next European Council meeting has not taken place, is still relevant? The truth of the matter is simple. Three French people said to each other: there is a crisis in the Community created by the problem of Britain's contribution to the Community budget. This is a well known fact, which was brought sharply into focus by the last meeting of the European Council in Dublin. What we asked ourselves was: is the European Parliament to be the only European institution which does not discuss this problem, out of some strange desire for caution, which we are really not used to seeing in this House? Of course, such an explosive issue has much in it to discourage any attempt at a solution. But, since we know that this problem has had, has at the moment and will undoubtedly have in the future repercussions on the budget, it seemed to us that this was a major issue which our Parliament was quite competent to debate, since we are one of the undisputed budgetary authorities.

So, starting from the simple fact of a crisis in an area which the Parliament is competent to deal with, it was essential to address this question to the Council, whatever the risks and criticism we laid ourselves open to, and in spite of the very real danger of this debate degenerating into chaos. For I am well aware that some of our colleagues could take advantage of this situation and use it as a handy platform for their ideas. This debate can be effective, if only, as was our intention when we put this question, our British colleagues can take a responsible approach, initiate a real dialogue and avoid electioneering.

After this much needed introduction, I would like to restate the basic principles of the debate as we see them. Firstly, we would like to remind you all that every country in the Community, including the United Kingdom, has gained positive economic benefits from joining the EEC. In a study made by Mr Christopher Johnson, the Lloyds Bank expert, it is estimated that an average of 0.3 % surplus growth has been achieved by Britain as a result of joining the Common Market and increased exports to a larger market free of customs duty.

Next, I am absolutely determined to make clear that, since for us the Community is not restricted to a simple free trade area, the 'fair return' concept is quite out of the question. Britain knew what the Community's rules were when it joined. These have not changed and cannot now be challenged. Along the same lines, I would add that clearly no solution can be found which infringes the basic principles of Community revenue and own resources — a system which must be scrupulously adhered to. Be that as it may, estimated figures for Britain's budget deficit in 1980 are 1.5 thousand million EUA; the British call this an intolerable situation.

## Galland

It seems to us that there are three measures which could be taken and which might gradually lead to our British partners becoming less dissatisfied with their role in the Community. The first measure is up to them. I must repeat that when one belongs to a Community, before expressing disappointment in it or criticizing it, one must have complied with all its rules. One of our fundamental rules is Community-preference. Eight countries do approximately 70 % of their trade within the EEC. Britain's supply rate within the Community is something approaching 40 %; this is much lower than that of its partners. We should note that definite progress is being made in this field since a few years ago the rate was 26 %, but much remains to be done. If Britain made up this difference, it would save almost 500 million EUA in customs duties, that is to say a third of its estimated budget deficit for 1980.

Let us not be simplistic. This is a major problem which Britain has tried hard to solve. It must try harder to bring its Community supply rate closer into line with that of its eight partners. As a result, it will make real savings in its budget and will be a good example to Greece, Portugal and Spain, three countries which will also have to readapt in the same way.

The second measure will result — I might even say is already resulting — from the forming of new common policies — on energy, transport and space — policies which are so patently necessary that they will automatically be financed and be profitable for Britain. This was made apparent this very morning, during the energy debate, when for the first time it seemed possible that provision might be made in the budget for a real common policy on energy matters. The third measure might result from temporary solidarity in the face of the present economic situation. In some circumstances, solidarity can be thought of as a sound Community attitude, although this must not be all one way. It must be displayed by everyone and for all Community problems, whenever one of the Nine is in real difficulty over a particular question. Our British colleagues will have to show their sense of solidarity themselves when the time comes. Seen from this angle, any financial support Britain may receive from the Community can only be temporary and incomplete.

As a result, I have reservations about the form of the new proposals the Commission has chosen to make. In this respect I have three questions to ask. Firstly: would not putting an *ad hoc* entry (what I would call the British entry) into the Community budget simply amount to using a technical device to mask official acceptance of a certain form of the 'fair return' concept? How can it be constructive to devise such a solution, when as I have just said, some of us find its formulation open to criticism, and when the Commission can give no figures for the size of the financial sacrifice it wishes us to make nor the length of time

for which we will have to make it? My third and last question is: have any definite measures been put forward which are in keeping with the spirit of the Community? In these circumstances it should come as a surprise to no one that we are reticent. Perhaps by adopting a different approach to the budget, we could arrive at detailed proposals which we could all accept. Can the British not put forward some definite proposals of real worth to the Community in general and which fall within the scope of the Regional Fund or of the Economic Development Fund for example? I will be told that money is not readily available. I feel that, when one remembers that on the night of 12 to 13 December 1979 the Council agreed to bolster the budget by an increase of 200 million EUA over its previous proposals, this shows a very pessimistic attitude to the possible outcome of the forthcoming budget negotiations. Can we not bring pressure to bear on the Council in these forthcoming budget negotiations so that priority may be given to the re-examination of some projects which have already been rejected but which are of interest to Britain and to the Community at large? I will give just one example to illustrate my point. Parliament Amendment 34 to the budget set aside, under Chapter 100, 50 million EUA for certain projects, one of which was the channel tunnel. This amendment was rejected by the Council. Should the Council not look at it afresh and is not the Channel tunnel a prime example of a project which is of real worth not just to Britain but also to the Community?

Mr President of the Council, I hope that in the debate before us the suggestions made by our Parliament will help you to find a solution to the difficult problem of the British contribution, which you have inherited right at the beginning of your term of office. Saint Exupéry once said 'If you want to unite men, teach them to build together'. The statement I have just made puts me at odds with the views of my British colleagues on many points, but it has also initiated a dialogue enabling us to build together. French and British, Liberals and Conservatives have agreed, in spite of our differences, to meet regularly within this Parliament in order to air our differing views, explain them and seek solutions to them together. Gaston Bachelard once said 'Nothing is automatic, nothing exists by itself, everything must be built'. Let us hope that this debate will reflect that view, and that our responsible and moderate approach will contribute to the greater good of the Community and our Parliament.

**President.** — I call Mr Cariglia.

**Mr Cariglia** — (I) Madam President, Mr President of the Council, this debate is taking place long after the Council statement, and I hope that this situation will not occur again, since in some ways it influences the debate itself and therefore its outcome.

## Cariglia

Mr President of the Council, I would say that in the light of the events of the last few weeks it is quite clear that the Community will have to face simultaneously an economic crisis, which had in any case been widely foreseen, and an international political crisis of which we have had due warning, and which is so dangerous that our ability to make a timely and united response is directly affected.

This is a testing time, from which Europe may emerge with its Community ideals strengthened, or may on the contrary, be weakened if nationalistic attitudes prevail. We therefore appreciate your commitment to overcome what you described as a lack of confidence and trust in relations between the institutions, and as far as we are concerned the Council can count on our fullest cooperation.

Moreover, the report of the Three Wise Men should be analyzed in depth by the individual institutions in order to find in it a functional basis for improving interinstitutional relations.

The Socialist Group regards cooperation between Council, Commission and Parliament as an essential precondition for the progress of Community policy. Only in that way will it be possible to adapt our development models to the changed conditions of the world economy, the main characteristic of which is the rising cost of raw materials and especially of oil.

In connection with the budget, Mr President-in-Office, we would ask for the procedure for adopting a new budget be completed as soon as possible without waiting for the 'package' involving agricultural prices, savings in agricultural expenditure, the British financial imbalance and convergence to be implemented. These problems exist. They concern a dispute which is important for the future of Community policy — a dispute which we wish to see ended as soon as possible, and which must not delay or hinder the approval of the 1980 budget.

The problem of the British budgetary imbalance must be seen in the perspective of increasing Community expenditure in the less prosperous countries by means of structural and investment policies designed to reduce the disparities between Member States. The main problem is therefore that of finding new resources for the Community.

Mr President of the Council you spoke in favour of the restructuring of Community policies to tilt the balance towards structural and investment policies but in my view you gave no indication of how to restructure Community expenditure by increasing the Community's own resources.

The energy problem is the one which the Italian presidency must make the greatest effort to solve, with the full support of Parliament. Mr Jenkins reminded us that the present international situation provides another, and perhaps the last opportunity to tackle the

energy problem on three fronts — energy saving, exploitation of internal resources and development of new sources of energy. This is a field in which it will not be possible to grant privileges to any of the Member States, and it is a problem which cannot be left to the initiative of the multinationals.

The strategic role of energy therefore makes it necessary for the Member States to take direct responsibility and define a policy which, without further delay, will implement the financial measures necessary to obtain savings in the industrial sector, the service sector, agriculture and domestic consumption to ensure the reduction of pollution and the transformation of coal, and finally to achieve greater safety in nuclear power stations and find alternative sources of energy.

We are aware of the energy shortage and of the resulting temptation to take the short cut of nuclear energy. But the bolder and more far-sighted the countries of the Community are, the better we will be able to reassure our citizens that development does not expose us inevitably to radioactive contamination.

Mr President of the Council, in your speech you ruled out the possibility that regional policy could consist merely of using the resources of the Regional Fund, even if its dual function of redistribution and stimulating initiative remains undisputed. We agree with this view. May we add that all common policies should in future be implemented in the regional dimension, replacing emigration of workers with immigration of capital in the southern areas of Europe, where there is an abundance of both land and manpower, essential factors for regional development.

The indispensable counterpart of regional policy is transport policy, especially that part of it concerned with financial contributions for infrastructures of interest to the Community as a whole. In this field the Community has not progressed, and transport between the industrial areas of central Europe and the southern areas is in some ways still similar to the conditions for crossing the Alps in the time of Hannibal.

It has been rightly said that the enlargement of the Community to include Spain, Greece and Portugal is a challenge which the Community accepts to avoid contradicting itself, but the challenge has certain immediate consequences. If one considers that Spain derives 90 % of its imports from outside the Community, and that only 60 % of its exports go to the Community — the products being, moreover, already in surplus within the Community itself — one realizes how necessary it is to bring Community policies rapidly up to date. This problem has already been raised by other speakers in this debate.

Finally, a word about consultation. Our hope is that no international problem, whether political or economic, in which Community interests are involved, may find Europe divided and weakened. In

## Cariglia

view of our strategic position, our disunity would be a positive destabilizing factor, and would ultimately increase the danger of war. We would also hope to see Europe play an active part and take the initiative so that, abandoning any neutralist temptation it may make to a contribution to human progress in keeping with its experience and traditions. Détente, about which so much has been said and so much is still being said today, and which is being increasingly exploited, is for us Europeans a basic fact of life, and we therefore all feel committed to preserving it. Nevertheless, we are aware that our strength lies above all in our security and in our free institutions, which we intend to defend against attacks from any quarter.

**President.** — I call Mr Bersani.

**Mr Bersani.** — (*I*) Madam President, I should like first and foremost to thank you for what you said to commemorate the tragic death of Vittorio Bachelet who was a Catholic — I say this for the benefit of Mr Pannella — a blameless figure, like Aldo Moro, Santi Mattarella and many other Christian Democrats who have given their lives for liberty — for Pannella's liberty, too — and to maintain a policy of inflexible resistance to terrorism very different from the approach of Mr Pannella, who has tried to use this as a pretext for making spurious causal connections between the spread of the most ferocious violence and the operation — albeit debatable, like any other human activity — of the democratic institutions in Italy and Europe.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the Right and Centre)*

Mr President of the Council, at the beginning of a new presidency and a new year, at a very tense moment in international life we listened to your statement with the greatest interest. We acknowledge that your statement made a positive contribution, with its clear and strong affirmation of political will, to a dialogue which we hope will develop between our institutions. Since then, over the past month, new developments have taken place.

The situation in Afghanistan has taken a very serious turn, posing alarming problems which appear to threaten world peace. At the same time the dialogue between our institutions, after the crisis caused by the budget, has not progressed as we would have wished. The impasse of the budget remains with us as a serious problem, to which I would especially like to call the attention of the President of the Council and that of Parliament. Among the aspects of your statement which we appreciated, there are some which in my view deserve to be stressed. First and foremost among these is your acknowledgment, partly with a new emphasis, of the priority to be given to strengthening cooperation between the Council and Parlia-

ment. You stated that this was one of the 'primary objectives' for of the Italian Presidency. You also 'tasks that this must take place on the basis of explicit acknowledgment of — and I quote — the 'tasks of guidance and control conferred on Parliament by the Treaty of Rome.' I must admit that the Council has never before expressed such a clear and precise acknowledgment in this Parliament. You then added — consistently — that, with a view to drawing up the new budget more quickly you intended to give priority to this cooperation on the basis of the political guidelines provided by the European Parliament. I shall return to this subject later, but I would like to stress the significance that this statement of yours, at the beginning of your speech, has for all of us.

Secondly, you strongly underlined the need to speed up the development of European Union, that is the transition from economic Europe to political Europe, with all the constitutional and legal implications. You referred explicitly to action with a view to establishing the most suitable institutional framework to that end. We give you credit for this. This is a new approach to a problem which is central to European integration. I would say that progress in this direction is all the more necessary to the extent that the international situation appears more serious, and the need more urgent for the European Community to play an active, dynamic and creative role in tackling the unsolved problems of the world.

In the economic, structural and common policy parts of your speech you presented quite a convincing picture of the more short-term aims which the Council proposes to attain during your presidency.

I would like to stress here — as various speakers have already done — the need to tackle, with the necessary decisiveness, the question of convergence, which should be seen not in narrow terms but in all its implications. The latter require an urgent change in the balance of structural and investment policies. A balanced overall view is required, which we, the Group of the European People's Party, have forcefully demanded during the debate on convergence. We return to the subject today at a time when some piecemeal approaches seem to be gaining ground. I have no hesitation in stating that such approaches would be an unacceptable deviation from the right course.

You went on to stress, rightly, the priority to be given to cooperation between the Community and the other areas of Europe and the world, particularly the weaker areas, and among those the areas suffering so tragically from underdevelopment and hunger. This cooperation would therefore be seen not only as an inescapable duty in the face of tragic human problems, but as an original and essential way of playing an active part, in the context of security and practical opposition to the serious military and economic threats, in the great struggle for justice, freedom, human rights and peace.

**Bersani**

If all this is true, it follows that, from this presidency onwards, the political strength of the Community's internal and international activity must be increasingly evident.

But, that said, I would like to devote the few minutes that I have left above all to the budgetary question. This question threatens to lead our Community up a blind alley, with very serious consequences. The predictions which are going the rounds, and which seem to indicate an attitude of almost fatalistic resignation, are not shared by the Group of the European People's Party. There is an urgent need to bring the whole question once more under control. Indeed, there is a chance of approving the new budget within a short time. This would be possible without ignoring the other questions which have meanwhile appeared to be linked with the budget — the fixing of new agricultural prices, the problem of certain changes in agricultural policy, and the adjustment of the British contribution.

In order to do this without making the approval of the new budget conditional on formal solutions to the other questions, we must envisage two phases — a first phase, in which the discussion of the budget accompanies that of agricultural prices, and a second phase, after Parliament has expressed its opinion on agricultural prices if possible in the March part-session, of using suitable technical procedures to separate the matter of the budget itself.

This question, if it is not tackled decisively, threatens to lead to a gradual deterioration of relations between the institutions. Parliament, for basic practical reasons, is in a dialectical relationship with the other institutions and especially with the Council. The Council, for its part, accuses the Commission of wasting time in drawing up the various proposals. The Commission, in a subdued way, accuses the Council of being the cause of everything that has gone wrong. Meanwhile the international situation urgently required harmonious cooperation among the institutions and considerable initiative.

The way this situation is dragging on also leads, as the experience of these first few weeks tells us, to the paralysis of some sectors of activity in each institution. The Council of Ministers and the Commission are preparing to call for the doubling of the provisional twelfths in a situation which is complex and difficult for all. It has therefore become urgent to define clearly the aims which we wish to achieve and the timetable for achieving them. The Group of the European People's Party thinks it possible to formulate our opinion on the subject at the extra ordinary March part-session which will concentrate entirely on agricultural prices. To this end our Committee on Agriculture must at once change the timetable for its own programme. Moreover, it seems possible to begin consultation simultaneously, first informally and, after

the opinion on agricultural prices, formally. To achieve this the Bureau of Parliament must express a firm will and take suitable steps.

According to this timetable it would be possible to approve the budget by the end of April. There would then remain the supplementary budget linked to the guidelines which have gradually emerged on the three questions I mentioned earlier. The alternative, mooted in whispers in the corridors, is to approve the budget in the autumn or even at the end of the year with the dangerous consequences I have mentioned.

Madam President, Mr President of the Council, the problem urgently and directly involves our two institutions, jointly responsible for the whole subject of the budget. Both must arrive as soon as possible at a strategy, and not allow the weeks and months to slip by. Each successive day becomes more crucial. So for Parliament, it is desirable that the timetable for and ways of taking action be better defined in the appropriate committees.

Much will depend on the firmness of the political will which we show in dealing with this delicate matter and in working together with the Council. As of now, Mr President of the Council, we are ready to draw on that parallel will to cooperate which you affirmed several times in your speech.

The budget must be seen as a basic political issue for the internal life and international action of the Community. The institutions must therefore show a sense of responsibility and a readiness to overcome the inherent difficulties. It is on that note that I would like to conclude, expressing on behalf of my Group a determined will to seek, as far as possible, to achieve in time those positive solutions which we regard as necessary for the Community and its peoples in the current world situation.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Taylor.

**Mr J. M. Taylor.** — Madam President, I would like to deal as graciously as I can with the remarks of Mr de la Malène, who was kind enough in his reference to British friends to refer to a perhaps slightly unfortunate remark made by a colleague of mine concerning the CAP. And I would like to reciprocate his cordiality by assuring French friends and all friends in this Parliament that it was perhaps a rather over-coloured phrase that was used in a heated moment and I would not associate myself with it.

I should also like to acknowledge the courtesy of Mr Galland, the author of the question. He was good enough to come to the group to which I belong last night. His gesture was much appreciated. We had a frank discussion, and I should like to express our appreciation of the great sincerity and the constructive way in which he has expressed his remarks this afternoon.

**J. M. Taylor**

He did raise a couple of issues to which I might briefly refer, the first being Community preference. I think it is fair to say that the United Kingdom's contribution to Community trade is rising fast and it has been doing so over some years. But in parallel with that, the Treaty of Rome does underline the importance of trade with the wider world too. I understand his misgivings about a separate budget line for certain purposes, but am a little sceptical about the size of the Regional Fund and the Social Fund as instruments for certain purposes at this stage. And if a separate budget line were required, then I would say that this Parliament would probably look with greater favour on an instrument that was within the budget than outside it!

I liked his remarks about the Channel tunnel. I think he would find good rapport in this group, a lot of interest in this group in that project.

May I say, by way of concluding my remarks about previous speakers, that I listened with great interest to the remarks of Mr Cariglia and Mr Bersani, who commented, helpfully, I thought on capital investment. I am myself very concerned with a proper capital accounting within the Community and the potential of borrowing and lending as an instrument of assistance to industry.

I make my group's response in this debate as one who believes deeply in the European Community and is at the same time proud of my own country and its history of defending Europe, although, perhaps, I am not so proud of some of the economic difficulties into which we have declined in recent years. It is as a European that I take strength from the fact that the Lange paper on convergence was approved by this Parliament late last year, recognizing, as it did, the possibility of a member country paying a unreasonable share of the contribution to the common good. It could be any country. The Commission too, which is neutral with regard to nationality or politics, has explicitly analysed the UK budgetary imbalance with a view to finding solutions, and given the principles of the Treaty and the broad desire that exists for convergence and harmonization, I should have thought that a situation in which one country suffered an annual deficit of one-and-a-half thousand million units of account as the price of its membership cried out for a degree of convergence and harmony. I accept, by the way, that there are great benefits to be derived from Community membership. Of course that is so. But those benefits are enjoyed by all the members, whereas the UK tax-payers really do stand out as paying a vast sum of money for the privilege. In saying that, I am not implying that other partners have inflicted that deficit of one-and-a-half thousand million units of account on the United Kingdom; but it exists, and in many ways it is a consequence of the fact that the Community is structured in a manner

which is most helpful to a country with a strong industry and weak agriculture. The UK, to its own misfortune, has an opposite profile. In the longer term, I am sure we would agree that convergence on greater efficiency all round is an important challenge for Europe.

But Madam President — and I make this remark to all colleagues, especially the author — in the short term, for people like myself who return week after week to England to plead for the vital importance of defending the standards and values of Western Europe and the Community, some urgent solutions are necessary in aid of our case. How widely is it appreciated, I wonder, in this Parliament that if the United Kingdom could simply graduate to three-quarters of the average level of receipts from the Community — three-quarters of the average level, not the average — the UK's imbalance would disappear by that fact alone? Now, if increased receipts of that order could be even partly spent, for example, on transport infrastructure and communications, it would not only improve British capability in European trade — and British trade in the Community has increased dramatically in recent years — but it would of course — and this is the other side of the coin — improve access to the British markets for other Community members too. And that would be '*communautaire*' and a fair return for our partners in this Community, to which, Madam President, we are proud to belong. British history and European history are inextricably bound up together, not least in the Entente cordiale, and we would wish it to remain so.

**President.** — I call Mr Segre.

**Mr Segre.** — (I) Madam President, Mr President of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, the unusual circumstances in which this debate is being held, for reasons beyond our control, undoubtedly make it impossible for this second part of the debate to be confined to linking up with the first part which took place a month ago, even though many or all of the problems mentioned in Mr Ruffini's statement, often in terms with which we agree, remain unsolved. But a month has passed and no ordinary month. It is therefore on this past month that we must reflect, and on the real political issue which it brought into prominence, and which I would like to sum up here in the words used by Mr Ruffini a month ago, when he said: 'The problem confronting us today is essentially of a political nature; it can be narrowed down to our capacity to find an adequate Community response to the challenges now confronting our individual countries and the Community as a whole.'

Have we increased this capacity in the past month? Have we made progress in the field of political cooperation and towards the goal, admittedly distant but essential for us, of a common foreign policy?

## Segre

An assessment of the past 30 days must unfortunately, in our view, be negative. Progress has not been made, and indeed it seems to us that the political will to achieve it has been lacking. No suitable Community initiative has been taken, and this has created a void, which has been filled by other initiatives which, whether their promoters intended it or not, have appeared to be substitutes, such as at the Paris Summit meeting between President Giscard and Chancellor Schmidt. We Italian Communists judge the conclusions of that Summit in an essentially positive way, leaving aside the different interpretations which were subsequently made of those conclusions. But our judgment of them itself leads us to stress critically that the impact which that Summit had, leading among other things to the revival — as was seen at the meeting of the Foreign Ministers in Brussels — of the old argument about whether the desire existed to create a sort of Directory, was mainly due to the fact that no initiative had meanwhile been taken to get the leaders of the Nine around a table and try to arrive at a common European position. Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, you will recall that this was the proposal put forward by our Group. We were well aware that it was a difficult proposal, in view of the variety of nuances and positions in the foreign policy of the Nine. But it was in any case essential, in our view, to try this European approach if we wanted, in a month so thick with serious events, to prevent, the voice of Europe falling silent or appearing, as in fact appeared weak and halting. But why was it silent? It would be only natural to reply that the voice of Europe was not raised because that voice did not exist, but that would be too simplistic a reply and we reject it.

The problem is a different one, and I now return to my subject of a short time ago. Why has no effort been made to create this common voice in the extraordinary circumstances which now exist? Mr President of the Council, we would like to know the reasons for this caution which threatened or threatens to become inertia. In our view, the reasons are many and do not enable us to be optimistic about the real state of political cooperation and the ability of Europe to develop its own policy at a time of international crisis. But one reason seems to predominate over all others — the fact that in all these years no adequate philosophy or concept has been developed of the relationship which must exist between solidarity with the United States and formulation of a European policy.

In this connection I would stress at once that the European policy for which we are calling has nothing to do with any kind of equidistance, neutrality or third force idea. It involves something very different — the capacity and will, and, even more, the right and duty of the Member States of the Community, to take up, in the context of constructive solidarity with the

United States and full respect for existing alliances, their own independent position, which would be a responsible one and therefore not *a priori* passive or uncritical. A real and deep friendship can never be uncritical or silent, but must be made up of frank dialogue, comparison of policies and discussion combined with respect for each other's dignity and interests. In other words, it is in our view a question of making a qualitative leap in mutual relations, convinced as we are that this is essential in order both to build a joint Western European will and to raise friendly and cooperative relations with the United States of America to a higher and more mature level.

But, Mr President of the Council, this is essential and urgent also for another political reason of interest to Europe — the effort which, albeit in different ways, various Eastern European countries are, in our view, making to keep open dialogue, maintain and revive *détente*, and prevent Europe from going back twenty years to the time of direct and manichean confrontation. One could also mention the efforts made by non-aligned and neutral countries, among which I would like first and foremost to mention Yugoslavia, and welcome here the politically very important announcement of the forthcoming conclusion of the agreement between the Community and Yugoslavia.

This effort which is developing should be followed with interest, and will acquire greater importance to the extent that West and East in our continent while of course respecting their alliances, will be able to show a common European awareness and converging aims of encouraging the great process begun at Helsinki and realizing the possibilities it has opened up, also with a view to the Madrid Conference. But we must realize that this effort can progress in the East only if those countries find a worthwhile attentive and intelligence partner in the nine countries of the Community — in other words, if the Nine, by refusing all ideas of confrontation, are able to express a common position and jointly to take steps designed to draw together the threads of dialogue and exercise a restraining influence on the two superpowers.

Such action is essential. It is even more so now than a month ago, given the disturbing level of mistrust and incommunicability which relations between the two superpowers have reached, and given the fact, confirmed by the present international crisis, that Soviet-American relations determine to such a large extent the whole international situation.

Madam President, the responsibilities and possibilities of our Europe are therefore great. It must affirm, in the context of inter-European and international relations, the conviction that there is no rational alternative to *détente*, that a new cold war can still be prevented, that progress can and must be made, also in order to stop new quantitative and qualitative leaps

**Segre**

in the arms race and to bring about instead a gradual, balanced and controlled reduction of armaments. If we look at the past month we will see that the awareness of these needs and possibilities has developed in parallel with the apparent deterioration in the international situation and in the state of Soviet-American relations. So many examples could be cited, but I shall confine myself to recalling, after the Paris meeting, the conclusions of the Socialist International in Vienna and the determination with which the Olympic Committees have not only defended — and continue to defend — their independence, but also reaffirmed the will to prevent the universal spirit of sport from being undermined. In our view, therefore, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, there are great possibilities which the Nine must seize by means of an initiative with the political and conceptual scope appropriate to great and decisive moments of history. Community Europe which is able to show consistency and determination in taking this road of restraint and wisdom will also be able to tackle more effectively and with greater conviction, the many serious problems facing it in European integration — for it will be stronger because it is more united and more aware of its own potentialities responsibilities and role.

**President.** — I call Mr Cecovini.

**Mr Cecovini.** — *(I)* Mr President, it is an honour and a privilege for me, as citizen and mayor of a city — Trieste — which has always felt itself to be part of Italy and Europe, to speak in the debate on the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council. While offering my most sincere wishes for success during the six months of the Italian presidency, I also want to say one or two things about Europe and Italy, as well as about my border area and my city.

The first thing we have to emphasize without any shadow of a doubt is that this affair of the rejected budget should encourage all of us to have greater respect for one another. In connection with this, I was delighted to hear the President of the Council promise that there would be a constant and useful dialogue between the Council and Parliament, because this is the only way in which Parliament can carry out the advisory and monitoring role laid down in the Treaty of Rome. If European policy is to be constructive, there must be adequate resources, and this means that everyone must be ready and willing to make greater sacrifices. However, there is not going to be any constructive form of regional policy, capable of reversing the steady trend towards greater and greater disparities among regional economies, unless at least the non-quota sections are freed from national control.

There is no doubt that if Europe wants to achieve its aims, it must also come up with its own ideas. I want

to give once again as an example the project to incorporate the northern Adriatic area into the process of European integration by making use of the ports of Trieste and Monfalcone. Quite apart from reviving the border area of Friuli-Venezia Giulia, the project offers a solution to two problems which are essentially Community problems and highly topical. The first concerns the Community's routes of communication with Greece, the eastern Mediterranean and countries beyond Suez, and the second offers a considerable energy saving, because it would take five days less to sail to the Suez Canal than on the usual route from Hamburg. The Commission's verdict on this project was 'interesting' with regard to the possibility of a specific Community initiative which deserved consideration. It is now up to the Italian Government to incorporate it in its regional programme, along with the Mezzogiorno, in the normal way. This would benefit the most sensitive border area in Italy and the city of Trieste as well. It would be a particular boon to my city which — while I am standing here as a European MP and mayor of the city and addressing the President of the Council — is threatened by a further serious blow to its shipyards and its seaport and to the few jobs which remain. Even as I speak, there is a general strike in Trieste in protest at this.

A European plan for shipbuilding must take account of what this city has already suffered. The six months of the Italian presidency provide an opportunity for the Council and the Italian Government to get to grips with the problem. The principle that advantages offered to third countries should not harm the Member States is a correct one, but if the reasonable facilities which are to be offered under the new treaty with our next-door neighbour Yugoslavia were to make Trieste a depressed area — and this time there would be no chance of revival — it would mean that the Community's regional policy had failed.

**President.** — I call Mr Bonde.

**Mr Bonde.** — *(DK)* Madam President, at the beginning of the 1980s the Community is faced with the prospects of a crisis much more far-reaching than the institutional crisis to which a temporary solution was found in the form of the Luxembourg Compromise of 1965-66. The free market for agricultural products which we have been promised has come to nothing as a result of monetary compensatory amounts, extensive national aid, and increasing differences in interest rates with the result that Danish farmers for example, must pay three times as much interest as their German counterparts. The annual adjustments of agricultural prices do not give farmers steady increases in their incomes. In Denmark, agricultural incomes are in fact falling, and there are no prospects of a real solution at Community level. Indeed, the Common Agricultural Policy is now under attack from three sides.

**Bonde**

Firstly, the Community budget has run up against the problem of the 1 % VAT ceiling. New revenue can only be introduced by an unanimous decision, so this means still more national aids. Secondly, enlargement of the Community with the accession firstly of Greece and then of Portugal and Spain will cost us so much that it will in itself require an increase in the Community budget, which is something no-one appears prepared to accept. The latest warnings from COPAS make useful reading in this respect. Thirdly, people in Britain now appear to have read Peter Shore's speech on the budgetary consequences which he made in the Commons debate in 1972 on the unreasonable discrepancy between income and expenditure, and this had led to a frontal attack on, in particular, the agricultural budget. I find it hard to understand how Danish farmers will be able to get out of this mess in one piece if they do not now recognize the fact that the Community is not what it was or what they thought it would become.

In this situation, the People's Movement is not crowing triumphantly 'we told you so'. We are fully prepared to discuss genuine solutions for the farmers who have now been put into a tight spot. The peoples' Movement is not offering any patent remedies for a political programme, but we would like to provide a forum for a public debate on how we are to get out of the situation in which we now find ourselves, in which the Community has not even lived up to the expectations of its own adherents.

The speech by the Italian Presidency was full of fine words, but where are the resources necessary for an enlargement of the Community? Where is the money for agriculture? Where are the jobs for the unemployed? What glimpses are there of real solutions to the crisis?

The Community is powerless in the face of the problems which have hit the economies of our countries. The Community's most important ally has slowed down in earnest. Unemployment in the United States is now very much on the increase and since the Community cannot export its way out of the crisis, unemployment will increase here too. Denmark will be the hardest hit as it is the weakest part of the Community. We may well have an official unemployment rate of 10 % sooner than most people think. This is the economic outlook if nothing is done. We will go home and urge the people of Denmark to do something.

**President.** — I call Sir Fred Catherwood.

**Sir Fred Catherwood.** — Madam President, the British members of the European Democratic Group welcome this motion asking for general debate on the British contribution to the Community budget because we genuinely think — and indeed from what we have heard just now it is quite clear — that our

colleagues in this Parliament do not realize the problem we face. It is not a problem of 1 500 million of units of account. The problem is that we desperately need help because our industry, on which we have always depended as a country, is bleeding to death. Instead of being given help, we are actually being asked to donate to the bloodbank, and told not to make a fuss about it.

Now during the twelve most prosperous years for the Community — between our first application for membership in 1961 and our final entry in 1973, when we were kept out — the Community rate of growth was 50 % faster than ours, the investment in manufacturing industry was 50 % greater, and when we entered in 1973 the output per worker was 50 % higher. Without the resources to catch up with the Community's investment, our industry simply has not got the manufacturing capacity or the modern equipment to compete on equal terms with the rest of the Community inside the Community. Our visible trade deficit with the rest of the Community is now £ 3 000m per year, and is rising at the rate of £ 500m per year at zero growth rate. This means that British industry in the Community is steadily closing factory after factory. Nothing offsets the deficit we have with the Community. Without the benefit of oil our overall deficit would be £ 10 000m. That is the real measure of our industrial weakness, and it is getting worse.

Our political opponents say — and Peter Shore has been mentioned just now — that because of our weakness we cannot afford to be members of the Community and we should pull out of the Community and put up the shutters. What are those of us who are true European and wish to remain members of the European Community to say to our fellow-citizens who face unemployment as factories close one after the other in the face of European imports? What can we say, except that we have friends in Europe and that the Community spirit is a helping spirit? How can we convince them of that when we meet fierce opposition to requests for help with our budget contributions of amounts that really should not be an issue among friends? If the cost of the CAP is, as Mr de la Malène said earlier, a fraction of a fraction of our total expenditure, then the UK budget contribution is actually a fraction of that; yet we have opposition. The working man in Britain needs hope as he sees factories closing in one industry after another. If we cannot give him some reason for hope, then he will take irrational action. There is no point in blaming him, we simply have to give him some future for which to work. It is foolish to remove all hope from a great nation. We have got too much recent history in Europe of great and democratic nations provoked to taking damaging and irrational actions, pressed to pay money that they do not have until their economies are wrecked and their democratic governments discredited and overthrown.

## Catherwood

We want to go home and tell our citizens that Europe today is not like that, that there is a Community spirit where the rich help the poor, and where nations which have fallen behind can be given a helping hand. What we desperately need now is a line in the budget for a fund to help investment in British manufacturing industry — perhaps using the same kind of mechanism of interest-rate subsidy and guarantee as we do for export credits. That would offset Britain's very high budget contribution and enable us to say to the British people that we have real friends in the Community who are taking practical steps to create new jobs and give new hope to our country.

**President.** — I call Mr Maher.

**Mr Maher.** — Madam President, is not the real problem in our Community that we have not made sufficient progress along the lines of integration? The real problem is that we are still to a large extent operating national policies. We have only one common policy — which is under heavy attack today because it is sticking out like a sore thumb. Of course we need to make progress in the energy field, but not at the expense of the policies we already have: that is not going to solve anything. Indeed I have a lot of sympathy with our British friends; I understand their problem. But I would like to remind them that there are two countries further down the line who are even poorer than they are and I think we want to be careful in any action that is taken by the British that these countries are not made even weaker still.

Madam President, I agree with the British that in thirty years' time, when the history of this Community comes to be written, we are going to be judged, not on whether we had a good or a bad common agricultural policy but on the degree to which we had the political will-power to redistribute or transfer the resources from the affluent parts of the Community to those parts of the Community that are under pressure.

I am not merely talking about rural regions. I am also talking about towns that are suffering and the populations in those towns. Let us for God's sake have the will-power to come together on that, but not at the expense of the policies that unite the Community today.

**President.** — I call Mr Paisley.

**Mr Paisley.** — Madam President, when the British people discovered that the estimated total cost this year of remaining in the Common Market was £ 2 200 million, no wonder they were outraged. I would refer the House to the recently published report by the Institute of Fiscal Studies in London.

What can be done? The British Prime Minister has stated that she is prepared to accept increased spending by the EEC in Northern Ireland as part of

the plan to put right the budgetary imbalance. As one of the most deprived areas in the Community, Northern Ireland is surely entitled under the laws of the Community to such help. Northern Ireland is a relatively small region of the United Kingdom. The population is about one-and-a-half million and has remained basically static, having fallen only slightly since 1974. The unemployment rate averages about twice that for the Community as a whole: current unemployment rates are 11.1% for Northern Ireland and only 5.6% for the Community. Within Northern Ireland, there are substantial variations in the unemployment rate — 9% in Belfast and 24% — and I call the attention of my Danish colleague to these figures: in Strabane he is worrying about 10% while part of Northern Ireland has 24%. The income per head in Northern Ireland is only 59% of the Community average. Since Mrs Thatcher has made this proposal, I trust that the Council of Ministers will take an early decision and implement it speedily.

**President.** — I call Mr Romualdi.

**Mr Romualdi.** — (*I*) Mr President, Mr Ruffini, ladies and gentlemen, in the two minutes which I have to speak on behalf of the non-attached Italian Members, I am not going to go into the problems mentioned in the report by the President of the Council — because I do not have the time — but I am simply going to wish him success. The President, and through him Italy, is taking over the presidency of this Community of ours at a very tense moment, when on the external front the Soviets and the Communist Party are tightening the noose around the West while within the Community we have the major problem of the new budget.

It was not irresponsible of us to reject the budget — as the Irish President claimed at the last part-session — but a wise political move and in many respects it was also a brave one. But let us not run away with the idea that we can do without a budget for any length of time. As Mr de la Malène said earlier, the budget is the basis of all our political acts. It will be no easy task, Mr Ruffini, to draw up the new budget, since the points made when the last one was rejected will have to be borne in mind. In other words, there has to be a greater emphasis on research, and we have to find the economic resources for a more extensive regional policy and in order to review the agricultural policy, which nonetheless must remain the cornerstone of the Community economy. I want to say something about political cooperation, too. It is said that political cooperation is not covered by the Treaties, but in my opinion it has become a vital factor in the move towards integration. Political cooperation is the only independent means we have, in the context of our alliances, of responding to the challenge of Russia and communism.

**Romualdi**

There is a lot more I could say to the President of the Council, but there is not time. I hope, as he said, that there will be more collaboration between Parliament and the Council and that there will be a closer working relationship, so that Parliament will be asked in good time to play an active role in the Council's decision-making. The President-in-Office of the Council should remember that we are not interested in what has already been done and signed, but in what is still to be done and signed.

**President.** — I call Mrs Groes.

**Mrs Groes.** — *(DK)* Madam President, the statement by the Italian Presidency regarding the programme for the next six months was not exactly bursting with specific ideas as regards energy, so I should like to put forward a Danish idea.

As you know, we in Denmark have currently introduced a moratorium on the atomic energy programme. As I see it, the European Community should take advantage of this fact to try out models for the planning of Community energy economics in our country. The Community should encourage experts, such as sociologists, town, traffic and housing planners and engineers to carry out jointly integrated projects at local and national level involving the most efficient and appropriate use of imported and indigenous energy sources including wind, biomass, straw, waste wood and geothermal energy.

The Community should back Denmark as an alternative energy research area. In particular, the Community should look into the possibilities of using wind energy in Denmark. There are currently no projects involving wind energy being carried out under the auspices of the Community, but we have enough wind and would like to develop our experiment with large windmills in Nibe and the testing centre for small windmills in Ris, which is unique in the world, outside the United States.

Madam President, I hope these ideas will be taken seriously both here in Parliament and in the Community institutions.

**President.** — I call Mr Ruffini.

**Mr Ruffini,** *President-in-Office of the Council.* — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I do not have enough time at my disposal to reply as fully as I would have wished to all the speakers who took part in this afternoon's debate and that of 16 January.

I would like to begin with a clarification in response to what Mr Scott-Hopkins said in his speech of 16 January — that my statement contained 'an awful lot of words'. Today Mr de la Malène, on the contrary, stated that the programme of the Italian Presidency

was too ambitious. I think I confined myself to indicating practical lines of policy. I do not know whether, and to what extent, the programme I described to you can be implemented, but I do know that the Presidency will devote all its energy to the implementation of this programme.

I would like to stress particularly the need for Community life increasingly to involve European citizens and the social forces in our countries.

After the election of the European Parliament by direct universal suffrage, a further step forward could be taken by giving special rights, particularly that for local elections.

I also took note of what Mr Klepsch said about the possibility of a European passport. As you know, the question is being studied in the context of the more general matter of special rights for European citizens. It has not so far been possible to achieve movement on this matter, which we have already been studying for some years. We intend to revive the idea in the hope of at last reaching agreement.

Another important factor for progress would be an improvement in the functioning of the tripartite conferences, which could conclude with the formulation of common commitments by the Council, Commission and social partners. This would be essential for achieving a more dynamic employment policy and more harmonious economic and social progress.

Some speakers, especially Mr Klepsch and Mr de Goede, dealt very fully with the problem of convergence. In this context the United Kingdom's request for a reduction in its contribution to the Community budget was given prominence. I think this approach was the right one. Community policies must indeed contribute, both in budgetary and in economic terms, to reducing divergences among the various economies. It is therefore not merely a question of the British problem, which is the most obvious one, but also of the problems of the less prosperous areas of the Community in general.

I am not in a position to tell you today, on behalf of the Council, in what way this problem of convergence and of the British budgetary imbalance can be solved. I can, however, tell you that the Council is now aware of the seriousness of this problem, and above all willing to find suitable solutions at the next European Council, to be held in Brussels on 31 March.

As far as the Italian Presidency is concerned, we shall make every effort to ensure that these solutions are not at the expense of what we have built up so far, but that they will tend to speed up the progress of our Community by developing common policies, in accordance with the hope expressed by Mr Carglia, Mr Bersani and Mr Taylor.

**Ruffini**

In this context I would also like to reply to the oral question put by Mr Galland, Mr Pruvot and Mr Calvez who, rightly concerned at the problem of the British budgetary imbalance, asked whether a debate in the European Parliament might not help the Council to arrive at a solution.

Referring also to what I said in the previous parliamentary part-session when I made the personal comment that any further contribution by the European Parliament could only assist the search for a solution to the problem raised by the questioners, I want to assure you today that the Council has taken note of the debate which took place on the subject at the November part-session, of the resolution adopted at that time and of the contribution made to that debate by the many speakers who tackled the subject of convergence and of the British budgetary imbalance.

Bearing in mind all the available facts, and on the basis of the proposals which the Commission submitted a few days ago, the Council will continue the search for appropriate solutions to be adopted at the next meeting of the European Council in Brussels on 31 March.

Various Members of Parliament have drawn our attention to the need to find solution quickly to the problem created by the rejection of the 1980 budget.

I would like first and foremost to point out to Mr Glinne that the Irish Presidency really did everything in its power to find a solution to the differences which had arisen between Parliament and the Council, and the failure to reach an agreement is certainly not the fault of that Presidency. I hope that, by means of an effort to consider the problem jointly and a careful political assessment of all the problem before us, it will be possible to arrive very soon at an agreement between our two institutions.

Mr Bersani, I can assure you that the Presidency, in meeting its responsibilities, will do everything possible in order to speed up the budgetary procedure.

I also wish to reaffirm that the Italian Presidency respects the Treaties and is well aware of the role of the European Parliament in connection with the budget.

All the chairmen of Groups who spoke after my policy statement dwelt on agricultural problems. There will be a debate on agricultural policy in March. I do not think it is necessary to release at this stage the well-known ideas put forward both by Parliament and by the Commission.

I am convinced that a more thorough debate on the subject will enable us to find solutions which safeguard the principles on which the Common Agricultural Policy is based, and which at the same time will correct some distortions which have arisen in its operation.

I thank Mr Cariglia for stressing the need for real progress in transport policy — one of the basic policies envisaged by the Treaty of Rome.

I confirm what I said in my policy statement on the willingness of the Presidency to hold an exhaustive debate on the memorandum submitted on the subject by the Commission, which referred to the measures necessary for an efficient transport policy, including the infrastructures mentioned by Mr Cecovini.

The Presidency intends to analyze the report of the Three Wise Men as diligently as possible to seek, as far as we can, to improve and streamline the workings of the Community institutions, and it is hoped that the commitment can be maintained to draw the appropriate conclusions at the European Council in March.

Moreover, at the invitation of the Presidency, an informal meeting of the Foreign Ministers was held in Varese on 8 February — as you know — in the course of which the report of the Three Wise Men was given a preliminary examination.

Any suggestions which the Parliament may wish to make on the problem will be kept in mind.

Harmony between the Community institutions is, for the Italian Presidency, the essential precondition for the success of European integration.

Then, with regard to the assessments which have been made by Members of Parliament, and especially by Mr Segre of the progress of and prospects for European political cooperation, I think that the nature of the problem requires our action to be realistic and practical.

Of course, if I were to give free expression to my European aspirations, I would without hesitation share the views which have been expressed by those who would like to see Europe speak with a single voice, both formally and in substance, at all times and on all problems. But there would be a common foreign policy for Europe and of course I hope there will be one as soon as possible — if we had European Union.

We have developed political cooperation among the Nine to a point where it is now in a position to realize, day by day, the aims which the nine governments have assigned to it.

The crisis arising from the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan has caused the nine governments to reflect on the need for them to make better use of this mechanism. They are therefore thinking of strengthening by arranging for its essential structures to come into operation automatically as soon as an international crisis develops so that consultations, cooperation and appropriate joint action can take place without delay.

With regard to Mr Visentini's point, I would like to remind him that, while it is true that I did not deal with the political aspect of the Afghanistan situation in my policy statement, this is because earlier at the beginning of the sitting, I made a statement on the

**Ruffini**

subject, in which I explained the decisions taken by the Council of Ministers on 15 January, and which was followed by a full debate at the end of which my policy statement was made.

Consultation among the Nine is continuing on the crisis caused by the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, on its various aspects and its effects, taking account of East-West relations and the progress of detente which we hope to see.

This consultation is based on the statement issued on 15 January by the Foreign Ministers, after the discussion of the Afghanistan crisis at the Council meeting and in the light of the discussions in the Security Council and General Assembly of the United Nations. In that statement — and I'm not indulging in polemics — which undoubtedly preceded the Paris meeting mentioned by Mr Serge, the Nine expressed their judgement on the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, describing it as a very serious violation of the independence of a non-aligned country belonging to the Islamic world, as well as a threat to peace, security and stability in the region.

Again, in the ministerial political cooperation meeting held in Brussels on 5 February, the nine Foreign Ministers had a full and constructive discussion of the problems facing Europe as a result of the Afghanistan crisis. Opinions were expressed which constitute a valid basis for a joint strategy taking account of the new situation which has developed, and important points of convergence emerged, which have already been sufficiently discussed. The Nine consider that the problem is essentially political because it involves the detente policy which according to European assessments and needs should be general and indivisible, although it is made more difficult and delicate by the present international crisis. There is a need of which the Nine need to take account and which they must find a way to meet with increasing effectiveness — for an adequate and continuing link with the political analyses made by the United States and the other Western countries. Linked with this need is the increasing attention which Europe must give to the developments which the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan has caused among so many non-aligned countries, especially in Asia and the Islamic world.

In Brussels, the Foreign Ministers agreed that the Nine's assessment of the situation created by the Afghanistan crisis must be updated and this will take place at the ministerial political cooperation meeting in Rome on 19 February.

In conclusion, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I am very pleased to have been able to take part in this full and interesting debate. The period covered by a presidency of the Council of Ministers is very short when seen against the complexity of the problems confronting us.

Among all these problems — all important, and the Presidency will give them constant attention — I think that two deserve special consideration in order to achieve a rapid and satisfactory solution. The first is that of obtaining approval for the 1980 budget, necessary to restore normality to Community life. The second is that of achieving economic convergence and correcting the British budgetary imbalance, necessary to establish a normal climate of harmony and solidarity among the Member States. These two problems, ladies and gentlemen, make up the priority task of this Presidency.

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

**Mr Pannella.** — (*F*) Madam President, somebody once said that hypocrisy is the homage which vice pays to virtue.

The Committee on External Economic Relations had requested an urgent debate on the agreement with Yugoslavia and we were told at the meeting of the group chairmen that it would take place as part of the debate on the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council. I am sure that this fact was confirmed yesterday, Madam President, at the meeting of the Committee on External Economic Relations and the Political Affairs Committee. But now I am informed that the debate will be held in connection with the report by Mr Jenkins.

Allow me to make one comment. All this seems rather odd, not only because of what I seem to recall but also from the constitutional point of view. The negotiating partner of any agreement with Yugoslavia is the Council and not the Commission, which merely plays a secondary role. It is the Council which has to explain its position and its ideas.

I really must insist on this point, Madam President. Contrary to what was said at the meeting of the group chairmen, we received confirmation yesterday at the meeting of the Political Affairs Committee and the Committee on External Economic Relations that this problem would be discussed along with the Council statement and not with the report by Mr Jenkins. This is a Council matter, not a Commission one.

**President.** — I do not have the minutes of the Bureau meeting in front of me and so I cannot give you chapter and verse on this point. However, the second item on the agenda for Thursday, 14 February — which was adopted at the plenary sitting on Monday — is 'Joint debate on the presentation of the Thirteenth General Report and work programme of the Commission and on the motion for a resolution by Mr Radoux and others on Yugoslavia'. This agenda appeared in the minutes which were also adopted by Parliament.

**President**

I take note of your statement and shall check on the decision taken at the meeting of the Bureau, but the procedure followed here is nevertheless in line with the agenda which was adopted.

The debate is closed.

12. *Provisional twelfths* (debate and vote)

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on :

— report (Doc. 1-756/79), drawn up by Mr Dankert on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, in application of Article 204 of the EEC Treaty and Article 8 of the Financial Regulation authorizing further provisional twelfths for Section III — Commission — of the general budget of the European Communities ;

— report (Doc. 1-755/79), drawn up by Mr Robert Jackson on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, in application of Article 204 of the EEC Treaty and Article 8 of the Financial Regulation authorizing further provisional twelfths for Section II — Council — and Section II, Annex I — Economic and Social Committee — of the general budget of the European Communities.

I call Mr Dankert.

**Mr Dankert, rapporteur.** — (NL) Madam President, as this is to be a short debate, I should like briefly to draw your attention to the fact that the motion for a resolution before you has been approved by the Committee on Budgets with 28 votes in favour, while four members stated that they were not opposed to it and therefore abstained. This matter is too important, however, to be allowed to pass without a debate or without saying a few words about it. It concerns Parliament's first decision on the functioning of the institutions under the system of provisional twelfths, applied as a result of the fact that, as you all know, we have no budget at present. The Treaty and the Financial Regulation set out how the Community should operate under such circumstances ; the motion for a resolution therefore contains a clear reference to Article 204 of the Treaty and Article 8 of the Financial Regulation. An obvious problem in this situation is that every legal service in every institution has its own interpretation of the Treaty. It is essential that the budgetary authorities — i. e. the Council and Parliament — agree on the procedure to be followed. In other words, it is vital for the functioning of the system of provisional twelfths that the Council and Parliament should adopt the same approach. I am extremely gratified that this joint approach, perhaps with a minor deviation here and there on the part of the Council, appears to have been established. That is also why the Committee on Budgets has proposed, with few objections, to agree to the Council decisions concerning two specific requests for additional

twelfths. The first request raises no difficulties. It concerns the granting of extra twelfths for the Commission's rent and insurance where the Commission itself requested these. The second request concerning emergency aid for Afghanistan is rather more complex. I shall not dwell on the way in which the Commission felt this question ought to be tackled, but shall refer solely to the Council's approach. The Council has decided to grant 10.5 million EUA of emergency aid to Afghanistan. Parliament itself, in a debate held here some time ago, stressed the political necessity of such aid. There is therefore every reason to reach a speedy decision on this. Since the Commission has not yet submitted a new draft budget and we still have only the 1979 budget, the 10.5 million EUA can simply be granted on the basis of Chapter 95 of the 1979 budget under the regulation of provisional twelfths. The Council has granted only 10.5 million, but I note that Article 950 of the 1979 budget mentions a figure of 42 million EUA. Three provisional twelfths of 42 million come to exactly 10.5 million. I assume that that is how the Council arrived at this figure. I think it would be sensible for Parliament to agree to this. For the sake of clarity, it would be advisable to point out that the 42 million represents, in our view, three provisional twelfths.

**President.,** — I call Mr Jackson.

**Mr Jackson, rapporteur.** — Madam President, the Committee on Budgets adopted two reports on the application of Article 204 of the Treaty and Article 8 of the Financial Regulation, concerning requests for further provisional twelfths. We have just heard from our colleague Mr Dankert about the applications from the Commission. My report before you deals with requests coming from the Council and from the Economic and Social Committee.

A word first about the general line that has been adopted by the Budget Committee. Subject to a definitive view, which will be taken later, we believe that both from the political point of view of a legal interpretation of the texts, of the article and the regulation, the procedure for increasing appropriations available to the Institutions beyond one-twelfth of the 1979 budget should be limited to those cases where there are important contractual obligations or urgent humanitarian needs which make the procedure necessary.

Now the Council, as Mr Dankert has pointed out, appears to share this view and that is very good, because we want to work with the Council so far as it is possible. Where possible, during this period before the adoption of the 1980 budget, we want to proceed by co-decision — although, of course, in all the areas that I cover as rapporteur for the administrative budgets of the various Institutions, we are dealing with non-compulsory expenditure, on which Parliament has the last word.

**Jackson**

Now to deal with the different elements of the situation, the Council did not accept a request from the Court of Auditors for further provisional twelfths to cover mission expenses. The Court had made this request because its activities are undergoing a considerable expansion, their staff has increased and their work has increased as the Court has begun to operate fully, and this has given rise to a much larger number of missions per month than was the monthly rate in 1979. The Council's view was that this request from the Court of Auditors could not be met because it did not arise from inescapable contractual obligations but from the pattern of work which the Court of Auditors had adopted.

Now the Committee on Budgets broadly share this view of the Court's application, but it recognizes that the Court of Auditors does have special responsibilities and duties which are very dear to the heart of this Parliament, and feels that the important checks and controls that the Court of Auditors applies should not be seriously interrupted by the present budgetary situation. This is why we decided to submit, and hope that the House will endorse, a proposal that the Court of Auditors or the Committee on Budgets could come back to this issue in March, if necessary on the basis of fuller information from the Court as regards the number of missions which it is envisaging and the cost of the various missions.

The Economic and Social Committee introduced several requests, one of which was for extra twelfths for meetings of the committee. The Council took the view that, for the same reasons as it was not prepared to agree with the Court of Auditors in respect of mission expenses, it could not agree to this application from the Economic and Social Committee because it was possible for the committee to alter its plans and arrangements to fit in with the budgetary means available to it under the one-twelfth system. So, although the Economic and Social Committee has provided very full information on its exact financial requirements — and the information it has given is rather a model of the kind of information we would like to get from all the Institutions in our work as budgetary authority — the Committee on Budgets has nevertheless concurred with the Council's approach to the application from the Economic and Social Committee with request to meetings.

On the other hand, the Economic and Social Committee and the Council have both made requests for extra twelfths for rents and for insurance under Chapter 21. We in the Committee on Budgets felt that extra payments on these lines have indeed become necessary, because there are contractual obligations to third parties which are falling due in the early

part of this year. The rent bills and insurance payments are settled, not on a monthly but on a six-monthly basis; they are due at the end of January, and the Institutions have to be in a position to pay them. As Mr Dankert has pointed out, the Commission is in exactly the same situation. So the Committee on Budgets has proposed that the requests from the Council and the Economic and Social Committee concerning rents and insurance should be approved but that the applications from the Economic and Social Committee in respect of meetings should be refused. And we shall re-examine the problems confronting the Court of Auditors later if serious difficulties are seen to rise and can be demonstrated to arise for the Court in its control work.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

We shall now vote, using the electronic voting system.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Dankert report (Doc. 1-756/79): Further provisional twelfths for Section III.*

The resolution is adopted.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Robert Jackson report (Doc. 1-755/79): Further provisional twelfths for Section II.*

The resolution is adopted.

### 13. Agenda for next sitting

**President.** — The next sitting will take place tomorrow, Thursday, 14 February 1980, at 10 a. m., 3 p. m. and 9 p. m., with the following agenda :

- decision on urgency of seven motions for resolutions
- decision on the request for an early vote on six motions for resolutions
- continuation of the debate on drug abuse and EEC health policy
- von Wogau report on Community transit
- Commission statement on the 1980 budget
- joint debate on the Thirteenth General Report and work programme of the Commission and on the motion for a resolution by Mr Radoux and others on Yugoslavia
- Cronin report on the ERDF
- Squarcialupi report on transboundary air pollution
- Sherlock report on exposure to harmful substances at work
- Catherwood report on the Common Customs Tariff
- Filippi report on SMUs in Portugal
- joint debate on two oral questions to the Commission on the wine sector

3 p. m. : voting time

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 7 p. m.)*

## ANNEX

*Questions which could not be answered during Question Time, with written answers*

*Question No 49, by Mr Buchou (H-346/79)*

Subject: Statute for a European company

Why has the Council not yet considered and adopted the directive on the European Company, even though the necessary opinions of the Community Institutions have been in its possession since 1974? Is the connection between the European company and the Fifth Directive the reason? In other words, is the Council's failure to act attributable to a desire to adopt legislation embracing the provisions of both directives?

*Answer*

The Regulation on the statute of the European Company, which the Council has had under study since the autumn of 1975, comprises over 300 Articles encompassing the whole spectrum of company law. Especially careful examination is necessary, given the Regulation's direct applicability.

The aim of the proposal for a fifth Directive, on which the European Parliament has still to deliver its Opinion, is to co-ordinate national laws regarding the structure of companies. The proposal is, in fact, broadly in line with Title IV of the statute governing the organs of the European Company. Although a certain degree of consistency between these two sets of provisions is desirable, the content of the statute is not dependent on the fifth Directive since there is a clear distinction between provisions in respect of a new form of company which are directly applicable at Community level and solutions to be adopted with regard to the co-ordination of legislation applicable to companies which are governed by national law.

\*

\* \*

*Question No 59, by Mrs Lizin (H-440/79)*

Subject: Attitude to India

Does the Council not feel that Europe should adopt a more positive policy of practical support towards India, whose geographical position is becoming crucial, thereby helping it to fulfil its desire to remain independent and non-aligned?

*Answer*

Since 1974 the Community has maintained contractual relations with India within the context of a non-preferential trade cooperation agreement. This agreement is still in force.

Nevertheless, in order to strengthen these relations, the Indian Government has expressed the wish that negotiations be started in order to replace the present trade cooperation agreement by a new agreement which 'enables both parties to pursue more dynamic relations based on closer cooperation and covering a wider range of economic and commercial objectives'.

To this end, the Commission has sent the Council proposals for the opening of negotiations with India with a view to the conclusion of a commercial and economic cooperation agreement. These proposals are at present being examined within the Council.

I would, moreover, point out to the Honourable Member that as one of the poorest developing countries India benefits substantially from the various forms of Community aid, i.e.:

- the Generalized Preferences Scheme,
- financial and technical aid to non-associated developing countries, among which India is by far the principal beneficiary and
- food aid, in particular in the milk-products sector.

\*

\* \*

*Question No 60, by Mr Kavanagh (H-451/79)*

Subject: Outcome of Council of Fisheries Ministers of 28 and 29 January 1980

Can the Council report on the results of the recent Council of Fisheries Ministers, particularly relating to the problems of inshore fishermen?

*Answer*

The Council's discussions produced a consensus on two points.

The first was the fixing of the total allowable catch (TAC) for each stock of species for 1980 in waters under the sovereignty, or jurisdiction of Member States, and the share available to Community fishermen.

Secondly, the Council agreed to introduce a Community system for the recording and transmission of information on catches made by Member States' fishermen so as to have statistics available as a basis for assessing trends in Member States' fishing activities in relation to the total allowable catches.

The Council agreed to return to the matter of the allocation of quotas among the Member States under the TAC fixed for 1980, technical conservation measures and structural measures, at one of its forthcoming meetings on the basis of proposals promised by the Commission.

As regards inshore fishing and aquaculture, the Commission representative informed the Council that the Commission intended shortly to submit as in previous years, a proposal enabling a degree of financial support to be given to the rationalization of this sector in 1980, drawing on the experience of previous interim structural measures and having due regard to the opinion of the European Parliament.

\*

\* \* \*

*Question No 67, by Mr Megahy (H-411/79)*

Subject: Compensation for the victims of acts of violence

Which Member States of the European Communities have passed laws and other provisions concerning compensation for the victims of acts of violence?

*Question No 68, by Mrs Seibel-Emmerling (H-412/79)*

Subject: Compensation for the victims of acts of violence

How wide are the differences in compensation for the victims of acts of violence between those EC Member States in which there is already legislation on compensation?

*Question No 69, by Mrs Vayssade (H-413/79)*

Subject: Compensation for the victims of acts of violence

What form of compensation is there for Community citizens who are the victims of an act of violence in Member States of the European Community where there are, as yet, no laws in force on compensation for the victims of acts of violence?

*Question No 70, by Mr Glinne (H-414/79)*

Subject: Compensation for the victims of acts of violence

What member states of the Council of Europe and what EEC neighbouring countries which are not members of the Council of Europe but from and to which there is considerable movement of persons have passed laws concerning compensation for the victims of acts of violence?

*Question No 71, by Mr Sieglerschmidt (H-415/79)*

Subject : Compensation for the victims of acts of violence

What are the Ministers meeting in Political Cooperation prepared to do to expedite the introduction of as compact a reciprocal system of compensation as possible for the victims of acts of violence in the Member States of the EC, the Council of Europe and neighbouring countries from and to which there is a considerable movement of persons ?

*Joint answer*

a) The specific question of compensation for the victims of acts of violence is not a subject for discussion in the framework of political cooperation. Consequently, I trust that the Honourable Members will appreciate that the Presidency is not in a position to give a reply on behalf of the Nine to these questions.

b) It may be that the Honourable Members had thought that the question of compensation for the victims of acts of violence would be dealt with as part of cooperation among the Nine to create a European legal area (*espace judiciaire*). However, this question is at the present time a matter of the domestic law of the Member States and is not being dealt with as part of the work in hand on legal cooperation in the field of criminal law.

\*

\*       \*

*Question No 66, by Mr van Aerssen (H-400/79)*

Subject : Compatibility of the laws of the German Democratic Republic with international law

In European Parliament Resolution No 1-280/79 the Foreign Ministers were asked on 28 September 1979 to consider the German Democratic Republic's penal code, which was amended on 1 August 1979, from the point of view of its compatibility with the relevant provisions of international law and to inform the European Parliament of their findings.

Are the Foreign Ministers now in a position to submit their findings to Parliament, as a considerable period of time has now elapsed ?

*Answer*

1. The Nine have noted the new measures in the GDR penal code which entered into force on 1 August 1979.

2. These measures are aimed especially at GDR dissidents and their contacts with Western journalists and media, but they could also be used to restrict human contacts in general between citizens of the GDR and people living outside the GDR. For instance, under threat of severe penalties, it is now prohibited to transmit written or other material considered to be harmful to the interests of the GDR, even if this material is neither secret nor confidential. Implicitly, the measures also represent an attempt further to restrict the free access to sources of information of journalists from other countries in the GDR.

3. The Nine consider that measures of this nature, which restrict freedom of opinion and information and threaten existing human contacts, are contrary to the obligations contained in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as well as to the undertakings agreed to by the GDR in the Helsinki Act, and they can only undermine the process of *détente*.

4. The Nine will continue to monitor carefully further developments, especially the application of the new measures by the GDR authorities.

\*

\*       \*

*Question No 72, by Mr Fergusson (H-429/79)*

Subject : Afghanistan

What consultations is the Conference of Foreign Ministers pursuing with the Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers in the light of their meeting in Islamabad ?

*Answer*

1. The governments of the nine Member Countries of the European Community followed with great interest the extraordinary meeting of the Islamic Conference held recently in Islamabad, because traditional bonds of friendship link Europe and the Islamic countries and because the Soviet military intervention in Afghanistan constitutes — as was stressed by the Nine in their official statement issued in Brussels on 15 January — flagrant interference in the domestic affairs of a non-aligned country belonging to the Islamic world.
2. The appeal made by the participants in the Islamabad meeting for a prompt withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan is in line with the position adopted by the Nine. This is the only measure which can ensure respect for international law and the principles and rules enshrined in the charter of the United Nations, which can relieve the severe threat to stability posed in an area of vital geo-political importance, and which can lead to the resumption of a constructive dialogue between the members of the world community in a climate of mutual confidence and in the common interest.
3. The governments of the nine Member Countries of the European Community are firmly resolved — following up previous action in the United Nations and in other international fora — to pursue their efforts to bring about a solution to the Afghan crisis in close cooperation with all governments which share their concern for peace and security in the region.

## SITTING OF THURSDAY, 14 FEBRUARY 1980

## Contents

1. Approval of minutes . . . . .	195	<i>Point of order: Mr Newton Dunn . . . . .</i>	213
2. Decision on urgency: . . . . .	195	<i>Mrs Spaak; Mrs Gredal . . . . .</i>	217
<i>Mr Glinne; Mr Klepsch; Mr Glinne . . . . .</i>	195	7. Votes:	
<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Ansart; Mr Pannella; Mr Glinne . . . . .</i>	196	<i>Nicolson and Forster report (Doc. 1-623/79): Restructuring in the shipbuilding and textile industries:</i>	
<i>Mr Fanti . . . . .</i>	196	<i>Mr Pannella . . . . .</i>	219
<i>Point of order: Mr Luster . . . . .</i>	197	<i>Amendment to paragraphs 1 to 6:</i>	
<i>Explanations of vote: Lord Harmar-Nicholls; Mr Pannella . . . . .</i>	197	<i>Sir David Nicolson, rapporteur . . . . .</i>	220
<i>Point of order: Mr Sieglerschmidt . . . . .</i>	197	<i>Amendment to paragraph 3:</i>	
<i>Mr Sarre; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mr Pannella; Lady Elles (ED) . . . . .</i>	197	<i>Sir David Nicolson . . . . .</i>	220
<i>Mr Sarre; Mrs Salisch . . . . .</i>	198	<i>Mrs Salisch; Sir David Nicolson . . . . .</i>	220
<i>Mrs Macciocchi; Mrs Bonino; Mr Haagerup; Mr Denis (COM); Mr Penders (EPP); Mr de Courcy Ling (ED); Mrs Chouraqui (EPD); Mr Donnez (L); Mr Coppeters (I) . . . . .</i>	199	<i>Amendment after paragraph 4:</i>	
<i>Point of order: Mrs Kellett-Bowman . . . . .</i>	203	<i>Sir David Nicolson . . . . .</i>	221
<i>Mr Puletti (S) . . . . .</i>	203	<i>Amendment to paragraph 5:</i>	
<i>Point of order: Mr Haagerup; Mr Sieglerschmidt . . . . .</i>	203	<i>Sir David Nicolson . . . . .</i>	221
3. Decision on requests for an early vote		<i>Amendment to paragraph 6:</i>	
<i>Mrs Weber; Mr Klepsch . . . . .</i>	204	<i>Sir David Nicolson . . . . .</i>	221
4. Order of business . . . . .	205	<i>Amendments after paragraph 6:</i>	
5. Commission statement on the 1980 Communities budget:		<i>Sir David Nicolson . . . . .</i>	222
<i>Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission; Mr Lange, chairman of the Committee on Budgets; Mr Dankert, rapporteur; Mr Notenboom (EPP); Mr J. M. Taylor; Mr De Goede; Mr Nord; Mr Ansquer; Mr Cottrell; Mr Tugendhat . . . . .</i>	205	<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Pannella; Mrs Salisch; Mrs De March; Mrs Roudy (S); Mr De Goede; Mr Nordlohne . . . . .</i>	222
6. Fight against drug abuse — Oral question with debate (Doc. 1-647/79) by Mrs Squarzialiupi and Mr Ceravolo — Public health policy — Oral question with debate (Doc. 1-701/79) by Mrs Schleicher and others — continuation . . . . .	211	<i>Adoption of the resolution . . . . .</i>	223
<i>Mrs Seibel-Emmerling (S); Mrs Gaiotti de Biase (EPP); Mr Newton Dunn (ED); Mrs Pruvoit (L); Mrs Chouraqui (EPD); Mr Pannella (I) . . . . .</i>	212	<i>Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-761/79) by Mr Pranchère and others: Oils, fats and proteins:</i>	
		<i>Rejection of the motion . . . . .</i>	224
		<i>Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-762/79) by Mr Davern and others: Oils, fats and proteins:</i>	
		<i>Amendment seeking to replace the entire motion:</i>	
		<i>Mr Buchou . . . . .</i>	224
		<i>Adoption of the resolution . . . . .</i>	224
		<i>Fuchs report (Doc. 1-704/79) — Energy objectives and nuclear energy:</i>	
		<i>Amendments to the Council Resolution:</i>	
		<i>Amendment to the second recital:</i>	
		<i>Mr Fuchs, rapporteur . . . . .</i>	224
		<i>Point of order: Mrs Bonino; Mrs Van den Heuvel . . . . .</i>	224

<i>Amendment after the last recital:</i>			
<i>Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .	225		
<i>Point of order: Mr Pannella</i> . . . . .	225		
<i>Amendment to the paragraph beginning 'Affirms the need':</i>			
<i>Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .	226		
<i>Amendment to the fifth subparagraph of the same paragraph:</i>			
<i>Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .	226		
<i>Amendment before the paragraph beginning 'Recommends that the Member States':</i>			
<i>Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .	226		
<i>Amendment to the paragraph beginning 'Calls on the Commission':</i>			
<i>Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .	226		
<i>Consideration of the motion:</i>			
<i>Amendment to paragraph 4:</i>			
<i>Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .	226		
<i>Amendment after paragraph 4:</i>			
<i>Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .	226		
<i>Amendment to paragraph 6:</i>			
<i>Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .	227		
<i>Amendment to paragraph 9:</i>			
<i>Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .	227		
<i>Amendment to paragraph 11:</i>			
<i>Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .	227		
<i>Amendments to paragraph 16:</i>			
<i>Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .	227		
<i>Amendments to paragraph 17:</i>			
<i>Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .	228		
<i>Amendment to paragraph 18:</i>			
<i>Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .	228		
<i>Amendment to paragraph 20:</i>			
<i>Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .			
<i>Amendment after paragraph 20:</i>			
<i>Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .	228		
<i>Amendment to paragraph 29:</i>			
<i>Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .	228		
<i>Amendments to paragraph 31:</i>			
<i>Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .	229		
<i>Amendments to paragraph 32:</i>			
<i>Mr Fuchs</i> . . . . .	229		
<i>Explanations of vote: Mrs Dekker; Mr Coppieters; Mr Von der Vring; Mr Schmid; Mr Bonino; Mr Martin; Mr Veronesi; Mr Gendebien; Mr Josselin; Mr Pannella; Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul; Mrs Groes</i> . . . . .	229		
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	233		
<i>Points of order: Mr Irmer; Mrs De March; Mr Pearce; Mr Prag</i> . . . . .	233		
<i>Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-705/79/rev.) by Mrs Weber and others: Safety of pressurized water reactors:</i>			
<i>Rejection of the motion</i> . . . . .	234		
<i>Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-769/79) by Mr Seligman and others: Safety of pressurized water reactors:</i>			
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	234		
<i>Linkobr motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-779/79): Safety of pressurized water reactors:</i>			
<i>Rejection of the motion</i> . . . . .	234		
<i>Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-776/79) by the Group of European Progressive Democrats: Energy supplies:</i>			
<i>Rejection of the motion</i> . . . . .	234		
<i>Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-780/79) by Mr Vergeer and others, Mr Seligman and others and Mr Pintat: Energy supplies:</i>			
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	234		
<i>Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-781/79) by Mr Damette and others: Energy supplies:</i>			
<i>Rejection of the motion</i> . . . . .	234		
8. <i>Organization of a special part-session</i>			
<i>Mr Sieglerschmidt</i> . . . . .	235		
9. <i>Fight against drug abuse — Oral question with debate (Doc. 1-647/79) by Mrs Squarcialupi and Mr Ceravolo — Public health policy — Oral question with debate (Doc. 1-701/79) by Mrs Schleicher and others — continuation</i> . . . . .	235		
<i>Sir David Nicolson; Mr Almirante; Mrs Krouwel-Vlam; Mrs Clwyd; Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission</i> . . . . .	235		
<i>Point of order: Mrs Gredal</i> . . . . .	241		
<i>Mr Vredeling; Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Vredeling</i> . . . . .	241		
10. <i>Regulation on Community transit — Report (Doc. 1-544/79) by Mr von Wogau on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs:</i> . . . . .	242		
<i>Mr von Wogau, rapporteur</i> . . . . .	242		
<i>Point of order: Mr Pannella; Mr Radoux</i>			
<i>Mr Notenboom (EPP); Mr de Ferranti (ED); Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission</i> . . . . .	244		
11. <i>Agenda</i> . . . . .	246		
12. <i>Activities of the Communities in 1979 (Thirteenth General Report) and Commission work programme for 1980 — Relations between the EEC and Yugoslavia — Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-737/79/rev./II):</i>			
<i>Mr Radoux (Doc. 1-737/rev./II)</i> . . . . .	246		
<i>Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Glinne (S); Mr Jonker (EPP); Mr Scott-Hopkins (ED); Mr Gremetz (C); Mr Berkhouwer (L); Mr Nyborg (EPD); Mr Pannella (I); Mr De Goede</i> . . . . .	247		
<i>Point of order: Mr Arndt</i> . . . . .	261		

<i>Mr Spinelli; Mrs Walz, Mr Radoux . . .</i>	262	<i>Point of order: Mr Berkhouwer . . . . .</i>	280
<i>Mr Arndt; Mrs Walz; Sir Peter Vanneck; Mr Spinelli; Mr Maher; Mr Blaney; Mr Gendebien; Mr Puletti; Mr Travaglini; Mr Cecovini; Mr Romualdi; Mr Balfé; Mr Beumer; Mr Purvis; Mr de Keersmaecker; Mr Prout; Mr Almirante; Mrs Gredal; Mr Sarre; Mr Henckens; Mr Alber; Mr Aigner . . . . .</i>	262	<i>Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission</i>	
		13. <i>Membership of committees . . . . .</i>	283
		14. <i>Agenda for next sitting:</i>	
		<i>Mrs Bonino; Mr Gendebien . . . . .</i>	283

## IN THE CHAIR: MR ZAGARI

*Vice-President*

*(The sitting was opened at 10.20 a.m.)*

**President.** — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of minutes*

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

Since there are no comments, the minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. *Decision on urgency*

**President.** — The first item on the agenda is the decision on the urgency of several motions for resolutions.

We shall first consider the requests for urgent debate in respect of the following motions for resolutions.

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-773/79) by Mr Hord and others: Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the outrageous treatment of Professor Sakharov;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-778/79/rev.II) by Mr Ripa di Meana and others: Arrest of the scientist Andrei Sakharov;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-782/79) by Mr Fanti and others: Measures taken against Andrei Sakharov.

I propose that Parliament take a single vote on these three requests since the motions deal with the same subject.

I call Mr Glinne.

**Mr Glinne.** — *(F)* Mr President, talks last night led to agreement on what would seem to be a complementary text to the ones which are listed on the agenda. This additional text was signed by a fair number of the Members in my group. You mentioned the motion tabled by Mr Ripa di Meana but apparently there is a document missing from your list. This document was the result of talks among the various groups, including mine.

**President.** — It was clear from the announcement I made that the motion for a resolution by Mr Ripa di Meana, Mr Blumenfeld, Mr Scott-Hopkins, Mr Bangemann, Mr de la Malène and Mr Pannella was a single document.

I call Mr Klepsch.

**Mr Klepsch.** — *(D)* Mr President, it was obviously not possible for technical reasons last night to include in your documents the fact that the Socialist Group is also associated with this text. I should like this to be put on the record. This motion for a resolution, which begins with the name of Mr Blumenfeld, is a document with which the Socialist Group as well is associated. I want to make this quite clear for the records.

**President.** — I call Mr Glinne.

**Mr Glinne.** — *(F)* It is rather difficult to accept the proposal for a single vote, Mr President, because of the wording of the first motion — by Mr Hord — which was tabled before agreement was reached. I should like separate votes.

**President.** — We shall therefore vote on the requests one after the other.

I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-773/79) by Mr Hord and others: Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the outrageous treatment of Professor Sakharov.*

**President**

Since the result of the vote by show of hands is doubtful, we shall take a fresh vote by sitting and standing.

Urgent procedure is adopted.

(Applause)

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-753/79/rev.II) by Mr Ripa di Meana and others: Arrest of the scientist Andrei Sakharov.*

Urgent procedure is adopted.

(Applause)

I call Mr Ansart for an explanation of vote.

**Mr Ansart.** — (F) Mr President, our party has already expressed its opinion in France on the measures taken against Andrei Sakharov in the Soviet Union. We were unequivocal in denouncing these measures. We firmly believe — let me say it again — that no one must be persecuted for his political beliefs. That is the fact of the matter. However, I want to repeat what I said here on behalf of my fellow party members during the January part-session. In our view, this Assembly does not have the right which it claims it has to pass judgment on everything that goes on in the world, and to do so in a piecemeal, one-sided and biased manner. It is not our job or our responsibility ...

(Uproar)

Just look at the fine show of democracy displayed by this Assembly which has vital issues to debate and serious discussions to organize on the economic, social and political situation in Europe. For our part, we are ready to commence and to participate in a debate on human rights taken as a whole. There is enough to be going on with in the European Community for a start. We have a much wider-ranging concept of human rights and we have no desire to whittle it down to freedom of expression, however important this may be. It would be interesting, say, to discuss how much freedom is enjoyed by our seven million unemployed, and by the millions of women and young people who are out of work and who are on the dole before they have even had a job. This is why we are going to vote against most of this morning's motions, except of course for the one concerning David Mange, who has the threat of death hanging over his head. And he is not by any means the only one in the world.

Thank you, Mr President, but I do object to the intolerant attitude which is always displayed by far too many of the Members here.

(Applause from certain quarters on the extreme left)

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Mr President, I was prompted to vote in favour of the motion by the same reasons for which the French Communist Party — unabashed at contradicting itself for the umpteenth time — is going to vote for the motion condemning a sentence of death in South Africa.

I fail to comprehend how in the eyes of people who profess to believe in life and liberty someone under sentence of death in South Africa is any different from someone who has been condemned to die in Afghanistan or someone who has been denied the right to exist in Russia, a country which is European by virtue of its culture and traditions but fascist in its attitude to freedom of expression.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — I now put to the vote the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-782/79) by Mr Fanti and others: Measures taken against Andrei Sakharov.*

Since the result of the vote by show of hands is doubtful, we shall take a fresh vote by sitting and standing.

The request is rejected.

Pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, the motion for a resolution is referred to the appropriate committee.

I call Mr Glinne for an explanation of vote.

**Mr Glinne.** — (F) Mr President, I feel I must say — much to my regret — that while agreement on this matter was supposedly sought, and to some extent achieved, some of the political groups have just refused to vote in favour of the Communist request for urgent procedure on what I can only consider to be shabby political grounds.

**President.** — I call Mr Fanti.

**Mr Fanti.** — (I) In my opinion, the rejection of the request for urgent procedure for our motion is a seri-

## Fanti

ous matter, since it casts dubious light on the behaviour of the groups in the enlarged Bureau. We shall not forget this tomorrow.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the left)*

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

**Mr Luster.** — *(D)* Mr President, Mr Glinne made a statement which was supposed to be an explanation of vote. If you ask me, what Mr Glinne said was not an explanation of vote. He merely gave out to those who voted differently and did not offer any explanation of his vote.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the right)*

**President.** — I call Lord Harmar-Nicholls for an explanation of vote.

**Lord Harmar-Nicholls.** — Mr President, I explain my abstention on this very important matter because, whilst the general spirit of the resolution is one that I could support, there is a sentence in it which runs contrary to the general spirit which would have brought my support. We must look at all the words in a resolution, because people who will be using our resolutions for or against us will be doing just that. I believe it was clumsy to introduce one sentence which defies bringing about the sort of answer that we want on this important question.

*(Applause from certain quarters of the European Democratic Group)*

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella for an explanation of vote.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(I)* Mr President, I voted in support of this request for the same reasons for which I voted in favour of Mr Hord's request. As regards the upholding of certain values, I believe in fact that those groups which are more inclined to take a party approach are showing that they want to exploit the very ideas for which they are campaigning.

In my view, we must defend the ideals of life and liberty whether they are championed by the Conservatives — who are not always so enthusiastic as they are on this occasion — or by the French or Italian Communists or by anyone else on the left — who are equally unenthusiastic on other occasions.

I want to appeal to Members to avoid party attitudes and shabby dealings when it is a matter of upholding certain values.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, I think it is unnecessary for me to remind the House that explanations of vote should not be given when deciding on urgent procedure. The chair is ready in fact to allow statements, in view of the vital importance of the subject, but there must of course be certain restrictions. In any case, there will be an opportunity to outline positions during the debate on the matter.

I call Mr Sieglerschmidt on a point of order.

**Mr Sieglerschmidt.** — *(D)* Mr President, I am quite confused by the proceedings here this morning, for which my group is also partly to blame. I have always thought that if an item is urgent, and this fact is recognized, it is immaterial just what is in a motion. If we agree that the Sakharov affair is urgent, we have to adopt urgent procedure in respect of all the motions on Andrei Sakharov. If we start picking and choosing now, it makes nonsense of everything. I should like whoever is in the Chair, Mr President, to instruct Parliament to be consistent.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — I propose that the two motions for resolutions for which urgent procedure has been adopted be placed on the agenda of the sitting of Friday, 15 February 1980.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-774/79) by Mr Sarre and others: Sentence of death passed on James David Mange.*

I call Mr Sarre.

**Mr Sarre.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, James Mange, a 24-year-old black South African opponent of the racist régime in Pretoria, was sentenced to death last 15 November after being found guilty of treason. At the same trial 11 other people received lengthy prison sentences. They were accused of belonging to the African National Congress which is — as you have probably guessed — banned in South Africa. They were also charged with leaving the country for a time, but they left South Africa in 1976 after the bloody events at Soweto. When they returned, they were picked up by the South African security police. It must be clear to everyone that this was a racist trial and a political verdict.

However, the death sentence which is hanging over James Mange is not irrevocable. First of all, interna-

Sarre

tional opinion can put pressure on the South African régime which is going through a very bad time at the moment. Furthermore, the policy of apartheid which is still implemented in spite of all the government statements is very widely condemned by the international community, and the government in Pretoria cannot afford to become even more isolated. Lastly — and this seems to me to be the significant factor — on 2 January James Mange was granted permission to appeal against his sentence, and there is therefore some chance that appeals for clemency will be listened to.

These are the reasons, ladies and gentlemen, why this Parliament should consider this matter without delay. There is a real chance that we can stop the execution of this opponent of the racist régime in South Africa. Let us take this chance, I beg you, by voting in favour of urgent procedure.

**President.** — In accordance with the Rules of Procedure, one speaker for and one against the motion may speak, in addition to the mover.

I call Mrs Van den Heuvel.

**Mrs Van den Heuvel.** — (NL) Mr President, I really think I am wasting Parliament's time if I speak in favour of this request for urgent procedure, since I cannot believe that this Parliament can be so selective in its indignation that it is more concerned about the Sakharov affair — which got my heartfelt vote — than about the Mange case. I shall simply let my colleague's urgent request prove that the House is not selective in its indignation.

(Applause from various quarters)

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) I am not sure that I am entitled to speak, but I want to support the request for urgency, for the same reasons which prompted the group chairmen to agree unanimously to the President's sending a telegram in support of James Mange.

**President.** — I call Lady Elles to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Lady Elles.** — Mr President, while recognizing the particular situation of Mr Mange, we cannot accept that this is a matter for urgency or for this House to consider.

(Cries from the left).

Mr President, our party has always declared its strong opposition to racialism and apartheid, but this particu-

lar question has nothing to do with either of those issues. It is a matter for the internal criminal law of South Africa, and for this reason we object to this particular resolution.

**President.** — I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure.

Urgent procedure is adopted.

(Applause from the left)

I propose that the motion for a resolution be placed on the agenda of the sitting of Friday, 15 February 1980.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-775/79) by Mr Sarre and others: Events in Guatemala*.

I call Mr Sarre.

**Mr Sarre.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I want to speak to you now about Guatemala and the recent events there.

The dramatic events which are taking place in Central America at the present time highlight the situation which exists in this part of the world. In spite of the opposition of the Spanish ambassador and his negotiations with the occupants, the Spanish embassy in Guatemala City was stormed and destroyed, with the loss of 39 lives, in the most cynical and brutal manner. This was an intolerable act. The dictators in power in Guatemala had decided that there were to be no survivors. The only person to escape the bloodbath was later snatched from his hospital bed and murdered. I am not going to go into any more detail about this event which has led to the breaking off of diplomatic relations between Spain and Guatemala. The most significant aspect of it all is that it reveals the extent and the ferocity of the repression suffered by the people in this country, especially the native Indian population.

These people are condemned to live in misery under the heel of a pitiless régime. They have to suffer exploitation from the great landowners, extortion from the armed forces and terrorist violence from paramilitary groups. In May 1978, for example, the army simply massacred about 100 Indians who were guilty of protesting against the expropriation of their land. Every day the régime is responsible for drafting people into the army against their will and for kidnappings by anonymous gangs or the 'squadrons of death'.

Sarre

Do I have to remind you of the murder of the former mayor of Guatemala City, Manuel Argueta, or of the secretary-general of the Social Democratic Party, Alberto Fuentes? Can I remind you of what the Jesuits said about Guatemala — that in the country there are no political prisoners because they are all dead or missing? At a time when this Parliament is paying particular attention to human rights, we cannot afford to ignore what is going on in Latin America and in Central America.

Of course, ladies and gentlemen, we do not condone the occupation of embassies as a political act, but at the same time we understand the need of these people to cast off the chains of repression and achieve a little more justice, freedom and democracy. As far as this affair is concerned, we are looking for a repeat of our protest against the occupation of the American embassy in Iran and the taking of hostages there. We are hoping that a majority of the House — and indeed why not everyone, although I suppose that is unlikely — will condemn the murder of the Spanish embassy staff and the slaying of the Guatemalan peasants. This will show — as Mrs Van den Heuvel pointed out just now — that this Parliament is not selective in its defence of democracy and human rights.

**President.** — I call Mrs Salisch.

**Mrs Salisch.** — (D) Mr President, I wish to speak in support of urgency on this motion. It was only yesterday that the President of this Parliament was unequivocal in condemning terrorism of any kind. I am convinced that the events at the Spanish embassy in Guatemala are an example of terrorism of the opposite stamp. It is a tragedy in my view that there should have been such a massacre in the Spanish embassy after the ambassador — at least this is the information I have — went to talk to the peasants and encouraged them in their action. I repeat, this is what happened as far as I am aware, and I have to accept that this is in fact what happened. It is an absolutely intolerable state of affairs when an injured man is dragged from his hospital bed and shot. We cannot tolerate this and we must speak out against it. I therefore ask the House to vote in favour of urgency.

(Applause)

**President.** — I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure.

Urgent procedure is adopted.

I propose that the motion for a resolution be placed on the agenda of the sitting of Friday, 15 February 1980.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

\*

\* \*

**President.** — I now put to the vote the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-779/79/rev.) by Mr Blumenfeld and others: Olympic Games in Moscow.*

Urgent procedure is adopted.

I propose that the motion for a resolution be placed on the agenda of the sitting of Friday, 15 February 1980, to be debated jointly with the motions for resolutions on Andrei Sakharov.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the request for urgent procedure in respect of the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-784/79) by Mrs Macciocchi and others: Tragic situation and threat of starvation in Cambodia.*

I call Mrs Macciocchi.

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — (I) Mr President, I am not going to offer the usual abstract political ideas in support of this request for urgent procedure. Instead, I am going to tell you what three Members of this House — Mr Donnez, Mrs Bonino and myself — saw when we visited the hell camps along the Thai-Cambodian frontier. We went there with 150 other people — Europeans and Americans, doctors, writers, local leaders, and so on — as proof of our determination to help a nation whose people are dying in the internment camps and to aid a country where 700 000 people are dying along the border and where the Vietnamese invaders are requisitioning supplies and sending the doctors who survived the Pol Pot massacres to reeducation camps. I urge the adoption of urgent procedure because we saw with our own eyes — and the horror of it all is still with us — how close famine is and how the meagre January harvest is already finished. From just about now there will be nothing left to eat for these people. We feel that this Parliament must act at once with a loud response to the cries of the dying and to what is left of a people that has been the victim of the greatest genocide in history after the wholesale massacre of the Jews in camps such as Treblinka and Auschwitz.

It is our fervent wish that quite apart from any political . . .

(Interruption by the French Communists)

. . . I see, you do not want to hear about the dead in Cambodia. You, of all people! Why don't you go and occupy Cambodia — you have already done so!

(Interruption by the French Communists; uproar)

Macciocchi

I know, it's a workers' paradise in Cambodia, it's socialism with a human face! But you are killing them all off! Just watch where you stand here, because there are people outside who are watching too! I really hope that Parliament can be unanimous on this point.

*(Applause)*

I really hope that just as people like Sartre and Aron can forget their political and ideological differences and unite in a plea to save the Vietnamese boat people, the people in this Parliament can unite as well, as is shown by the signatures which we were able to collect at the beginning. It is in this way, with this tangible proof, that we are appealing to this Parliament for immediate and concrete aid, and asking the Members here to forget their vote-catching ploys and their manoeuvring along party lines and to vote for urgent procedure. It is not on our behalf that we ask this, but on behalf of the people of Cambodia, or what is left of them.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Bonino.

**Mrs Bonino.** — *(I)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I see that this subject upsets some of the Members here. Let me tell the French Communist Members that it does not bother me at all if I have collected signatures from Members in the Liberal Group or other groups. I say this because in the light of the dramatic situation we witnessed in Thailand — 700 000 refugees — there can be no place for contemptible political manoeuvring and shabby party ploys. I do not think anyone can accuse us of having had anything to do with the Pol Pot régime. We are not the ones to accuse of having had anything to do with that nazi-communist régime. Perhaps there are others who . . .

*(Interruption by the French Communists)*

. . . had tacit or explicit dealings with Pol Pot's nazi-communist régime. We certainly did not. But after all that has happened to these people who have also suffered at the hands of other imperialist powers, you cannot just say: look who you are with and who you are dealing with! Why don't you look at who you are with? What are you trying to say, all on your own there? That it is a workers' paradise, the socialist tomorrow?

*(Applause)*

But what kind of socialism is this? Killing hundreds and thousands of people . . .

*(Applause)*

What socialism is there in the prison camps in Thailand? What kind of workers' paradise are you going to

build with half a pound of rice a day? That is what I want to know. It is true — because I saw it for myself — that the international aid which we have supplied in recent months has saved more than half a million people. We saved them — there is no denying that — but the important thing is that we have to continue supplying aid, because the monsoon season is coming and conditions will become dramatic.

I know that a resolution has already been adopted by the Committee on Development and Cooperation and that the Political Affairs Committee has appointed a rapporteur. But it is with you that we want to collaborate. Of course, the problem of Cambodia is not going to be solved overnight, but at least let's get down to discussing it! Alas, we are going to carry on discussing it in March and April, because this is a problem that is going to go on for years. I have no idea when or if it is going to be solved, but let me say to you, to the rapporteur of the Political Affairs Committee and to the Committee on Development and Cooperation, that you should not kid yourselves that this debate is going to pass you by. Let's start discussion tomorrow, because the situation is critical, as the rains are coming in a month. We have to decide immediately what aid to send to continue saving these people who until now have relied on human responses — perhaps not supplied in the name of socialism but in the name of genuine humanitarianism — which is the very opposite of your ideologies of death. Let's start talking now. Those of you who are going to discuss this matter in committee will go on talking in March and April, but for God's sake let's start taking decisions now! This is no time for following the party line. Let us all vote unanimously for these reasons.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Haagerup.

**Mr Haagerup.** — *(DK)* Mr President, I am afraid I should like to speak against the request for urgent procedure in connection with this motion for a resolution, but not against the text itself.

As can be seen from the signatures which have been put to this motion, it has attracted a great deal of sympathy from several political groups in this House, including of my own group. However, I must, as spokesman for the Political Affairs Committee, urge Parliament to vote against the request for urgent procedure so that it will be possible for this motion for a resolution — which was tabled with the most serious of intentions — to be discussed by the Political Affairs Committee at its meeting in Brussels next week. Naturally, this will not mean a delay in the urgently needed food aid to Cambodia. Indeed, we all wish to speed up this food aid and assure that it is distributed effectively.

## Haagerup

The motion for a resolution, however, contains very far-reaching political ideas which could complicate this aid. I am thinking, for example, of a special committee of investigation appointed by this Parliament and the convening of an international conference with a view to neutralizing the whole of Cambodia. This motion for a resolution should be discussed by the Political Affairs Committee and, if the request for urgent procedure is rejected, the whole question will be discussed both in the Political Affairs Committee and at the next part-session of this Parliament, so that it will be possible to assess the political implications. These procedural considerations are the only reasons why I urge Parliament to reject the request for urgent procedure.

**President.** — I call Mr Denis.

**Mr Denis.** — (F) Mr President, this motion which has been tabled is just a pretext to cover up the blatant fiasco of the border walk. In any case, Mr Dumas and Mr Ruffin of the *Médecins sans Frontières* organization have just revealed that the whole political idea and the means for carrying it out came directly from the US Congress and the State Department. The authors of this motion were not concerned about aid for the Khmer people. The people who are out there — those who are working for the International Red Cross, Oxfam, UNICEF and other organizations — state that aid is being distributed in spite of all the problems which are the terrible legacy of American aggression — which you seem to have quietly forgotten — Khmer rouge genocide, destruction, lack of means of communication, transport, unloading facilities, and so on.

Here is another report on the situation, ladies and gentlemen:

It must be admitted that the Cambodians are more scared of the Khmer rouge than of the Vietnamese . . . There is a certain degree of stability in Cambodia today. It is wrong to say that everyone in Cambodia is against Heng Samrin and the Vietnamese. What would you do if you had to choose between a not very honourable but relatively free life and existence under a gang of torturers? . . . The markets are now open again in Cambodia, money is circulating, family life is picking up where it left off, schools and the health system are functioning again. The life which the Vietnamese and their Cambodian puppets are giving back to the country is not all that bad.

(Uproar)

Go on, laugh! I suppose you are surprised. Do you know where this was published? Today in fact, in a paper which is close to the French Socialist Party, *Le Matin*. While the Socialist Members here are signing this motion, this is what is being published in a paper which is close to the Socialist Party. And the author of this article is your old friend Prince Sihanouk himself.

(Applause from certain quarters on the extreme left)

What the Khmer people need today is certainly Community aid, and all our determination and effort. Mr Cheysson should be ashamed of what he said the other day. The Community must supply aid to these people without any political strings attached. It must be generous aid in the way of food, and facilities for transport, communications and unloading. There is only one way we can emphasize what has to be done now — and that is by voting against urgent procedure for this thimble-erig of a motion.

(Applause from certain quarters on the extreme left)

**President.** — I call Mr Penders to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD).

**Mr Penders.** — (NL) Mr President, I should like to give a brief explanation of vote on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party on this highly important motion for a resolution dealing with what is a very important and emotionally highly charged issue. To begin with, I want to dissociate myself utterly and completely from the statement I have just heard from the French Communists, which was — in my opinion — a truly disgraceful line to take.

(Applause from various quarters)

Firstly, let me say that no-one in this House fails to recognize the urgent need for humanitarian aid — food and medical aid — to be given to the sorely tried people of Cambodia. There is not the slightest doubt about that. My second point is that this motion for a resolution includes a number of extremely interesting aspects, such as the visit to Cambodia of a committee of investigation from the European Parliament and the convocation of an international conference to go into the question of whether Cambodia could be declared a neutral area, as was done at the 1954 Geneva Conference. These proposals are politically highly significant and, in our opinion, deserve to be given serious consideration. However, if we agree to adopt the urgent procedure, the question will come up for discussion early tomorrow morning before an almost empty House. I am reliably informed that the Political Affairs Committee is prepared, at very short notice, to go into the important proposals contained in this motion for a resolution very thoroughly, and that the whole process can be completed within one or two weeks.

Although we believe this to be a very important motion for a resolution, the Group of the European People's Party is unfortunately, for the reasons I just mentioned, against the adoption of the urgent procedure. We would, however, be more than willing to have this question dealt with speedily and constructively by the Political Affairs Committee.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

**President.** — I call Mr de Courcy Ling to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mr de Courcy Ling.** — Mr President, Members of my Group are extremely worried about this problem. We have known about it for a long time — too long now. We have listened to the argument of the rapporteur and we have every confidence in the deliberate way in which he is considering what we should best do in the Political Affairs Committee. Above all we have listened to and admired what Mrs Bonino has said.

*(Applause)*

We congratulate her on the courage of her mission and the human way in which she has described what she saw, and she has won our entire sympathy. The problem is that we need to provide food aid for these people in their desperate plight. The problem is that the motion for a resolution, as we see it, does not match up to what Mrs Bonino has said — unfortunately the motion is not worthy of Mrs Bonino. At the same time, we in our group find the position of the French Communist party on this issue, as on many other current international issues, utterly detestable.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

We believe that the French Communist Party completely underrates and misunderstands the current of human feeling in Europe. I therefore want to explain, Mr President, that we feel our sympathies in this Group are entirely with Mrs. Bonino and we only wish that there were a motion for resolution which would bring about the food aid which is urgently required. The resolution itself is inadequate and, with deep regret, we cannot vote for it this morning.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the right)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Chouraqui to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

**Mrs Chouraqui.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, one of the Members from our group happened to go along on the same trip with Mrs Bonino. I want to tell you why we shall be voting in favour of urgent procedure. It is because the tragedy of Cambodia has not abated and because there must be no slackening or stopping of international aid. No matter what is done, there is still a threat of famine and a lack of medical supplies, doctors and the equipment they need, because in the ridiculous nature of things they are sometimes stuck just when they are practically in Cambodia. I must confess that I do not really understand how this Parliament can vote for urgent procedure when there is a man in the condemned cell in South Africa and not do the same when there are other people in Cambodia who are also condemned to

die of starvation, cold and lack of care. It seems to me that this is an equal case for urgency.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the right)*

We shall vote in favour of urgent procedure because the Community has an obligation to assert its deep concern about Cambodia, and because this European Parliament must show its concern for the welfare of mankind wherever it is threatened.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the right)*

**President.** — I call Mr Donnez to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mr Donnez.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Haagerup spoke earlier to say that, as he was rapporteur for the special committee, he could not vote in favour of urgency. I just want to say that the majority of the Liberal and Democratic Group will vote for urgency because there is extreme urgency.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the right)*

The matter is extremely urgent as regards the health situation, extremely urgent as regards the food situation, and extremely urgent as regards the political situation!

I was on the trip, too. And I want to say to the Communist colleague who disagrees with me that the men and women of goodwill who took part in this march organized by the *Médecins sans Frontières* to save Cambodia went there in all sincerity, their hands bare, to offer these suffering people a fraternal greeting and the help they could give as men of goodwill — and nothing else. There was no element of provocation in our attitude, as some people have written. We held out our bare hands to the Cambodians, and we are ready to hold them out to the Vietnamese, provided that they are not holding Soviet weapons in their hands. And we are even ready to hold out our hands to the French Communists, provided that they do not come here to give us the garbled translation of the orders they have received from their Russian masters.

**President.** — I call Mr Coppieters to speak on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

**Mr Coppieters.** — (NL) Mr President, I should like, on behalf of my Group, to express my surprise at some of the statements we have heard, especially the suggestion, which surely cannot be taken seriously, that the matter be referred to the Political Affairs Committee. Obviously, if — as I hope — we adopt this request for urgent procedure, there is nothing to stop the Political

## Copiers

Affairs Committee going into this question in more detail over a period of weeks and, unfortunately, even months.

A second point I want to make, Mr President, is that Members are always referring to the Friday of a part-session as if it were not all that important because a few hundred Members spend the Friday packing their bags and are never here whenever we come to discuss matters for which the urgent procedure has been adopted. We take the view — and we think our view should be shared by all the Members of this House — that Friday is a working day like any other, and I hope therefore that this subject will be given a thorough airing tomorrow.

One final remark: I am surprised to see that one of the major political groups in this House has spent the last few months tabling resolution after resolution on hunger, human rights and so on, when the very same group took the view earlier on that there was no need for a special committee on human rights. I should like to take this opportunity of protesting at the equivocal attitude shown for example by the European People's Party.

**President.** — I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman on a point of order.

**Mrs Kellett-Bowman.** — Mr President, under Rule 29 it is for the President to propose the time limit for tabling amendments. If urgency is adopted now, will it be possible to table amendments restricting the resolution to immediate food aid, as that is what most people in this Parliament would like?

**President.** — I call Mr Puletti to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Puletti.** — (I) It was with keen interest that I listened to the reasons justifying the request for urgency for the Macciocchi motion. On behalf of the Socialist Group I may say that we shall be voting for urgency. If we had any doubts about the acceptability of this motion, they were cancelled by the attitude of the French Communist Party and Mr Denis, whose argument I can only describe as detestable. I should like to suggest that Mr Denis read the documents on this matter by the Italian Communist Party, which has taken a quite different line from the one adopted by the French Communists, who are inclined to offer the House solutions and arguments which must be rejected.

(Applause)

In reply to those who claim sometimes that this Parliament should not tackle as a matter of urgency vital

political issues, let me say that in politics everything hangs together and it is ridiculous to keep the Cambodian affair separate from Andrei Sakharov's exile, the invasion of Afghanistan and whatever else is happening in the world. The whole pattern of world events is something which cannot fail to be of concern to us — unless we want to admit that we are powerless and chicken-hearted. The Socialist Group will vote in favour of urgent procedure.

(Applause)

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

**Mr. Haagerup.** — (DK) Mr President, I should like to ask you to answer the question put by Mrs Kellett-Bowman so that, if urgency is adopted, we will know whether we can table an amendment aimed at restricting the resolution to food aid, which is something we are all agreed on, regardless of party-political differences. I should therefore be grateful if you would answer this question so that we can decide, if urgency is adopted, whether or not we can table an amendment tomorrow restricting the motion for a resolution to food aid.

**President.** — I propose that the deadline for tabling amendments to this motion for a resolution, in the event of urgency being adopted, be set at 6 p.m. today.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

I call Mr Sieglerschmidt on a point of order.

**Mr Sieglerschmidt.** — (D) Mr President, I left the Chamber for a few minutes and now that I am back I see that we are still discussing the urgency of the motion on Cambodia. I should just like to know, Mr President, how this squares with the Rules of Procedure, since according to the Rules there can be only one speaker for and one against. Before that the Member making the request may speak. I want to make it clear that we are discussing urgency here. I should really like to have some explanation as to how this procedure which seems to have taken root — the discussion has been going on for more than half an hour now — is in accordance with the Rules of Procedure.

(Applause from various quarters)

**President.** — Mr Sieglerschmidt, the Rules of Procedure state that one speaker in favour and one against may be heard, but they also allow the spokesmen of the political groups to be heard. This is what has happened.

I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure.

**President**

Urgent procedure is adopted.

I propose that the motion for a resolution be placed on the agenda of the sitting of Friday, 15 February 1980.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

3. *Decision on requests for an early vote*

**President.** — The next item is the decision on the requests for an early vote on six motions for resolutions to wind up the debate on the oral questions to the Council and the Commission on energy (Docs. 1-705/79 rev., 1-769/79, 1-776/79, 1-777/79, 1-780/79 and 1-781/79).

As the six motions deal with the same subject, I propose that we take a single vote.

I call Mrs Weber.

**Mrs Weber.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to ask straight away for the vote to be taken separately. Our motion for a resolution is concerned with the energy issue but it covers only one aspect of the general energy debate, an aspect on which this House may well be of one mind. Europe is currently in a situation in which we spend plenty of time arguing about the harmonization of egg boxes, but where it is possible for dangerous installations such as power stations to be built in border areas where they will seriously affect people living on both side of the border. And the harmful effects are not restricted to power stations — although Victor Abens and Mrs Lizin gave us two examples of nuclear power stations yesterday — but can come from any industrial plant which is likely to affect people living nearby.

We in Europe still have no sensible procedure for instituting consultations which would enable people living on either side of the border to influence any decisions. The Euratom Treaty does contain certain articles relating particularly to nuclear power stations — and that is why I have raised this point in this context — which provide for consultation procedures and which would theoretically enable the European Community to take a hand. However, this has never been put into practice. Article 37 of the Euratom Treaty provides for consultations, but it has never yet been applied. We believe that specific proposals must be worked out for such a consultation procedure going beyond what the European Parliament has so far worked out and beyond what the Commission has so far proposed. In our opinion, anything to do with nuclear power stations which is likely to affect people living on the other side of a national frontier should be investigated via this consultation procedure. What we are concerned about is not only nuclear radiation, but also the potential effects on the volume and quality of water, structural policy and the accumulation of

potential hazards. We also believe there should be an arbitration mechanism which could be applied in any dispute. Furthermore, we think that European considerations should take precedence over national legislation and that imprecise legal concepts should be cleared up.

We would therefore ask for the decision to be taken as quickly as possible so that the committees can produce own-initiative reports on this subject. I really do not understand what all the fuss is about. Surely this is something which has a lot to do with nuclear energy and is of special significance for our people. Surely I have the right to explain my motion for a resolution . . .

(Mixed reactions)

. . . I should like to ask the House to be a little more tolerant when someone is trying to explain a motion for a resolution. I really do not see the problem. I request an early vote on this matter.

**President.** — I call Mr Klepsch.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) Mr. President, we — that is the chairmen of the political groups — have just come from a meeting of the Bureau. I am sorry the chairman of the Socialist Group is not here to put an end to these incredible goings-on. We have now spent an hour and thirty-five minutes on things which should have been out of the way in fifteen minutes.

(Applause)

I can only say, Mrs Weber, that if everyone were to do the same as you and take such a long time explaining each individual motion for a resolution from this package which is supposed to be voted on *en bloc*, we should be here for 2½ hours. The idea was that the reasons behind requests for an early vote should be given in the course of the debate, which would mean simply putting the question to the vote now. This is equally an appeal to the President. I am fully in favour of all six resolutions being voted on together, under the urgent procedure, but the best way of ensuring that we do not get through this week's business is to let things go on as they have so far. The same applies to this request to have all six resolution voted on separately. I cannot imagine that Mrs Weber is here speaking on behalf of the Socialist Group. I appeal to her emphatically to withdraw her request and go along with the President's proposal that all six be voted on together. How can we get through our work if we carry on like this?

I would appeal to you most urgently on behalf of the chairmen of all the political groups to withdraw this request.

(Applause)

**President.** — Mrs Weber was entitled to speak as mover of the motion.

I put to the vote the request for an early vote.

The request is adopted.

The motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

#### 4. *Order of business*

**President.** — At the request of the enlarged Bureau I now propose that we consider the statement by the Commission on the 1980 budget. We shall continue with the normal order of items on the agenda thereafter.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

#### 5. *Commission statement on the 1980 Communities budget*

**President.** — The next item is the Commission statement on the 1980 Communities budget.

I call Mr Tugendhat.

**Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, first of all, may I begin by thanking the House for making it possible for this statement to take place this morning, despite the rearrangement which was necessary in the order of business. I am extremely grateful to you for this opportunity, because I think it is highly desirable that a statement on the budget should be made first in the European Parliament

*(Applause)*

and it is only possible to make the statement first in the European Parliament if we are able to do it this morning before leaks and so forth reach the press. So first of all, I would like to thank the House for giving me this opportunity. And now, Mr President, I turn to the substance of the matter. Last December following the rejection by this House of the draft budget for 1980 the President of the Commission said that at the earliest favourable moment the Commission would make budgetary proposals which it judged would best form the basis for agreement between the two halves of the budgetary authority. It is my privilege, Mr President, to present to you this proposal which is designed to restart the budgetary procedure.

I hope that it will be the basis on which the two arms of the budgetary authority can resolve their differ-

ences. It is designed to enable them to do so without any unnecessary delay.

It is, however, essential that the solution to the present problems should stand on its own merits. The Community needs not just a budget but a budget that can carry forward the construction of Europe and contribute to resolving the problems that are worrying people in all parts of the Community. The Commission believes that this proposal can do that. It is in this spirit that I commend it to the House.

In drawing up our proposal, Mr President, we have taken serious note of the act of the European Parliament last December and of the events leading up to it, notably the substantial and detailed resolutions of 7 November and 13 December. We have also sought to take account of the need arising from the prevailing economic difficulties and of the constraints which those difficulties impose.

We hope that this House will in turn see our proposal as a whole. It confirms the preliminary draft budget of last July and takes that preliminary draft budget as a starting point. There are four main elements in our proposal, reflecting the four points in the Parliament's resolution. These are agriculture, the Community's borrowing and lending activities, the relationship of the European Development Fund to the rest of the budget, and the level of non-compulsory expenditure. I would like to take each of these in turn and briefly make a few comments on the proposal as a whole.

I think it would be best to begin with agriculture, since that obviously occupies such a large part of the budget. The Commission's proposals in the agricultural sphere were of course laid before the House earlier this week by my colleague, Vice-President Gundelach, and I won't go over ground that he himself has covered. But as already announced, the proposals reflect not just the financial consequences of the November savings package but also those of the February package and that of course includes the savings propositions and the prices. When one takes the whole lot together, the forecast net saving in EAGGF guarantee expenditure contained in our proposal as compared with the draft rejected in December is 823 m EUA. The major share of this is provided by the milk sector, notably in the proposals for the co-responsibility levies and the non-application of certain aids.

As the House knows, Mr President, the Commission has proposed certain price increases on which the House will of course have an opportunity to express its views. What is however clear, from the budgetary point of view, is that operating through the price mechanism alone could not provide us with a strong enough weapon to tackle the problem of surpluses. The proposal for savings are absolutely essential. Moreover there is a close link between the various kinds of measures we have put forward. If the Council proves unable to adopt the structural measures in their

### Tugendhat

present form, the Commission will have to reconsider the price proposals.

If, however, the Commission's proposals are adopted — and I hope very much that they will be — the proportion of Community expenditure devoted to agriculture will go down from 66.9 % in 1979 to 63 % in 1980. Put another way, between 1973 and 1979 the average annual increase in EAGGF guarantee expenditure was 17.6 %. The Commission's proposals have as their aim the stabilization of expenditure as between last year and this year, thus releasing resources for potential use elsewhere. The Commission believes that, in putting forward the proposal, it is responding to the views of Parliament, as expressed through its amendments to the agricultural chapters of the budget, and taking a step in the right direction.

I turn now to borrowing and lending and to the budgetization of the European Development Fund. On these two points the Commission and Parliament have been at one on the principle involved. On borrowing and lending the Commission has, as the House knows, proposed budgetization for two years in succession. It is the Council that has so far failed to act. We are therefore once again bringing forward our proposal. We would also point out that during the conciliation procedure of 12/13 December — during the long night that preceded the rejection of the budget — the Council stated that it was ready to — an I quote — 'conclude within a period of six months its examination of the Commission's proposal to amend the Financial Regulation with a view to reaching a common position . . .' The Commission urges the Council to act in accordance with the forthcoming attitude it showed last December. I hope very much that it will.

The European Development Fund is a more complicated matter. The Commission reiterates its belief that the Fund should be budgetized. It was with this in mind that the Commission, in its preliminary draft budget, reserved Chapters 90 and 91 for appropriations for the European Development Fund, and it will continue to keep them open. The Commission has, nevertheless, reluctantly come to the conclusion that the procedures in the Council and indeed, in the Member States have gone too far for the effective budgetization of the Fifth European Development Fund. This is a matter of considerable regret to us. Ratification by national parliaments of the new Lomé Convention, financed on the basis of a special key, is now beginning. The Commission feels that to include in a budget which should comprise general and universal forms of revenue other forms of revenue raised on a basis different from the overall principle, and indeed on a principle which is hypothecated as to their use, would be a double precedent which the Community could later live to regret. The Commission has therefore confined itself to proposals for the supply of information concerning implementation of the Convention, as a result of which, we believe, Parliament

should find itself well placed to exercise its legitimate influence, while expenditure is actually taking place.

Parliament of course already has the power of discharge which will now, as a result of the additional information being made available, acquire new meaning. As I have said on a number of occasions in this House, the power of discharge gives Parliament a potential that has not been fully utilized in the past. I therefore think that the proposal we are putting forward on this occasion for the European Development Fund, though it does not go as far as we would like, and while I recognize that it does not go as far as Parliament would wish, will enable Parliament, through the discharge, to exercise greater leverage than in the past.

I come now to non-compulsory expenditure. In its resolutions of November and December Parliament complained of what it regarded as unjustified cuts being made by the Council. Clearly the Commission would not have made the proposals it did last June, had it not regarded them as fully justified at that time. But it is now seven months later and the Commission is obliged to take account first of the loss of time, which in certain cases hampers implementation, and, secondly, of the view taken by the budget authority last year. It has not, therefore, touched those lines where the two halves of the authority — Parliament and the Council — were in agreement.

Thirdly, we have had to take account of the legislative situation in the Council. This House is aware that the Commission does not share the view that it is possible, simply by virtue of Article 205 of the Treaty, to implement any and every line of the budget without a separate legal base. In the circumstances, therefore, the Commission has been obliged to reconsider the proposed expenditure levels of last June and in certain cases revise them.

I am saying of course that choices, sometimes painful choices, have had to be made. The Community is committed to reducing the disparities in economic performance between the Member States and to strengthening action in the structural field. There, one of the choices — pleasant rather than a painful choice — has been to retain in full our proposal of 1 200 m EUA in commitment appropriations for the Regional Fund.

*(Applause)*

A significant Community contribution to the social aspects of the adaptation and reorganization required of European industry is another essential ingredient. The Commission has therefore maintained a high level of appropriations for the Social Fund. The proposal we are putting forward reduces our original proposal by only 69 m EUA. We also believe it right to maintain measures such as those specifically aimed at the steel industry where serious problems are being experienced in a number of the Member States. Non-compulsory

## Tugendhat

appropriations in the development field have been fully retained. It has been possible to keep research at a reasonable level. There is the good news. If I might turn to the less-good news, there are two areas, energy and transport, where the Commission would have liked to recommend a higher level of appropriations. For lack of a legal base, we have not felt able to retain the appropriations, either for the energy reserve or for prospecting for hydrocarbons. Energy is nevertheless self-evidently an urgent Community priority and, as the President of the Commission indicated in his programme speech, increased Community resources must be devoted to this sector. As regards transport, the Council has on the table a wide-ranging proposal which the Commission urges it to adopt, whereupon the Commission will at that stage bring forward the necessary financing proposals.

Mr President, the total of our proposed increased non-compulsory expenditure as compared with the draft budget is some 354 m EUA and brings the maximum rate to 25 %. As a result of the measures we have taken, this is of course substantially lower than the increase we proposed last June.

I have set out briefly how and why we have acted as we have done in the various sectors. If a new basis for agreement is to be found for the 1980 budget, there must be realism. Before I conclude, Mr President, let me summarize the salient characteristics of this budget.

The total appropriations in the proposal I am now laying before you amount to 16.4 billion European units of account as compared with 17.9 billion European units of account in the preliminary draft budget of last June. This proposal will nevertheless give the Community a budget somewhat larger than last year — 6 % larger in fact. As compared with last year, the balance of expenditure as between compulsory and non-compulsory expenditure is not merely maintained but is tipped, I am pleased to say, towards non-compulsory expenditure.

*(Applause)*

In 1979 compulsory expenditure — which includes other items besides agriculture — was 80.5 % of the budget. In this proposal it constitutes just under 77 % of total expenditure; a step in the right direction. Of this, as I have said, agricultural guarantee expenditure in 1980 should go down to 63 % as compared with nearly 67 % last year. The proposed agricultural savings are an important element in the process of re-balancing Community expenditure, and the Commission must warn against a situation arising in which, as the result of failure of the Council to make the necessary decisions in the agricultural sector, this balance regresses as compared with last year.

Finally, Mr President, the new VAT rate. On the basis of payment appropriations which will flow from the Commission's proposals, the new rate is 0.68 %, as compared with 0.88 % in the Commission's prelimi-

nary draft budget and 0.78 % in 1979. This is a rate lower than many in this chamber may have expected, and a significant part of the explanation lies in the increased estimates relating to customs duties which are expected now to yield 530 m EUA more than forecast last June. It is also the case that 200 m EUA in payments from the Regional Fund have had to be carried forward. And of course nine months after the preliminary draft of last June, for all the reasons I have just set out, we are proposing a smaller overall budget. This should provide us with considerably increased headroom — just over 3 billion EUA — before the 1 % ceiling is reached. But I must emphasize that whether this happens and whether the European taxpayer gets the relief that this would provide depends to a considerable extent on our agricultural savings package.

In this context, Mr President, let me make one last point. This is the budget proposal as it stands at the moment. When the European Council comes to conclusions in relation to the current discussion of convergence questions, including the UK budget problem, the Commission intends to bring forward to the two halves of the budget authority consequential financial proposals which it hopes will reinforce the proposed level of Community regional and structural expenditure.

Mr President, the Commission's proposal, taken as a whole, represents a better balance of Community expenditure than the recently rejected draft. I have explained what we have done in order to enable the House to see where we have proposed retaining the increases recommended earlier and where we have recommended cuts, as well as the relationship between agricultural and non-agricultural expenditure. But with reference to a point raised by several Members, I must point out that the two halves of the budgetary authority can, if they so agree, take the various elements — notably agriculture — at different speeds. This they are free to do. What, however, is important is the final result. We have put forward a balance which we would recommend to the House and to the Council.

Let me conclude by saying a word about timing. As I said at the outset, the Commission believes that both Parliament and the Council wish to see a budget adopted without any unnecessary delay. Our proposal has been designed to facilitate this. Clearly it is not in the interests of the Community that the present situation be prolonged a moment longer than it need be. All reasonable speed is important because — let me remind the House — in order to realize the extent of the expenditure savings proposed by the Commission in the agricultural sector, it is essential for the necessary decisions to be taken by the Council of Ministers in due time. With every delay, savings are lost, and the savings in the milk sector are the most significant, as the marketing year for milk begins on 1 April. Every day that goes by after 1 April without the necessary

## Tugendhat

decisions being taken means in effect a loss of savings roughly at the rate of 10 m EUA a week. Only a week or two's delay in the effective date would mean that EAGGF expenditure in 1980 would unavoidably rise above the 1979 level.

Similarly in other sectors is an urgent need to get expenditure back on to a normal basis. I am sure this House, as well as the Council, will agree. The Commission will do everything in its power to facilitate adoption of a 1980 budget on a basis acceptable to this House and the Council, the coequal sides of the budgetary authority.

## IN THE CHAIR: MR JAQUET

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange, Chairman of the Committee on Budgets.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in response to a request from both arms of the budgetary authority expressed in December last year, Mr Tugendhat has just presented the Commission's proposals for the 1980 budget. For my part, I should like to thank him for the way he and the Commission have gone about this task, because the revised proposals are based largely on the European Parliament's decisions of 7 November and 13 December last year. I think this House would agree that we should examine these proposals in the light of those decisions, and this being so it seems to me that the Commission's proposals are by and large in line with Parliament's own ideas on the 1980 budget, although it is true that the Council has come to completely different conclusion I feel that it is our responsibility as well to ensure that the decisions on the 1980 budget are taken as quickly as possible, and these decisions must include the whole agricultural price package — with all its legal and political ramifications — as proposed by the Commission. I would therefore address an urgent appeal to the Council to take the same line. If we get embroiled in a supplementary budget for the agricultural sector, we shall be in danger of getting into the same kind of cost spiral as we had last year. I can but underline, therefore, what Mr Tugendhat said on this subject. My appeal is addressed to us — the European Parliament — and to the Council, in other words to the budgetary authority as a whole. We expect the necessary proposals to be forthcoming from the Council as soon as possible; after all, the Council is required to present us with a draft, including — as I just said — proposals relating to the agricultural sector. However, we have our own contribution to make, and we must examine very carefully how much time we need to work out our position on these proposals, bearing in mind the need for quick decisions on the agricultural package.

We must try to get the whole discussion on the 1980 budget over with by May, or June at the latest. We can only advise the Council to bear in mind that, as far as we are concerned, the starting point remains the decisions taken on 7 November and 13 December last year, allowing for certain developments and changes which have taken place in the meantime. In this respect, I believe the Commission has come up with highly sensible proposals.

I should just like to remind you once again that our rejection of the budget was based on four points: firstly, the over-emphasis on the one-sided expenditure on agriculture — in other words, the need we expressed to curb surplus production; secondly, the unhealthy and unreasonable relation between payment appropriations and commitment appropriations for non-compulsory expenditure; thirdly, the budgetization of borrowing and lending; and fourthly, the budgetization of the European Development Fund.

The Commission's proposal also gives the Council a chance to move closer to the European Parliament's position on certain essential points, over and above what was offered during the long night of 12/13 December which Mr Tugendhat referred to just now. Before we get down to the official conciliation discussions on the draft budget for 1980, we should try — on a very informal basis — to come to some understanding, so that neither of the arms of the budgetary authority need fear losing face vis-à-vis the other institution or the public in general. That would give us a chance to get by with only one reading of the budget. This is a proposition to the Council, the condition being that the Council must be quite clear as to its own position and that of the European Parliament and must take steps to find ways of bringing the two positions closer together on the basis of the Commission's proposal.

I do not want to go into any more detail here; that is something which will have to wait for a subsequent stage in the procedure. The Committee on Budgets will be taking a first look at the proposals next Tuesday and Wednesday, and we shall be calling in the other committees as and when required. We have asked the chairmen and rapporteurs of the other committees which were involved in the autumn to attend our meetings so that via its committees and their chairmen and rapporteurs the whole House can take part in this discussion. But, as I said, ladies and gentlemen, time is getting short.

**President.** — For the next 15 minutes, speakers will be allowed only to ask brief questions.

I call Mr Dankert.

**Mr Dankert, rapporteur for the general budget.** — (NL) Mr President, I shall refrain from stating my

**Dankert**

views, because they are very largely the same as those expressed by Mr Lange.

I should like to ask Mr Tugendhat two questions. Firstly, he referred to the great importance of making savings in the dairy sector. I share his view, but I should just like to know whether concrete plans already exist for utilization of the income from the co-responsibility levy. That, after all, will tell us whether savings are in fact being made. I get the impression that the new 'superlevy' will be used to get rid of stocks, which would be at variance with the policy that has been pursued so far on this levy.

My second, brief question refers to the problem of the British contribution to the Community budget. Am I right in assuming from what Mr Tugendhat said that the question of the British contribution can only be solved by way of a supplementary budget?

**President.** — I call Mr Notenboom to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD).

**Mr Notenboom.** — Mr President, I only wish to put one question. On 7 November 1979, in our resolution, paragraph 38, Parliament made its views known on four important points, as mentioned by Mr Lange. The Commission has now included two new issues in the budget debate: agricultural prices and, perhaps indirectly, the problem of the British budgetary contribution. Is the Commission aware, or was it perhaps on purpose, that it has thereby reduced the ability of Parliament to take a decision and has delivered us into the hands of the Council?

**President.** — I call Mr Taylor.

**Mr J. M. Taylor.** — Will the Commissioner please take note that this sector of Parliament generally welcomes his statements. We are pleased that the proportion of agricultural expenditure is down, but we wonder what chance those proposals have of surviving the attentions of the Council. Would he please bear in mind that we welcome his remarks concerning borrowing and lending and the Regional Fund, but that we have regrets about transport and energy, and would he not agree that in the light of the less stable world situation energy considerations are more rather than less urgent now than at the time of the December budget rejection? Does he not agree that some good may come from the Council of Agriculture Ministers deliberating on farm prices in parallel with the Council of Budget Ministers deliberating on the budget and that, provided the budget remains indivisible, we have a genuine prospect of a uniquely realistic budget in the first instance with, at most, a token supplementary budget in the autumn?

Finally, would the Commissioner be good enough to tell the Council, the most powerful institution in the Community, that if it is bighearted enough and sufficiently generous in spirit to move towards these Commission proposals it will be in this Parliament the most popular Council of Ministers ever?

*(Laughter)*

IN THE CHAIR: MR POUL MØLLER

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr De Goede.

**Mr De Goede.** — *(NL)* Mr President, Mr Tugendhat had a number of things to say, and I was particularly interested in what he said about energy, transport and agriculture. However, I was even more struck by his lack of reference to ways of combating unemployment and to the employment issue in general. I should greatly appreciate it if Mr Tugendhat would give us a little more detailed information on this point here in this House. After all, if there is one thing that is of real interest to the people of Europe, in the light of the threatened increase in unemployment, it is an answer — however brief — to this question.

**President.** — I call Mr Nord.

**Mr Nord.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I had intended to ask a number of questions, but most of these have since been asked by other Members. There is, however, one question I should like to put to Mr Tugendhat, and that concerns transport policy. If I understood him correctly, he said that, for lack of a legal base, no substantial appropriations had been set aside for Community transport policy. Perhaps Mr Tugendhat could tell us a little more about this and whether the Commission proposes to do nothing about this situation. If not, what prospects are there for developing this Community transport policy, which is something we all want?

**President.** — I call Mr Ansquer.

**Mr Ansquer** — *(F)* Mr Commissioner, ladies and gentlemen, you have presented us today, Mr Tugendhat, with the new proposals for the 1980 budget, although the budgetary documents are still in preparation. We thus appreciate the difficulties involved in this unusual procedure and would like to thank you for the effort you have made. Following your statement I have four questions to ask. The first is this what

**Ansquer**

is the legal nature of the Commission's proposals? I think this needs to be explained in order to clarify the course of the budgetary procedure.

Then I have two questions concerning the United Kingdom contribution. We know that the Commission is obliged to insert a declaration on the United Kingdom contribution into the draft budget. What, therefore, is the legal nature of this declaration? And in this connection, does the Commission intend to set the problem of the United Kingdom contribution in the framework of operations in favour of the least prosperous countries, in particular Ireland?

Lastly, my final question is both a question and an observation. Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, if my interpretation of the vote taken by this House last December is correct, this rejection was voted in order to improve the 1980 budget. However, after we had heard Mr Tugendhat explain that agricultural expenditure was being stabilized — in other words that savings were being made on agricultural expenditure — and that there were to be cuts in certain agricultural products, he went on to say that the overall budget was less than the previous one. I ask myself, therefore, whether we have not been taken for a ride — and in putting this question, ladies and gentlemen, I leave you with another one: this being so, will the 1980 budget, in its new form, in fact be adopted?

**President.** — I call Mr Cottrell.

**Mr Cottrell.** — Mr President, I was very sorry to hear the Commissioner imply in his statement that he feels transport may be one of the neglected areas in the new budget. It is, as most of us in this House realize, one of the Cinderellas of Community policy, and I happen to be a very keen supporter of the proposed common transport infrastructure policy. I wonder if the Commissioner might be able to give the House some indication whether there will be real progress in this area within the life of this Parliament. I believe that this is something that the House itself very much desires and also something that the people of Europe are looking forward to seeing real progress in.

**President.** — I call Mr Tugendhat.

**Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, I was asked a number of questions, some of which I will seek to answer as fully as I can, others of which it may be necessary for me to answer at greater length during the course of the proceedings of the Committee on Budgets and in the reading which will take place in this House.

I would, however, like to begin, if I may, by thanking Mr Lange, the chairman of the Committee on Bud-

gets, and other Members who talked favourably about some of our propositions and about the balance.

I come first to Mr Dankert, who asked the first question. He asked in particular about the coresponsibility levy, and I am grateful to him for having raised this question first of all in the Committee on Budgets last night, which has given me a chance to produce a fuller answer than might otherwise have been possible this morning. The 1.5 % tax yields 122 million European units of account and the super-tax yields — on the basis of our proposals, of course — 330 million European units of account. Both those figures are, of course, dependent on the arrangements coming into force on 1 April. If there is a delay after that date, clearly there will be less money.

I was asked whether the proceeds of the coresponsibility levy would be spent on special measures. The answer to that question is, No, they simply come as a reduction of the total EAGGF expenditure. If they are not adopted, or adopted later at a lower rate, then of course the VAT element in the Community's own resources will have to compensate for the shortfall.

Mr Dankert also asked me about the British, as indeed did Mr Ansquer, whose questions I will come to a little later on. Mr Dankert asked me whether the British problem can only be solved through the means of a supplementary budget. The answer to that is, No, it will depend very much on the rate of progress achieved in the solution of this problem; obviously, if a solution comes sooner, then we should be able to incorporate our proposal in this budget. Of course it would be for the budgetary authority to determine what happened thereafter, but we should be able to incorporate a proposal in this budget. If it came later, then, of course, it might have to be done by means of a supplementary budget.

Mr Notenboom asked me an important question. May I say first how grateful I am to him for putting his question in the English language. I commend him on the skill with which he speaks my mother tongue. I do not, however, find myself at all in agreement with the proposition that he put forward.

I would like to make something very clear. The budget is not a static instrument. I believe, and I believe that it is the view of the House, that the budget should embrace all Community income and expenditure, that it should include the financial implementation of Community policies as well as being a policy document in itself. And I think that if we are producing a budgetary proposal in February, we must take account of events that have occurred between November and February. If we had excluded from the budget things which are public knowledge, propositions which have already been before the House, that would indeed have reduced the value of the budget, it would have made the budget a partial rather than a comprehensive document. And as the powers of the Parliament

## Tugendhat

depend very much indeed on the extent to which they can bring influence to bear on the budget, and the extent to which they can assert their influence against the Council through a creative tension, it seems to me very important indeed that the budget should be a comprehensive document. The way in which the budgetary authority then deals with that document is, of course, a matter for the budgetary authority. As I have made clear, the budgetary authority can, if it wishes, deal with the two parts or with different parts at different speeds. But certainly I believe it is our duty to provide the Parliament with a comprehensive document. And it is because we wish to build up Parliament's powers that I took that view. Certainly, one thing I hope I shall never be guilty of is an attempt to reduce Parliament's powers, and I think Mr Notenboom knows me well enough to know that.

Mr Taylor asked me whether I felt that energy had become more vital in the time that has passed since the rejection of the draft budget. I certainly agree with him that energy has become more vital, and that is why the President of the Commission laid such particular stress upon it during his speech. Mr de Goede suggested that I had left the employment question out of the budget, that I had not referred to the employment question. That is certainly not the case, because, of course, I specifically mentioned that we were seeking to maintain the Social Fund at a very high level indeed. In fact the proposal which we have put forward for the Social Fund, which is directed quite specifically at the problems to which he referred, is 931 million units of account: that is 69 million less than in our original proposal, but 55 million more than in the draft budget that the Parliament rejected. In addition, of course, I mentioned our support for the social measures for steel. I mentioned how we were now recommending that these should be non-compulsory expenditure, and I know very well both from the Committee on Budgets and from other committees, as well as from the personal representations made by Members from many parts of the House, that great importance is attached to that particular measure, and I was pleased to be able to have it in.

Mr Nord asked me a question about transport, and indeed he was not the only one to do so. We attach, as I said in my speech, great importance to transport and we wish very much that we had been able to put an appropriation into the budget. As I made quite clear, the fact that we did not do so did not mean that our devotion to this particular priority has been in any way diminished. We did not put an appropriation in because, owing to the absence of a legal basis, the money could not be spent. We urged the Council to adopt a legal basis, and as soon as it has done so I can assure the House that it is our intention to bring forward an appropriate financial instrument to the budgetary authority without any delay at all.

Mr Ansquer then asked me a range of questions, some of which are a trifle complicated for a brief answer of

the sort that I am giving now, but I will do my best to provide him at any rate with some of the answers.

First of all he asked me about the legal nature of the proposal that I was bringing forward today. What I have brought forward today is a confirmation of the preliminary draft budget. I made that clear in my initial remarks. The Commission takes the view that the budgetary procedure can proceed normally on the basis of this proposal. Naturally there is no obligation on the two halves of the budgetary authority to have two readings. They can, if they wish, decide to have one reading; that is, as I have said before, a matter for the budgetary authority itself to determine. But what we have done is to produce something which confirms the preliminary draft budget in order, as I said in my speech, to facilitate the implementation of the budget.

Mr Ansquer asked whether I thought — at least I thought he was asking whether I thought — that what we were bringing forward now was an improvement on the draft budget that was rejected in December. Certainly, as I said in my speech, I do believe it is an improvement on the draft budget. I think it is an improvement both in terms of agriculture and in terms of non-agriculture.

I was also asked a question about the British. Well I answered that mainly in relation to Mr Dankert's question. Of course the precise details of whatever may be brought forward there depend on a number of events, and perhaps in the spirit in which Mr Notenboom spoke my language, I can only say to Mr Ansquer, 'on verra'.

(Laughter)

6. *Fight against drug abuse — Public health policy*  
(continuation)

**President.** — The next item is the continuation of the joint debate on:

— oral question with debate (Doc. 1-647/79), tabled by Mrs Squarcialupi and Mr Ceravolo on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, to the Commission:

Subject: Fight against drugs

In view of the progressive spread of drug abuse, particularly amongst young people and often involving hard drugs, which is leading to a worrying increase in the number of deaths and which calls for resolute and appropriate action by the political authorities — and whereas drug abuse can only be really countered effectively by taking measures in the social field;

THE COMMISSION IS ASKED

whether it recognizes the need for it to take urgent measures such as:

## President

1. A study into new forms of action to combat the traffic in drugs at every stage by means of increased coordination between the Member States themselves and with the countries which produce drugs;
2. A comparison of the experiments carried out both within and outside the Community to fight drug dependency, to assess which of them are worth following up, together with an increase in research including the development of an appropriate action programme;
3. A review of international agreements on soft drugs in order to harmonize legislation to take account of the new situation;
4. Action, using all available means, against those forms of drug dependency about which so much has been said but little practical action taken, i.e. smoking and alcoholism which are just as dangerous as other forms.

— oral question with debate (Doc. 1-701/79), tabled by Mrs Schleicher, Mr Albers, Mr Ghergo, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mrs Maij-Weggen, Mr Verroken, Mr Estgen, Mr Michel, Mr Mertens and Mr Nordlohne, to the Commission:

Subject: Public health policy in the EEC

At the second meeting of the Council of the Public Health Ministers of the Community on 16 November 1978, it was specified that the Commission should submit detailed proposals on health protection in the Community as soon as possible.

The following fields were to be covered:

- means of limiting the over-consumption of medicines;
- dangers of smoking;
- vaccinations; mutual aid following large-scale disasters;
- health cards.

Will the Commission state:

1. The practical proposals which have so far been submitted in these individual fields?
2. What studies have already been completed or are still being carried out on the above mentioned themes?
3. Whether it has already formulated measures for the improvement of public health standards in the Community?

I call Mrs Seibel-Emmerling to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mrs Seibel-Emmerling.** — (D) Mr President, the Socialist Group very much welcomes this debate, which has come about at the instigation of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. We are not blind to the fact that more and more young people in our countries, deliberately or simply out of apathy, are opting out of society, rejecting our way of life. Drug-taking is only one form of this opting-out process, and I am afraid

we shall be faced with many other manifestations unless we succeed in making the future more attractive to young people, including those to whom drug-taking seems a tempting way out of their problem, which should by rights be ours to solve. Throughout the Community the help we offer these drop-outs is pitifully and shamefully inadequate. Clearly, a society in which it is good form to consume alcohol, which shows no sense of responsibility in its consumption of medicines and in which our use of nicotine gives even babes in arms an early taste of the sort of environment they can look forward to is not exactly a good advertisement for abstinence from drugs. It is high time we got down to discussing this question, but it is also high time something was done.

We know what has been done so far in our Member States, and we feel that these national efforts will have to be better coordinated and harmonized. What we have in mind is not just the more obvious anti-drugs measures, but above all striking at the social roots of the problem, to give our young people a chance of survival. There must be a change in the position of young people; they need better job prospects and better conditions at school and at home; they must be given suitable opportunities for work and leisure. I should like, at this juncture, to present officially our amendments to the committee's motion for a resolution. We must learn from each other's experience not only as regards the prevention of drug abuse and how best to inform and educate people but also on the possible forms of therapy and the problem of how to motivate people to take advantage of them. In other words, we must harmonize our efforts, and we ought to reach agreement on what dangerous drugs should be banned. Because heavy penalties are involved, we cannot go on with the present situation regarding movements across borders within the Community. We need a register of drugs for the whole Community, and we should also have a prescriptions register which will prevent doctors from contributing, for whatever motives, to the increased consumption of drugs.

We must work together and do everything in our power to put an end to the drugs traffic; and we should show no mercy to those people who brutally destroy the life and health of their fellow human beings for reasons of profit. We must also do everything possible to improve the position of those countries where drug-producing crops are cultivated illegally, and this will include making up the incomes of people who have so far had to make a living from these illegal crops. We must open our markets to their substitute crops, and we shall have to give some thought to how best to provide generous aid. This is something which is rightly the job of the European Community, because it is we who are responsible for these things. We cannot expect the Member States to go it alone. All these measures and many more, which I have not been able to mention because time is too short, must be tackled in a Community framework.

## Scibel-Emmerling

Let me conclude with a personal remark. I do not believe that this House will cut a very credible figure in the fight against the classic drugs from the East if at the same time it supports the West's own drugs by subsidizing such things as the production of tobacco and spirits.

## IN THE CHAIR: MRS DE MARCH

*Vice-President*

**President** — I call Mrs Gaiotti de Biase to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD).

**Mrs Gaiotti de Biase.** — (I) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, we must be grateful to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection for having raised once again before this House the serious problem of drug consumption, which is taking on more and more alarming proportions, and for having done so in full knowledge of the fact that this is only one stage in a job which must be continued later. I should, however, like to express regret that the Committee on Youth and Culture has not yet been consulted on this problem:

I said "raised once again" because the topic had already been discussed in some detail by the European Parliament as long ago as 1972, on the basis of a report drawn up by Mr Laudrin. So, as early as 1972 the Members of this House were aware of the seriousness of the problem. But the Commission of the European Communities unfortunately did not then take those steps that needed to be taken and which Parliament recommended. It probably considered it more desirable, for legal and other reasons, to leave the affair to inter-government cooperation. We must record, however, that the results of this inter-government cooperation are still very far from being satisfactory, as is shown by the official statistics and, even more dramatically, the unofficial statistics, on arrests of drug traffickers and on the number of deaths.

Nevertheless, these statistics only constitute the tip of the iceberg. Many drug tragedies remain unknown. The connection between these phenomena and the other phenomena of destabilization, uncertainty and disorder in our society, though very amply documented, does not always appear in all its clarity. We cannot ignore the increasing number of crimes, often brutal ones, carried out by persons under the influence of drugs or with the aim of obtaining further doses.

In recent times we have witnessed an increase in drug addiction and, what is more serious, the spreading of

drug addiction over a wider geographic area and a containing reduction in the age at which young people get involved with drugs, above all in schools at all levels.

The causes of this are many, and they are not difficult to single out, but they are harder and harder to deal with directly. To be sure, the national authorities do all they can to prevent this very real tragedy from spreading, but their efforts cannot produce satisfactory results if we do not get it firmly into our heads that the social phenomena in question, precisely because they are not merely national, precisely because they have common characteristics, precisely because they are typical of all our industrialized societies, require in my opinion common strategies and measures designed to be both preventive and curative.

With this initiative, Parliament expects something more from the Commission than has so far been done. The time has come to make Community measures part of the national legislation and to give vigorous encouragement to scientific research into medicines and into the various therapies involved, as well as, to give greater support to experiments, including experiments of a social nature, carried out by therapeutic bodies and groups of young people as an act of solidarity in the face of phenomena of this scale and importance.

We ask the Commission — and we shall commit ourselves to this — that this series of measures should have two fundamental characteristics: the utmost attentiveness and readiness to stimulate this research and to accept all possible results and the utmost rigour and seriousness — because in these matters we cannot gamble with young people's futures — towards superficial and permissive attitudes which tend to play down the gravity of the matter and fob us off with permissiveness, oversimplification and, often, irresponsibility.

**President.** — I call Mr Newton Dunn to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mr Newton Dunn.** — Madam President, I have the honour to speak in this debate as a member of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection and also on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

In the European Democratic Group we do not wish to lose sight of the appalling and degrading consequences which come from heavy smoking and from addiction to alcohol. We therefore welcome the question from our colleagues in the European People's Party which follows up the meeting of the nine Health Ministers in November 1978. However, in the very short time available to me, a mere five minutes, I have to concentrate on the urgent, growing and very serious problem of hard-drug abuse in the Community. That is to say, the abuse deriving from heroin, cocaine and marijuana.

Newton Dunn

Madam President, I should like to ask the Members here present, and those who are listening, two questions. Mrs Squarzialupi has already told us that 1 000 young people die each year in the Community and that they are getting younger every year. Have the Members considered what is happening in the schools to which their children are sent? Can we be quite sure that they have not yet already been offered free samples of heroin or of soft drugs? Did you, Madam President, share my horror at hearing of the report of a school in France where drug-pushers were waiting outside the gates of the school to give free samples to the children? All our children are wide open to abuse. We have to act quickly.

Secondly, Madam President, I wonder how many Members still believe that the real drug problem rests in the United States and not in the Community? Do those Members know that deaths from heroin in the Federal Republic of Germany are running at a rate 8 times the death-rate in the United States for a comparable size of population? Eight times as many *pro rata*: It is incredible! The drug problem is here, with us, in the Community. Drugs are coming in from many sources: the French connection, the Chinese connection in the United Kingdom, Turkish immigrant workers in West Germany, Iranians fleeing from that troubled country where they are not allowed to take out their money, so they take it out in hard drugs instead. All these, and other sources, contribute to the flow of narcotics coming into our Community. Madam President, we are creating a Community of free movement for people and goods. It is also becoming a community of free movement for narcotics. We therefore need Community action to support and reinforce the fight against trafficking in our continent. We need education for our young children and for young people to alert them to the dangers. What starts as glue-sniffing — and that is dangerous in itself — and accepting free samples leads on the crime and prostitution in the desperate search for money to pay for their next 'fix'.

Young people should also be told that marijuana, a so-called soft drug, harms their sexual prowess. The private cannabis smoker should be told that his perception of time and distance is altered after smoking one joint, so that he is no longer safe behind the wheel of a motor-car.

Madam President, I turn all too briefly and quickly to the problem of the producers — the poppy-growers. The United Nations coordinates the fight to persuade farmers in certain areas of the world — the Golden Triangle and the Golden Crescent — to change their crops from opium to more useful products. It is an incredibly difficult task to persuade them to change. Results so far show that it is not sufficient to take away the poppy-seeds and give them other seeds to grow. Instead, what is required is a comprehensive programme of health care, education and crop substitution over a widespread area in order to change the

traditional lifepatterns of whole communities. This is a major and expensive task. Yet, Madam President, three Member States of our Community failed to donate one single penny to the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control in 1979, and the other six States of our Community paid a total between them of 540 000 dollars. Look at it in another way, fellow Members: the nine Member States paid on behalf of the 410 Members of this Parliament a grand total of 80 American cents. Not 80 cents for each of us, but a total of 80 cents for all 410 of us. It is absolutely scandalous! And it is no wonder that we are losing the battle against the drug traffickers. I would personally like to see an entry in the 1981 Community budget of a contribution from us to the United Nations fund.

Madam President, it is our duty as Members here to raise the level of public awareness in the Community. It is our duty to spark the Community into co-ordinated action. We have an epidemic on our hands. My group does not want to have a little debate on the problem and leave it at that. We want action, and urgently. Hence we have tabled, and I formally move it now, a motion to wind up the debate.

Madam President, my group admires Mrs Squarzialupi's motion on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, which I personally supported. However, we believe that that resolution is not strong enough and therefore we have tabled our own resolution, which is even stronger. Mrs Bonino's motion is entirely unacceptable: tea and coffee are included in the category of drugs, and they are calling in their resolution for cannabis to be legalized, which is scandalous. I also formally move my personal amendment to Mrs Squarzialupi's motion, in which I call for a committee of this Parliament to study the problem.

Madam President, I conclude by inviting all Members to share our concern at this urgent problem and to support the resolution when it is voted on tomorrow.

**President.** — (F) I call Mrs Pruvot to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic group.

**Mrs Pruvot.** — (F) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to begin by launching an urgent appeal to all my colleagues. Drugs spare no section or category of society. Any young person may one day be tempted. Hashish and marijuana are neither on the left nor on the right, they simply exist.

Drug addiction hits our youth hard, that same unfettered youth which, wherever it may be, represents the future of our world. Could we not, on this one occasion, work together to oppose this terrible blight, which we all condemn and of which we are all afraid?

The truth is that this evil is spreading, and that we must take definite and prompt action, care for the vic-

**Pruvot**

tims of this scourge and track down the traffickers. But before all else, we must strike at its very roots, at the reasons for its spreading.

For drug addiction is not a perversion, the young person who takes drugs is 'going through a difficult period'. Perhaps he has difficulties at school or in communicating with people, perhaps he lacks confidence in the future or wishes to escape from a difficult environment. According to specialists in this field, family problems must take most of the blame for drug use by young people. The lack of something to do and unemployment are also factors which foster drug addiction. On the other hand, this does not mean that a return to full employment would be any more likely to remove teenagers' doubts and dissatisfaction.

But what we really need is to pursue a real youth policy, a social and cultural policy which young people will be glad to take part in and, why not, even enthuse over. We should set up an educational system and vocational training methods which prepare young people for a working life in which they will have the chance to live full, rich lives and not merely 'exist'. This is really the basic problem. Even if this is above all a question for individual nations to decide, it is, in my opinion, the problem which should receive top priority from the Community.

We will often have cause to return to this problem, since Europe's agricultural, industrial and economic future lies with our youth and the culture we give them. But world-wide rampant drug addiction obviously requires immediate and drastic action if we are to avert disaster.

Proliferating drug use, by secondary school children for example, is an exceptionally serious matter; our society and our European Community have no right to ignore it.

Doctors working in the field refuse to lump all drugs together, and the methods applied to fighting their use must, of course, differ in the same way. Tobacco and alcohol are permitted drugs, and we must absolutely do something about this situation, but it would be sheer folly to add others to the list.

As for France, it is against any lifting of restrictions on the use of cannabis. Last November, during the fifth Ministerial Conference on European cooperation in the fight against drug abuse in Stockholm, France officially restated her 'opposition to any new decision which might lead to the legalization of so-called soft drugs'. This opinion was unanimously shared by our partners in the 'Pompidou Group'. This group, formed in 1971 at George Pompidou's instigation, is made up of the Nine and Sweden and has set itself the task of organizing European cooperation through the exchange of data and information on all the facets of the drug phenomenon. Any legal and administrative action taken by France to fight drug abuse is generally

based on a desire to help drug addicts rather than punish them, while ensuring that drug traffickers are severely punished. The emphasis is placed on preventive action in schools and elsewhere, on informing young people and their families and on training those people who will be responsible for dealing with drug questions at different levels. Moreover, we play an active part in international organizations whose aims are to restrict the growing of the opium poppy, to set up rules for the manufacture of and trading in opium, and to classify psychotropic substances. Statistics prove that as a result my country is less drug-ridden than other European countries, although drug addiction is on the increase there too.

Up to now, and in spite of proposals already put forward, in particular by the Liberal group in 1972, nothing has yet been done by the Community to alleviate this disaster.

Today, we give our wholehearted support to the step taken by Mrs Squarcialupi and Mr Ceravolo on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.

On the basis of Article 235, since we can treat the drug problem as a social one and uphold that the fight against drug abuse contributes to the improvement of living conditions — this objective figures in the preamble to the Treaties — the institutions of the Community have a major and essential role to play: they must give impetus to national governments to speed up and strengthen international cooperation in this area; they must coordinate any preventive, health or legal measures taken by each of the Member States; and, above all, they must enable European youth to believe in Europe and with new-found confidence in its future to have the desire, the all-out desire to live.

**President.** — I call Mrs Chouraqui to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

**Mrs Chouraqui.** — (*F*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to raise here today a vigorous protest, both as a woman, a citizen and a mother, but also of course, as a member of the European Parliament, against the increase in drug taking, of hard or soft drugs, in Europe and especially in my own country. I must protest in particular at those people, who, in Europe, and especially in France, distribute tracts, stating their opinion that, on the one hand, the sale of soft drugs should be liberalized, and on the other that medical supervision should be stepped up. It is a contradiction in terms to be both for the open sale of drugs and stringent medical supervision. I do not see either how one can distinguish soft drugs from hard drugs, and, in my opinion, this distinction is not based on any sound medical evidence.

### Chouraqui

We know that a person very quickly passes from psychological dependence to physical dependence and finally to complete drug addiction. And the fact is, that drug addiction poses a serious threat today to the European Community, and the inhabitants of the world at large, since 84 % of drug takers are unfortunately under 25.

Vulnerable youngsters turn into sick people unable to face up to the ordinary everyday problems of life. How can they possibly revert to being responsible men and women, able to play a major and active role in the life of the community?

What can the European Community do? The measures included in the Treaty establishing the European Community do not provide explicitly for the fight against drug addiction. And in the past precious little attention was paid to this social problem.

Each of the Member States is faced with this distressing problem, which has such wide-ranging social implications. Urgent action must be taken on a Community and worldwide scale. At Community level, Article 235 of the Treaty provides the necessary basis for action. This article stipulates that: 'If action by the Community should prove necessary to attain, in the course of the operation of the common market, one of the objectives of the Community and this Treaty has not provided the necessary powers, the Council shall, acting unanimously on a proposal from the Commission and after consulting the Assembly, take the appropriate measures.' In pursuance of Article 235, the Community is thus empowered to act. What are the possible solutions? We should remember the proposals made by President Pompidou in 1971. The main points of those proposals are the following: strengthening of action by police and customs in this area; elaboration of a common policy on the fight against illegal drug traffic; setting up of regional specialist centres, with the task of defining and applying practical measures; harmonization of evaluation techniques used by experts; joint development of better methods of prevention and medical treatment, and finally, as far as possible, harmonization of the penalties imposed in the Member States.

Of course, other points need to be clarified. Agreement should in particular be reached on controlling the source of supply of drugs, that is to say anything which has to do with the growing of plants used in drug manufacture.

Finally, let me mention that the Community should be prepared to finance an educative programme aimed at warning the public, and especially young people, of the dangers of drug addiction and also of the excessive taking of medicines. We must help the hapless victims of narcotics traffic, I mean the drug addicts. We must not treat them as outcasts from society, but help them to overcome their slavery to drugs, so that they can revert to being useful members of society.

In conclusion, I would like to draw your attention to two important seminars, organized in Ireland in 1979 by the Health Education Office. Their debates and conclusions will shortly be published. The themes were 'Alternatives to drugs' and 'Prevention through information'. The outcome of these debates should in my opinion be studied at Community level. There is also a case for looking urgently into ways of organizing, at the same level, a seminar on the problems of the drug traffic and on information concerning the dangers of drug addiction.

I firmly believe that in the present international crisis, which is shaking Europe and the world at large, we must prepare our young people for a life of effort, of self-discipline and perhaps even of struggle — and above all, we must help them not give up in the face of the dangers of everyday life.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Madam President, it is first and foremost disgraceful — and I repeat it — that on a topic of this sort, as on others, the political groups in this Parliament should agree to oblige speakers to take part in debates in which they have only three or four minutes' speaking time, and I wanted to thank you, Madam President, for the tolerance which you showed towards the Member who has just finished speaking. However, this is no way to conduct a debate.

I just wanted to say, in the limited speaking time allowed me, that when politics takes leave of science to follow people's pet hates, we cannot expect the result to be anything other than disastrous. Madam President, what does science understand by the word 'drug'? According to the sciences of pharmacology and pharmaceuticals, alcohol, tea, caffeine and, above all, all the numerous tranquilizers and stimulants turned out by the vast international drug industry, must definitely be considered drugs. What are we concerned with here? We are concerned with the drug addict: that is to say, with someone who is addicted to and dependent upon drugs and who, to this extent, is dangerous both to himself and to others. For the politician, for the believer in positive law, for society as a whole, what is really frightening is the awful irresponsibility of the drug addict and the danger he represents for himself and for others.

What then, Madam President, does all this mean? That the drugs we are concerned with are the drugs that deprive the user of his freedom, not the ones that injure his health — because strychnine and a thousand other things also injure health. A drug is something that deprives a man of his freedom of action and his responsibility and which becomes a social danger.

But are there not such things as soft drugs and hard drugs? Is alcohol a soft drug? We are perpetually

**Pannella**

debating wine production in order to produce more and more and consume more and more. Well, alcohol is responsible for 50 % of the deaths in road accidents. On the other hand, a hard drug like heroin is responsible for a thousand deaths in Europe. There is no doubt it is abominable and dangerous, but you are rather inconsistent: tobacco and wine give rise to dependency and addiction; they also have physical effects and therefore they are drugs. The derivatives of Indian hemp, on the other hand, in the opinion of the World Health Organization and according to 90 years of scientific studies which have never been disproved, will do all the harm that you like but they will not cause physical dependency or addiction or cause physical damage, nor do they make a man a danger to himself and to others. It is said that there is a risk of graduating from one drug to another. But, Madam President, there is the same kind of link as there was in the 30s in the United States between consuming alcohol during the period of prohibition and indulging in illegal betting during the same period. Since the bookmakers and boot-leggers, applying the law of profit to both alcohol and clandestine betting, made it easy for anyone to break the law, it often happened that somebody who indulged in illicit drinking then went on to indulge in illicit betting. This kind of relationship is created by the law. Hashish and marijuana are non-drugs, whereas tobacco and alcohol, produced by your capitalistic profit-motivated industries, are all murderous products and are habit-forming, not to speak of other effects. What then, Madam President, should be the reaction of a serious-minded Parliament? It should not be that of letting itself be carried away by its own pet hates, bringing in diabolical influence, as if drugs were dangerous philtres; instead it should simply attempt to influence the economic and social laws that are responsible for the spread of hard drugs, whether these hard drugs are alcohol or heroin.

And what, you supporters of the free market and the law of profit in this House, what is the incentive to indulge in hard drugs if it is not the profit that arises from it as a consequence of prohibition? In the 30s, during the period of prohibition in America, there were alcoholics and a profiteering Mafia grew up. You, by wishing to penalize drug-takers, are doing nothing more than bringing the economic law of profit into the picture as a motive for this industry of death. It is no accident that in Brussels the man responsible for suppressing the drug trade was at the same time the principal drug trafficker. Nor was it an accident, Mrs Chouraqui and Mr Debré, that in General de Gaulle's France the DST was caught red-handed supporting and financing its own international activities by protecting the international heroin Mafia. And everyone knows what sort of thing went on in socialist-governed Marseilles, where the highly respectable Guerini brothers were the ones who protected this kind of traffic.

So I accuse everybody who continues to maintain, in the face of the scientific evidence, that hashish is a soft

drug of irresponsible demagogy: hashish is in fact a non-drug. So, if you are really not hypocrites and criminals, have the consistency to recommend criminal laws against that very alcohol which you want to see produced in greater quantities, which you support at every level and which is responsible for social disasters in France, in Italy and in Germany, if it is true, and it is, that 70 % . . .

**President.** — Mr Pannella, you rightly pointed out a short while ago that Mrs Chouraqui had been granted two extra minutes. I took note of that. You were given three and a half minutes and you have now been speaking for six minutes. I should therefore be glad if you would conclude.

**Mr Pannella.** — (*F*) . . . I have finished, but let there be no misunderstanding. Madam President, I welcomed your tolerance but I was not pedantically counting every single additional minute that you had given the previous speaker, and I should like to thank you for having been generous with me as well. But I cannot help noticing that in this Parliament, which is expressing through the conservative Members of this House its respect for the institution of the family and the great traditional values, there are only two of these Conservatives present to carry on this demagogy, whereas they are the very ones who benefit from the profits created by the drug industry in the way their society is organized. They come here with the intention of attacking one or two adolescents who smoke a few cigarettes and who are at the mercy of drug traffickers as a direct consequence of the laws laid down by these conservatives and, not to forget the other side, Mr Marchais's conservatives as well.

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

**Mr Newton Dunn.** — Under Rule 28, which concerns speaking-time, would you tell me how much time is now left for the Technical Coordination Group, please?

**President.** — No time remains for the Technical Coordination Group, which has had far more time than was originally allotted to it.

I call Mrs Spaak.

**Mrs Spaak.** — (*F*) After Mr Pannella's speech, I would like to bring the discussion down to earth somewhat, and approach it more calmly, by making a very few brief general remarks, Madam President.

Everyone admits that there has been a radical change in the sociology of drug use. There are more products

Spaak

on the market, at lower prices, and drug use has become more widespread. All these factors mean that there has been a dramatic increase in the number of accidents involving drugs. Although larger and larger amounts of drugs are being seized, the effect is not to slow down drug use, quite the contrary.

Within this new context, I subscribe wholeheartedly to the terms of Mrs Scarcialuppi's oral question, and I would like to stress two points. In his speech, Commissioner Vredeling emphasized the fact that it is difficult for the Nine to pursue a common policy in the fight against drugs. I am nonetheless convinced that as regards prevention and presentation of the facts to the public, a policy of close cooperation between our different countries must be undertaken. In countries such as ours, with their extremely large educational systems, action of this kind would be sure to be effective and we could learn from each others' experiences.

Now I would like to address myself to Mr Pannella in particular, but I can see that once he has finished speaking, he pays little attention to other Members' speeches. (*Applause from certain quarters*) The motion for a resolution tabled by Mrs Bonino and a few other members, which aims at removing cannabis from the list of dangerous drugs and legalizing its manufacture and sale to the public, seems to me — to use a euphemism — to show a lack of caution. The experts are, to say the least, not agreed on the toxic effects of this substance when compared, for example, with those of alcohol. Some biologists have established that a single dose of cannabis remains present in the body for thirty days after it has been taken, whereas a single dose of alcohol disappears in a matter of hours. In saying this, I am not, of course, defending alcohol consumption, but do recommend that we exercise extreme caution in this matter.

Lastly, I would ask you, Mr Commissioner, to give us the findings of the meeting of the Pompidou Group, held in Stockholm in November 1979.

**President.** — I call Mrs Gredal.

**Mrs Gredal.** — (*DK*) Madam President, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection has addressed a series of questions to the Commission regarding drugs. I should like to speak on behalf of myself and of various other members of my group and to begin by saying that I regard this question as extremely serious. In my previous job, I worked for many years with drug problems. However, I should also like to advise Parliament against taking up this problem as a particular matter for the Community. This subject has always been one about which many people will talk at great length but, unfortunately, very little gets done. If we look around in this House we see that the previous speakers have left already; they have said what they had to say, and they

have no further wish to listen to what is going on. This is in sharp contrast to the length at which people always tend to speak on this subject since there is always too little action.

As I said, I should like to advise against taking this matter up at Community level since it is not one which can be dealt with within the borders of nine countries, as it is much more far-reaching. In my view, we in the Nine must use our energy on many other things within the social sector. Since we now have other bodies which deal with this problem, I think we should make more effort than we have in the past to strengthen these bodies.

Many of those who have spoken here today have done nothing to encourage their own governments to do more work on combatting the drugs problem, since this is something which could have been done in a different way for many years. I am thinking here of the Pompidou group in which I myself have taken part. This Pompidou group includes representatives of the nine countries plus Sweden and is the only body which provides all the possibilities to do something at Community level and beyond, which I regard as very important. This Pompidou group is to come under the Council of Europe in the future, which means that the 21-country group will be able to work on this problem. I regard it as a far better solution that all these countries should work on this problem.

In addition, there is the United Nations which has also worked on this problem for many years. I cannot claim that any of these bodies has solved the problem since it is an extremely difficult one. We should not think, however, because the nine countries here in Parliament are intending to work together that we will be able to solve the drug problem in Europe. This will not be possible.

As you are no doubt aware, we were recently in the United States as part of a delegation and that country too was in favour of cooperating with the Community on this problem. We made it clear that, in our view, the bodies I have just mentioned should also be involved in this work. The United States was also in favour of this idea. My appeal today, therefore, is that it would not be a good idea for the Community to take this matter up as an exclusively Community matter. I recommend to the many members of Parliament who speak at such length and so heatedly regarding the drugs problem that they should take this matter up in their own countries and support the work aimed at stamping out drug abuse via the existing bodies. I think we have a much bigger job to do in these areas.

I should like to make just one point. As we know, one of the most effective ways of tackling the problem of drug abuse is to make those parts of the world producing drugs change over to other production. We must, I think, acknowledge the fact that the United States has done most in financial terms to encourage a change-

## Gredal

over to alternative production in these countries. Europe on the other hand has been somewhat reluctant to spend large sums.

As I said, we should, in my view, use our efforts in the bodies which already exist, and concentrate here in Parliament on other social problems of which, I think, there are plenty within commissioner Vredeling's competency. We have no need to go looking for further jobs to do.

As regards the other subject which we are discussing jointly — i.e. public health policy — I should just like to add a few remarks. In my view, health policy is outside the scope of the Community. Indeed, I am surprised to find the term 'Council of Health Ministers' in the documents. In my view, there is no such thing. A number of meetings of the Ministers of Health of the Nine countries have been held and of course they can meet and exchange experience — I think this is perfectly reasonable. However, I maintain that the Community cannot introduce anything in the nature of legislation in the field of health. The Danish Government has also stated quite clearly at the meetings of the Ministers of Health, that health matters were purely national concerns for the each of the nine countries.

**President.** — The proceedings will now be suspended until 3 p.m.

The House will rise.

*(The sitting was suspended at 1.20 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)*

## IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

*Vice-President*

**President.** — The sitting is resumed. I appeal to you all to cooperate in making up for the time we have lost.

## 7. Votes

**President.** — The next item is the vote on motions for resolutions on which the debate is closed.

We shall begin with the motion for a resolution contained in the *Nicolson and Forster report (Doc. 1-623/79): Restructuring in the shipbuilding and textile industries.*

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(I)* Thank you, Mr President. I rise to give an explanation of vote and to comment on all the amendments . . .

**President.** — This is not the time for explanations of vote, Mr Pannella. They are given before the vote on the motion. You cannot give an explanation of vote on the amendments or on the whole series of amendments before the vote on the motion.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* In accordance with which Rule in the Rules of Procedure, Mr President?

**President.** — Pursuant to Rule 26(3), once the general debate and consideration of the texts have been concluded, only explanations of vote shall be permitted. During the January part-session the House interpreted this to mean that explanations of vote alone could be given before the motion is put to the vote. I intend to respect the decision of the House.

We shall now vote on the motion for a resolution.

I put the preamble to the vote.

The preamble is adopted.

On paragraphs 1 to 6, Mrs Hoffman, Mr Piquet, Mr Fernandez, Mrs Le Roux, Mrs Poirier, Mr Frischmann, Mr Martin and Mrs De March have tabled Amendment No 7 seeking to replace these paragraphs by the following new paragraphs:

1. Considers that the increase in unemployment and the serious crisis in the shipbuilding and textile industries necessitate different measures than those proposed by the Commission and call for an immediate and total halt to all Community intervention plans aimed at restructuring and conversion in these two sectors, as in the iron and steel industry;
2. Asks that no further restructuring plans be drawn up for other sectors;
3. Emphasizes that the industrial conflicts and the massive opposition of the workers to these plans, particularly in France and the United Kingdom, are an extremely positive basis for safeguarding sectors of industry that are of vital importance to the economy, jobs and independence of every Member State;
4. Opposes, in the light of the foregoing and by way of general principle, the use of appropriations from the Community budget to finance these restructuring measures, and stresses that funds from the budget for 1980 and preceding years must in no circumstances be used to finance measures such as these that create unemployment and underemployment;
5. Emphasizes that the allocation of funds to finance measures to accompany restructuring plans under the pretence of thereby limiting the social and human consequences of the latter can in no circumstances serve to justify such restructuring plans;

## President

6. Believes that it is the responsibility of each Member State to implement a social and economic policy aimed at high and balanced growth capable of generating sufficient revival of demand, particularly in the sectors affected by restructuring measures;
  7. Emphasizes that the imperative need for a policy of this nature necessitates an immediate and substantial increase in earnings, above all, of the lowest paid;
  8. Believes that the problems of over-capacity and under-consumption in the sectors in question are due, above all, to the austerity policies coordinated at Community level and implemented in every country;
  9. Considers that the enlargement of the Community to include Greece will deal a very severe blow to the shipbuilding and textile industries in Europe and in France, in particular; declares its hostility and opposition to this enlargement and asks, therefore, that the plans for this country's accession be abandoned altogether.
- (iii) to take note of the fact that fuel consumption is one of the principal costs in the operation of merchant vessels, and to bring forward coordinated measures designed to encourage the replacement of marine power plant, where any significant energy, environmental and safety saving might ensue;
  - (iv) to review the domestic credit terms in relation to countries outside the EEC and, when agreed, to ensure that such terms are adequately policed within the Community;
- c. Calls on the Council to take serious note of the fact that the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry is currently suffering a shortage of merchant orders of crisis proportions; believes, in recognition of this, that special aid in the form of a 'scrap-and-build' policy should be introduced without further delay and that such a policy should take into account the need for improved environmental protection and energy efficiency;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Sir David Nicolson, rapporteur.** — I oppose the adoption of the amendment. I think that it is a political document. It is full of generalities, I am not in favour of the views expressed and I think that it is covered by the motion for a resolution as it stands.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 7 to the vote.

Amendment No 7 is rejected.

I put paragraphs 1 and 2 to the vote.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 are adopted.

On paragraph 3, Mrs Salisch and Mr Caborn on behalf of the Socialist Group have tabled Amendment No 6 seeking to replace the paragraph with the following new paragraph:

- 3 a. Urges the Commission to elaborate urgent, concrete measures for the maintenance of employment through diversification in those areas which are heavily dependent on textiles and/or shipbuilding, as regions which are already economically and socially underprivileged and suffering from the collapse of existing industries cannot withstand further cuts in jobs opportunities;
- b. Calls on the Commission as a matter of urgency:
  - (i) to draw up improved standards aimed at reducing the incidence of damage to marine and coastal environments as a result of vessel-operating procedures and inadequate standards of vessel construction and maintenance, thereby also ensuring maximum operational safety; these proposals should be based on the IMCO regulations;
  - (ii) to ensure that such proposals, if not implemented by shipowners, would debar their vessels from entry to EEC ports;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Sir David Nicolson, rapporteur.** — Mr President, I must reluctantly say that I do not think that we should have these amendments at this time. I think that there is a lot of good material included in the amendments which have been suggested by Mrs Salisch and Mr Caborn, but the Commission is going to submit proposals on safety in the next few months and we are recommending in our motion for a resolution that we should have an own-initiative report on a general policy for aid to restructuring industry which will go into greater detail. I think at this stage, and for the purpose of this motion, I would prefer not to recommend acceptance of this amendment.

**President.** — I call Mrs Salisch.

**Mrs Salisch.** — (D) Mr President, I had said that I wanted a separate vote, if you had been good enough to allow it. I believe that the safeguarding of jobs is a primary aim and that this is of course true in the case of this motion. It was with the votes of Members from your group, Sir Davis, that this idea was adopted by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. I request a separate vote, Mr President, on the first paragraph and the rest of the amendment.

**President.** — You have proposed that we vote separately on paragraph 3(a) of this amendment. I believe that your proposal is in order.

I call Sir David Nicolson.

**Sir David Nicolson, rapporteur.** — I fully understand the importance of considering the social aspects of aid, particularly with regard to the maintenance of employment and the creation of new jobs, but para-

Nicolson

graph 3 of the motion for a resolution does state quite clearly that financing is to be coordinated with the Social Fund, and the opinion of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment states that social measures should in future be taken as an integral part of a coherent industrial policy. Therefore I would merely like to reiterate my belief that the point that the previous speaker is making is covered by our motion for a resolution. —

**President.** — The rapporteur maintains his position. However, I consider that Mrs Salisch's request is valid.

I put to the vote the first paragraph of Amendment No 6.

The first paragraph of Amendment No 6 is rejected.

I put to the vote the rest of Amendment No 6.

The second part of Amendment No 6 is rejected.

I put paragraph 3 to the vote.

Paragraph 3 is adopted.

I put paragraph 4 to the vote.

Paragraph 4 is adopted.

After paragraph 4, Mrs Salisch and Mr Neal on behalf of the Socialist Group have tabled Amendment No 2 seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

- 4 a. Is of the opinion that social measures should, in future, be taken as an integral part of a coherent industrial policy aimed at creating full employment, calls for the speedy elaboration of such policies and resolves to include substantial appropriations for this area in the 1981 budget;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Sir David Nicolson, rapporteur.** — Here again, Mr President, I find nothing wrong with the paragraph. Since I feel that the matter is covered in the motion and in the programme which we are suggesting, which has been supported by the opinion of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, I am against this amendment.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 2 to the vote.

Amendment No 2 is rejected.

On paragraph 5, Mr Seal on behalf of the Socialist Group has tabled Amendment No 3 seeking to replace the paragraph with the following new paragraph:

5. Condemns the way in which the Commission has allocated the money from the 1978 budget; deplors the

lack of formal consultation with interested parties, in particular the fact that the Commission made no formal or informal request for suggested projects from the man-made fibres industry, and that the projects actually selected seem to have been decided upon almost entirely by personal contacts; calls for the whole matter to be thoroughly investigated, and Parliament informed of the outcome of this investigation in order to dispel the present atmosphere of mystery; considers that a consultation procedure should be established and in future be seen to be fully utilized, this being particularly important as the allocation from the 1979 budget remains to be spent;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Sir David Nicolson, rapporteur.** — Mr President, I am against this amendment. I think it is redundant and I do not recommend it.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 3 to the vote.

Amendment No 3 is rejected.

I put paragraph 5 to the vote.

Paragraph 5 is adopted.

On paragraph 6, Mr Seal on behalf of the Socialist Group has tabled Amendment No 4 seeking to replace this paragraph with the following new paragraph:

Views this matter with the utmost seriousness, involving as it does the centrally important areas of industrial policy and democratic accountability;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Sir David Nicolson, rapporteur.** — For a similar reason as before, I do not recommend acceptance. I do not think we need this addition.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 4 to the vote.

Amendment No 4 is rejected.

I put paragraph 6 to the vote.

Paragraph 6 is adopted.

After paragraph 6, I have two amendments. Mr Spinelli on behalf of the Committee on Budgets had tabled Amendment No 1 seeking to add the following new paragraph:

7. Also asks the Commission:

- to draw up an overall multiannual estimate of financial aid for industrial restructuring and reconversion,
- to embark on this policy on the basis of the appropriations authorized in the budget without waiting

## President

any longer for the adoption of regulations by the Council and without seeking the Council's prior informal agreement to the projects to be financed,

- to amend its proposal for a framework regulation of 26 October 1978 on the lines suggested by Parliament in its opinion of 26 April 1979.

Miss Quin has tabled Amendment No 5 seeking to add the following new paragraph:

6 a. Calls on the Commission as a matter of urgency:

- to upgrade shipbuilding areas from category 3 to category 2 in the list of priorities for the allocation of assistance under the European Social fund;
- to devote a larger proportion of funds than has already been proposed under the non-quota section of the Regional Fund towards encouraging the growth of new economic activity and towards improving the environment in shipbuilding areas;
- to seek to implement proposals for granting redundancy payments to workers laid off in the textile and shipbuilding industries similar to those available for coal and steel workers under the ECSC Treaty.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Sir David Nicolson, rapporteur.** — Mr President, as far as Amendment No 1 is concerned, I think that this is a useful and constructive addition to the motion for a resolution. It does in effect call on the Commission to go ahead and spend the appropriations authorized in previous budgets without waiting for the prior informal agreement of the Council on the projects to be financed, and thus this amendment gives more teeth to paragraph 6 of the motion for a resolution, and I would recommend it. As far as Amendment No 5 is concerned, I do not recommend it. I do not think it is necessary.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is adopted.

I put Amendment No 5 to the vote.

Amendment No 5 is rejected.

Before we vote on the motion for a resolution as a whole, explanations of vote may be heard.

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Mr President, I shall vote in favour of the motion even though the method of assessing the amendments tabled here was not based on their intrinsic value but on a strict party approach

by the rapporteur — although this is nothing new as far as his group is concerned.

I shall vote in favour, Mr President, on the basis of my own dealings with the voters of Trieste and with the voters in my own constituency. I shall vote in favour also because I am aware that in this sector there is an increasingly risky policy of competition, outside the Community. All too often, when we are drawing up international agreements, we tend to forget sectors like shipbuilding, which is a sector of vital strategic importance for the life of our countries, for our economies and for the international strength of this Community. For these reasons, and because of the firm stand taken *vis-à-vis* the Council, I intend to vote in favour of this motion — even though I think it is inadequate and deplore the party-minded approach to it.

**President.** — I call Mrs Salisch.

**Mrs Salisch.** — (D) Mr President, I also want to give an explanation of vote. I could not disagree more with the rapporteur when he insists that the amendments which I tabled should be rejected because these points are already essentially covered in the motion for a resolution contained in his report. The fact of the matter is that there is a great deal in Sir David's report about improving matters by means of social measures, but I am sure that I made clear yesterday and in the amendments that we are not just concerned with improving matters, but that if there is to be any restructuring we want to guarantee that no jobs are lost or else that new jobs will be created immediately to replace the old. I really do feel that it is extremely high-handed of you, Sir David, to propose that the House do not accept this. This is yet another example for the House of how even Members who have gone along with a certain approach on the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment act differently when they come into the Chamber. I find this all very regrettable and it makes committee work that much more difficult. I shall therefore vote against the motion.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mrs De March.

**Mrs De March.** — (F) Mr President, it must have been clear to everyone that the amendment we tabled expressed our downright rejection of the industrial restructuring plans which are coordinated by the Commission and implemented in each Member State. Our amendment was rejected by Parliament, and this is significant.

Our motion asked that no further restructuring plans be drawn up and opposed the use of appropriations

**De March**

from the Community budget to finance these measures, because our aim is to defend the vital sectors of our economy and to protect our regions and the interests of French workers. We are against the halfhearted social measures which are the response to the crisis and which force unemployment and atrophy on the regions involved.

The countless promises which have never been kept are not going to convince us to accept the enlargement of the Community, to include Greece in particular. This enlargement will deal a very severe blow to the shipbuilding and textile industries in France.

This is why the French Communist Members and their comrades are against these restructuring plans and other crisis-related measures. This is why we are campaigning against these plans which run counter to the national interest of France. All this explains our vote, which is a vote on behalf of the workers of France, a vote on behalf of French industry and a vote on behalf of the future of our great nation.

**President.** — I call Mrs Roudy to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mrs Roudy.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is obvious that there is a tremendous difference between . . .

Thank you, Mr Bangemann.

As I was saying, it is obvious that there is a tremendous difference between what restructuring really means for workers and the conception of it which filters through to most of the Members in this Chamber. Obviously we are talking about different things.

On the one hand, of course, you have the interests of the multinationals while on the other there is the daily drama of unemployment, especially when it affects factories in certain areas, like Vaux-en-Velain in the Rhône-Alpes region, which could still have a viable existence but which are shut down by order of the Rhône-Poulenc textile company. But people do not want to know about it. There is talk of some paltry remedy, of aid which is going to be offered but which will not really make any difference. When things are like this, and if you are a Socialist and think about the living conditions of the workers, you cannot accept such proposals.

The report we have been given says that the manufacturers of synthetic fibres were consulted. But what about the workers? It is this blatant gap which has to be criticized. Let me make it quite clear: the Socialists will never be able to accept proposals like this which do not give a damn about what happens to millions of workers!

**President.** — I call Mr De Goede.

**Mr De Goede.** — (*NL*) Mr President, it is a sad fact that the Council is conspicuous by its absence during this important debate on the probable loss of two million jobs over the next few years. I have already mentioned this during the debate. Be that as it may, it also has to be said that the Nicolson and Forster motion, albeit praiseworthy, has one or two gaps in it, such as the omission of the Socialist Group's amendments. I voted for these amendments and was sorry to see that they were rejected, but I was pleased to see that the Spinelli amendment was adopted. In spite of these shortcomings, I do not think there is any justification for voting against the motion tabled by Sir David Nicolson and Miss Forster. We shall therefore vote in favour of it.

**President.** — I call Mr Nordlohne.

**Mr Nordlohne.** — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to give a personal explanation of vote, since I am a member of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. As it was not made very clear during Tuesday's debate, and still does not seem to be all that clear, I want to point out that the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment felt obliged to state its position with regard to these Commission proposals, which had been referred to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment for its opinion. The fact that in accordance with the Rules of Procedure of this Parliament the position of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment cannot be incorporated in the Forster report prompted the Socialist Members on the committee to table a number of amendments — although this was really the job of the committee — which we agreed on with a great majority, indeed unanimously. But they were not presented here in this form. I wanted to explain why the voting was different. The Forster report gets my full backing, and I recommend that it be adopted. I wanted to say this on behalf of the members of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. We shall be discussing this at the next meeting on Thursday.

**President.** — I want to make an announcement. Now and then I fail to see certain Members because they are lurking behind a newspaper. If you are going to read a newspaper, at least be a little more discreet about it.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole.

The resolution is adopted.

**President.** — I now put to the vote the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1—761/79) by Mr Pranchère and others: Oils, fats and proteins.*

The motion is rejected.

**President.** — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-762/79) by Mr Davern and Mr Buchou: Oils, fats and proteins.*

On this motion, Mr Blumenfeld has tabled Amendment No 1 seeking to replace the text of the motion by the following text:

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to the surplus production of milk products in the Community,
  - having regard to the ensuing high costs and the imperative need to curb these costs,
  - concerned, on the one hand, at the Community's high level of dependence on imports of oils, fats and proteins,
  - mindful, on the other hand, of the Community's interest in exporting agricultural products,
1. Calls on the Commission to propose a balanced policy for the stabilization of the market in the various animal and vegetable fats and proteins;
  2. Hopes that this policy will take equal account of the legitimate interests of consumers and agricultural producers in the various processing sectors;
  3. Expects the Commission to open negotiations with the main supplier countries for the various oils, fats and proteins with a view to restoring balance on the Community markets,
  4. Calls on the Commission to stimulate internal Community production through appropriate measures of market organization in order to diversify the supply base;
  5. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and Commission.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Buchou, rapporteur.** — (F) Mr President, there is nothing in Mr Blumenfeld's text which contradicts anything in the motion I tabled together with Mr Davern. However, we feel that it is less complete and less precise on one or two important points. For this reason we prefer to keep our own text.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

As the result of the show of hands is not clear, a fresh vote will be taken by sitting and standing.

Amendment No 1 is adopted.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole.

The resolution is adopted.

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in the *Fuchs report (Doc. 1-704/79): Energy objectives for 1990.*

Before voting on the motion for a resolution proper, we shall consider the amendments to the Council resolution.

On the second recital, Mr Coppieters and Mrs Bonino have tabled Amendment No 18 seeking to amend the recital as follows:

- Whereas the general energy policy guidelines of the Community *should be* as follows:
  - (a) unchanged
  - (b) unchanged
  - (c) *increasing the use of solid fuels for electricity production*
  - (d) unchanged
  - (e) unchanged
  - (f) unchanged

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) I recommend rejection, Mr President. This amendment is in contradiction with the entire motion.

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

**Mrs Bonino.** — (I) Mr President, the Chair is inclined not to permit explanations of vote on the amendments. Can you tell us by virtue of which Rule of Procedure you deny us this right;

I know that this is going to come up at the meeting on 21 February. However, I think that the opinion of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions should also be heard, since as things stand at the moment the interpretation of the Rules alter them radically.

I am prepared not to give an explanation of vote now, but I do ask you to refer this matter to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions for an opinion.

**Bonino**

**President.** — Mrs Bonino, the point you are raising was also raised by Mr Pannella a while ago. The answer is quite straightforward. Pursuant to Rule 26 and the decision of the House at the January part-session, it was decided — and Rule 26 can in fact be interpreted in this way — that explanations of vote would be heard before the vote on the motion. The Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions has already been asked to give a ruling on this point.

You may speak, Mrs Bonino, but please be brief.

**Mrs Bonino.** — (I) Mr President, the Rules of Procedure cannot be changed, even by a decision of the House, unless the proposed changes have been discussed beforehand by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, on the basis of a relevant report. I therefore ask you again to refer the matter to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

**President.** — Mrs Bonino, you are making us waste a lot of time. The Rules have not been changed; they have been interpreted.

**Mrs Bonino.** — (F) I realize that, but an interpretation can be an alteration, Mr President.

They were always interpreted differently until January. Now there is another interpretation . . .

**President.** — The matter is closed for the moment. We shall come back to it at the appropriate time.

**Mrs Bonino.** — (F) There is a Committee on the Rules of Procedure which has to decide. The House cannot . . .

**President.** — I call Mrs Van den Heuvel.

**Mrs Van den Heuvel.** — (NL) Just a word about this matter. I can inform Mrs Bonino that I tabled a motion last month seeking advice from the Committee. Mrs Bonino is thus getting what she wants.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 18 to the vote.

Amendment No 18 is rejected.

After the last recital, Mr Coppieters and Mrs Bonino have tabled Amendment No 19 seeking to add a new recital:

— Whereas in order to make the necessary political choices about these long-term objectives the Council needs to have before it detailed alternatives, and in

particular one based on a moratorium on nuclear energy and maximum development of renewable energy sources.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) For the same reasons, Mr President, I recommend rejection.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 19 to the vote.

Amendment No 19 is rejected.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Mr President, I only want to say that although the Rules of Procedure could not be followed as regards the amendments — because this is what has happened — the Chair ought at least to read them out for the benefit of those present, so that we have a better idea of what it is all about. The Rules of Procedure state that the amendments have to be moved. You have done away with this requirement, but I should like the Chair to be a little less sparing with its announcements, that is all.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, apart from the fact the President could change the sense of an amendment when he is reading it out, I think that the Members here are big enough to get for themselves from the proper department the amendments which have been available since yesterday. You have to get your paperwork in order.

On the paragraph beginning with the words 'Affirms the need', Mr Coppieters and Mrs Bonino have tabled Amendment No 20 seeking to amend this paragraph as follows:

Affirms the need to achieve these aims, for convergent actions by the Member States and actions by the Community in the following areas:

1. unchanged
2. an increase in the use of solid fuels to cover electricity production. Each Member State should contribute to the achievement of this overall goal, particularly in the following areas:
  - (a) a return to the coal output of 1973 (250 mtce = 175 mtoe) under satisfactory economic conditions and subject to avoiding increased levels of pollution
  - (b) unchanged
  - (c) unchanged
  - (d) deleted

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) I recommend rejection, Mr President.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 20 to the vote.

Amendment No 20 is rejected.

On the fifth subparagraph of the same paragraph, Mr Coppieters and Mrs Bonino have tabled Amendment No 21 seeking to amend this subparagraph as follows:

Top priority to research into, development of, and promotion and encouragement of all available techniques for using renewable energy sources.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) I recommend rejection, Mr President.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 21 to the vote.

Amendment No 21 is rejected.

Before the paragraph beginning 'Recommends that the Member States', Mr Coppieters and Mrs Bonino have tabled Amendment No 22 seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

Calls on the Commission to draw up urgently an alternative set of energy objectives based on a nuclear moratorium and a maximum effort to develop renewable energy sources.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) I recommend rejection, Mr President.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 22 to the vote.

Amendment No 22 is rejected.

On the paragraph beginning 'Calls on the Commission', Mr Coppieters and Mrs Bonino have tabled Amendment No 23 seeking to amend the paragraph as follows:

Calls on the Commission to provide it *every three months* with a report on the convergence of the policies of the Member States in respect of these objectives and guidelines and to propose measures likely to achieve them.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) Again, Mr President, I recommend rejection.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 23 to the vote.

Amendment No 23 is rejected.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution proper.

I put to the vote the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 3.

The preamble and paragraphs 1 to 3 are adopted.

On paragraph 4, Mr Moreland has tabled Amendment No 1 seeking to add the words 'and management' at the end of the paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) I recommend adoption, Mr President, since it goes without saying that both management and unions will be involved on the subject of restructuring.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is adopted.

I put to the vote paragraph 4, thus amended.

Paragraph 4, thus amended, is adopted.

After paragraph 4, Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group has tabled Amendment No 4 seeking to add the following new paragraph:

4 a. Puts forward the following priorities for the Community's energy objectives for 1990:

- the effective realization of an energy-saving policy which is binding on all Member States;
- the reduction of imports of energy, especially oil, together with a common effort to develop the use of the Community's indigenous energy sources, in particular coal;
- research, development and production of new energy sources;
- is of the opinion that nuclear energy should not be further developed until the problem of safety and radioactive waste has been solved and the consent of a clear majority of the public has been obtained;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, I recommend rejection of this new paragraph because it practically renders impossible the further development of nuclear energy.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 4 to the vote.

Amendment No 4 is adopted.

**President**

I put paragraph 5 to the vote.

Paragraph 5 is adopted.

On paragraph 6, Mr Moreland has tabled Amendment No 2 seeking to replace the word 'narrow' by 'short-term'.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, I recommend adoption, since the original wording was 'narrow' but 'short-term' in fact comes to the same thing. I recommend adoption.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 2 to the vote.

Amendment No 2 is adopted.

I put to the vote paragraph 6, thus amended.

Paragraph 6, thus amended, is adopted.

I put paragraphs 7 and 8 to the vote.

Paragraphs 7 and 8 are adopted.

On paragraph 9, Mr Coppieters and Mrs Bonino have tabled Amendment No 10 seeking to amend the paragraph as follows:

Considers that the main aim of the Community's energy policy is the achievement of maximum independence with regard to imported oil and all other raw materials in order to secure the greatest possible autonomy in energy supplies.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) I recommend rejection.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 10 to the vote.

Amendment No 10 is rejected.

I put paragraph 9 to the vote.

Paragraph 9 is adopted.

I put paragraph 10 to the vote.

Paragraph 10 is adopted.

On paragraph 11, Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group has tabled Amendment No 5 seeking to delete the words 'in this connection'.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) I recommend adoption of this amendment, i.e. the deletion of the words 'in this connection', because the order has been changed.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 5 to the vote.

Amendment No 5 is adopted.

I put to the vote paragraph 11, thus amended.

Paragraph 11, thus amended, is adopted.

I put paragraphs 12 to 15 to the vote.

Paragraphs 12 to 15 are adopted.

I have two amendments on paragraph 16. Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group has tabled Amendment No 6 seeking to amend the paragraph as follows:

Is of the opinion that in the medium term Member States' anticipated energy requirements in 1990 can be met only if greater recourse is had to coal.

Mr Coppieters and Mrs Bonino have tabled Amendment No 11 seeking to amend the paragraph as follows:

Is of the opinion that, in view of the harmful environmental impact of massive use of coal, and in view of the threats to safety and health associated with the production of nuclear energy and the unsolved problems of nuclear waste disposal, Member States' anticipated energy requirements in 1990 should not be met by massive recourse to coal nor by any further recourse to nuclear energy above the level existing today.

These two amendments are mutually incompatible. What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, I recommend rejection of both amendments since they would mean that our energy requirements for the future could not be guaranteed.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 11 to the vote.

Amendment No 11 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 6 to the vote.

Amendment No 6 is rejected.

I put paragraph 16 to the vote.

Paragraph 16 is adopted.

I have two amendments on paragraph 17. Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group has tabled Amendment No 7 seeking to delete the paragraph, and Mr Coppieters and Mrs Bonino have tabled Amendment No 12 seeking to amend the paragraph as follows:

**President**

Considers there should be an immediate moratorium on the further development of nuclear energy and that the threat to the health and safety of workers and of the population in surrounding areas from existing installations should be reexamined at Community level.

These two amendments are mutually incompatible. What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) It is quite clear that the general trend is for rejection, Mr President.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 12 to the vote.

Amendment No 12 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 7 to the vote.

Amendment No 7 is rejected.

I put paragraph 17 to the vote.

Paragraph 17 is adopted.

On paragraph 18, Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group has tabled Amendment No 8 seeking to add the following at the end of the paragraph:

... in particular with regard to imports from third countries in which coal is produced in bad social conditions.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) I recommend rejection, as this would render any energy policy absolutely impossible.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 8 to the vote.

Amendment No 8 is rejected.

I put paragraph 18 to the vote.

Paragraph 18 is adopted.

I put paragraph 19 to the vote.

Paragraph 19 is adopted.

On paragraph 20, Mr Coppieters and Mrs Bonino have tabled Amendment No 13 seeking to amend the paragraph as follows:

Urges most strongly that research and development in respect of all renewable energy sources, including in particular solar energy, biomass, wind energy and wave energy, be increased in accelerated, and calls for increased financial outlay to this end.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) I recommend rejection as the original wording is more precise.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 13 to the vote.

Amendment No 13 is rejected.

I put paragraph 20 to the vote.

Paragraph 20 is adopted.

After paragraph 20, Mr Coppieters and Mrs Bonino have tabled Amendment No 14 seeking to add the following new paragraph:

20 a. Considers that the Commission should draw up, as a matter of urgency, an alternative set of energy objectives for 1990 based on the assumption of a nuclear moratorium and a maximum effort in the fields of energy conservation and development of renewable energy sources.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) I strongly recommend rejection.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 14 to the vote.

Amendment No 14 is rejected.

I put paragraphs 21 to 28 to the vote.

Paragraphs 21 to 28 are adopted.

On paragraph 29, Mr Coppieters and Mrs Bonino have tabled Amendment No 15 seeking to amend the paragraph as follows:

Calls on the Commission, in view of the importance of the energy supply problem, to report to the European Parliament at least *once every three months* and, if necessary, more frequently on the progress made and successes and failures encountered in implementing energy policy objectives, and also on convergence between the policies of the individual Member States.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) I recommend rejection.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 15 to the vote.

Amendment No 15 is rejected.

I put paragraph 29 to the vote.

Paragraph 29 is adopted.

I put paragraph 30 to the vote.

**President**

Paragraph 30 is adopted.

I have two amendments on paragraph 31. Mr Moreland has tabled Amendment No 3 seeking to replace the words 'a loan of' by 'grants and loans of at least'; and Mr Coppieters and Mrs Bonino have tabled Amendment No 16 seeking to amend the paragraph as follows:

Calls on the Commission to issue immediately, on the basis of concrete programme proposals, a loan of 5 000 million EUA to finance investments in the renewable energy and energy-saving sectors.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, I have some sympathy for Amendment No 3 but I must nevertheless recommend rejection, since I feel that if there is an extension to include grants, the whole idea might be put at risk. This is even more true in the case of Amendment No 16 by Mr Coppieters and Mrs Bonino, who ask for 5 000 million EUA. This, too, will be impossible. I recommend rejection of both amendments.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 16 to the vote.

Amendment No 16 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 3 to the vote.

Amendment No 3 is rejected.

I put paragraph 31 to the vote.

I have two amendments on paragraph 32. Mr Coppieters and Mrs Bonino have tabled Amendment No 17 seeking to amend the paragraph as follows:

Requests the Commission to adopt the following amendments, pursuant to Article 149, second paragraph, of the EEC Treaty.

Mr Glinne on behalf of the Socialist Group has tabled Amendment No 9 seeking to amend the paragraph as follows:

Calls on the Commission to amend the Draft Council Resolution on the energy objectives of the Community for 1990 to take into account the above considerations, pursuant to Article 149, second paragraph, of the EEC Treaty.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Fuchs, rapporteur.** — (D) I recommend rejection of both amendments, Mr President. If we accepted the Coppieters-Bonino amendment, it would mean that all of a sudden we agreed with the earlier amendments which have already been rejected. In the case of the Glinne amendment, it would mean that the whole motion would not be adopted. I recommend rejection.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 9 to the vote.

Amendment No 9 is rejected.

I put Amendment No 17 to the vote.

Amendment No 17 is rejected.

I put paragraph 32 to the vote.

Paragraph 32 is adopted.

I put paragraph 33 to the vote.

Paragraph 33 is adopted.

Before we vote on the motion for a resolution as a whole, there are a number of Members who wish to give explanations of vote.

I call Mrs Dekker.

**Mrs Dekker.** — (NL) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to give an explanation of vote on behalf of Mr De Goede and myself with regard to these proposals and resolutions, and at the same time comment on yesterday's debate on energy policy. The point I want to make is that the Commission failed to take the opportunity it had to respond to the points made by Members in the course of this debate. Following the debate on employment at the last part-session, Mr Vredeling was very critical — rightly so, in my opinion — both in the House and in the media of the fact that the Commission in its executive capacity — in this case he himself — had practically no opportunity at the end of the employment debate to respond to the points and questions which had been brought up by Members. During yesterday's debate, I asked the Commission a number of specific questions, as indeed did a number of other Members. Mr Brunner simply failed to reply to these questions. In my opinion, it is intolerable that the Commission should simply ignore the points raised in this House, because it makes it difficult to reach a balanced conclusion on the proposals under discussion. I therefore deplore the fact that Mr Brunner did not take the opportunity to respond. As to our explanation of vote, we are against those resolutions and proposals which are too unreservedly in favour of nuclear energy. We are, on the other hand, very much in favour of the Socialist Group's motion for a resolution which provides for a compulsory consultation procedure and safety standards for nuclear power stations, particularly those in border regions.

Let me conclude by saying that we shall not be voting for the Fuchs Report in its present form.

**President.** — I call Mr Coppieters.

**Mr Coppieters.** — (NL) Mr President, I shall of course be voting against the Fuchs Report, but I

## Coppieters

should first of all like to address a word of thanks to the rapporteur, whose views are summed up in his constant use of the word 'rejection'.

Our aim is a policy of energy autonomy, and our thoughts are directed here principally to oil, but also to the raw materials needed for nuclear fission and fusion. I cannot conceal my indignation at the refusal to accept that in the present situation a moratorium is the only proper solution in various advanced-technology countries. Moreover, the Commission obviously has no intention whatsoever of making any great effort in the field of renewable sources of energy. Of course, the Commission claims this is not so, but can show no figures to support that claim. This is particularly unfortunate. All these amendments were aimed at making the necessary arrangements for keeping a close watch, on a month by month basis, as it were, on progress regarding alternative energy sources. The fact that all our amendments have met with the same fate — recommended 'rejection' — is a slap in the face for all those who think that nuclear energy is a danger to our way of life.

**President.** — I call Mr von der Vring.

**Mr von der Vring.** — (D) Mr President, I should like very briefly to explain why I am against this report, and to save time, I shall also speak on behalf of Mr van Minnen. My Group tabled Amendment No 4 to ensure that, in the Community too, safety precautions would take precedence over energy policy objectives. Those in responsible positions have always claimed in public that this was to be taken for granted. But now we are trying to get it set down in black and white, the rapporteur promptly gets up and says that to make this a definite priority would jeopardize the development of nuclear energy. This gives the lie to all those claims that safety must take precedence over energy policy objectives. For this reason, we cannot possibly vote for this motion for a resolution.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Schmid.

**Mr Schmid.** — (D) Mr President, I should like to explain why I and other members of my group will also be voting against the motion for a resolution. We made it clear in the course of the debate that, as far as we are concerned, safety is an important consideration. We also asked the Commission very precise questions, because we felt that we could only vote on this matter if we were fully aware of the safety situation and of the risks involved. We have not been given the answers we wanted, and I therefore feel unable to vote for a motion for a resolution promoting the development of nuclear energy before this House has had a

proper discussion on the safety factor and the report of the relevant committee of experts. I shall therefore be voting against the motion for a resolution.

**President.** — I call Mrs Bonino.

**Mrs Bonino.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in explaining why I intend to vote against this motion for a resolution I want to remind you, probably for the umpteenth time, that I do not think it is compatible with the serious nature of a Parliament to deal with a topic such as this one by limiting the speaking time to five or ten minutes per group. How can anybody, let alone somebody who is against nuclear energy or who has doubts about nuclear energy, speak or make a convincing case in one or two minutes? If the five or six of us in the anti-nuclear energy lobby had wanted to say something individually, all we should have had would have been thirty seconds' speaking time each, and the most we could have done would have been to do what the rapporteur did, i.e. get up and say 'we are against', and then we should have had to sit down without saying why.

But I am voting against because, according to what I gather from this report, you are heading towards a nuclear-based society, you are heading towards not just a uranium-based society, but towards a plutonium-based society, at a time when many problems and in particular those concerning radioactive wastes, have still not been completely solved. You are making a choice that will affect future generations without the technical and political problems concerning this choice having been first settled.

We have had the accident at Three Mile Island and the recent Rogovin report, and yet nothing will induce you to stop and reflect a little. It was not even possible to get you to vote in favour of allocating some additional money to investment into renewable sources of energy. It is my belief that you are quite insensitive to these things because your choice is a preconceived choice, supported by a nuclear lobby, and the results are extremely obvious.

But let me also give voice to another worry, namely, that the spread of nuclear power stations will lead to political repression, exactly as it is leading to political repression at this moment at the Plogoff station, where the forces of law and order were called in to deal with non-violent protests. This should give you some idea of the kind of society you are going to build, of the kind of basis you are creating for a society which will not tolerate dissent because it will no longer be able to do so.

For these reasons, because of the insensitivity that you have shown for the safety problems, because you do not care what kind of a world we are constructing for future generations, because you say today that we are

Schmid

going to choose uranium whereas in reality it is obvious that we are going to choose plutonium and fast-breeder reactors, I shall vote against in the hope that here at least this dissenting voice can make itself heard. But we should also give the public in the Member States the chance to say what it thinks, so that it may have the opportunity to oppose your choice.

**President.** — I call Mr Martin.

**Mr Martin.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the French Communists and allies I should like to reiterate our opposition to the Fuchs report — a report which is after all past improvement — and at the same time recall the purpose of our own motion for a resolution, the main reasons behind which were set out by my colleague Félix Damette, so that I need not dwell on this.

I would simply add a current example: the determination of the French government and the European Economic Community to close the mines in the Cévennes, which is an unfortunate illustration of the policy of winding up the production of coal in France although this is one of the pillars of our independence in energy matters.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this is a piece of anthracite. I have brought it from the Estival mine in the Cévennes coalfield.

(*Interruptions*)

This is not Afghan coal, it is coal from the Cévenne coalfield, where I was on 31 December, 800 metres below ground, talking with a delegation of French Communist Party officials and Members of Parliament and with the miners. We as Communists stand side by side with the workers carrying on their struggle 800 metres below ground. We thus gave our support to the miners who had been occupying this pit for several days to protest against your policy of annihilation, against the annihilation of the coal industry being carried out by the French government and the European Economic Community and to demand that pits should be kept in operation and coal production developed in this and in other coalfields.

Lend an ear to our miners! There were more than 20 000 of them before the inception of the ECSC, which was supported by all the parties in France except the French Communist Party. There were 20 000 of them and now there are 1 850 left. Pits have been flooded and blown up, just as other modern equipment has been destroyed. Now it is the mining industry which is threatened with extinction in this region, just like the wine industry and the textile and footwear industries. Lend an ear to the miners of France, particularly those in the South. Their message to you, and that of the French Communist party, its

Members of Parliament and their political allies, is that your . . .

**President.** — Mr Martin, you have exceeded your speaking time.

**Mr Martin.** — . . . (*F*) I am about to finish, Mr President, it will take me 9.5 seconds — the time of a 100 metres at the Olympic Games, which we are sure will be held in Moscow!

(*Laughter*)

Let me finish, then. I felt it my duty to say once again that in this battle they are waging, with public support, against the disastrous policy of the French government and the EEC, against this scrapheap policy, in their battle for life and justice, for the right to work, for the protection of our regions and our coal industry, the miners of our country have and will always have beside them the French Communist Party, its Members of Parliament and their allies.

**President.** — I call Mr Veronesi.

**Mr Veronesi.** — (*I*) Mr President, after deciding that we would devote an entire day to the important problems of the Community so that we could hold a detailed debate, we have seen that we have in fact halved the time devoted to the energy problem, which was given so much prominence in Mr Jenkins' report. This was a fundamental mistake, because this is a problem which has had extremely profound and far-reaching emotional repercussions on public opinion, not only European public opinion but world public opinion. We were wrong . . .

(*Interruption by Mr Pannella*)

Calm down! Calm down . . .

I believe that this was a mistake: we have not discussed very much. Nevertheless I wanted to remind you that the debate in committee was long, detailed, passionate and intense. Mrs Bonino, who is sitting here beside me, never put in an appearance. I never saw her. It would have been a good place for her to make the views known. Even today she said her piece and then she went off for a walk, as often happens with these people. She could have had all the time she wanted to set out . . .

**President.** — Mr Veronesi, your explanation of vote should concentrate on the motion and not on Mrs Bonino.

**Mr Veronesi.** — (*I*) . . . we shall be voting in favour, having measured and weighed up all the evidence with

Veronesi

seriousness and with a sense of responsibility and — let me also say this — with a modicum of competence as well. Terms like 'safety' and 'certainty' must be properly defined once and for all. Otherwise they give rise to serious misunderstandings which can only harm public opinion and the future of Europe and which consequently run the risk of hampering the completion of projects that deserve to be seen through to the end. For these reasons we shall vote in favour.

**President.** — I call Mr Gendebien.

**Mr Gendebien.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I too should like to stress that this is a deplorable travesty of a debate, and what is particularly deplorable is Mr Brunners' offhanded manner. I am not sure whether it is out of bad manners or an atrophied sense of political responsibility that he deemed it unnecessary to reply to more than 20 specific interpellations, statements and questions expressed in this House. If we go on like this and if the Commission imitates the Council in its contempt for Parliament, within a few months this House will have ceased to perform any really useful function. Secondly, I should like to protest at the fact that the Community authorities, both the Commission and the Council, have embarked on a policy of developing not only the classical forms of nuclear energy but also fast-breeder reactors despite the fact that a large number of national parliaments have not yet had the chance of taking a decision on this issue.

Lastly, let me finish by expressing any dismay at the facility with which the majority in this House is committing itself to the excessive, unjustified and uncontrolled development of nuclear energy, without taking into account the considerable dangers that this presents for the future, and without paying the slightest attention to public opinion. That is why I shall vote against the report before us today.

**President.** — I call Mr Josselin.

**Mr Josselin.** — (*F*) The oil crisis could have marked the beginning of a serious attempt to think out ways of fighting against wastage and more generally against this throw-away society which you all condemn in your speeches.

By resolutely and unquestioningly accepting nuclear energy, the Fuchs report dashes any hope of serious consideration at European level of ways to change this society you condemn. It is my contention that the acceptance of nuclear energy and the supposed will to seek new sources of energy are totally incompatible. These new forms of energy could have been a necessity, but with this report they have become empty words, a mere alibi. Over and above the question of the risks, I should like to say, as a Breton and a Social-

ist, that I too was at Plogoff recently and that in reality it is an even more centralized society that this nuclear energy is creating. While the younger generation is prepared to rethink the relation between man and his environment this report crushes their hopes. I shall vote against.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (*I*) Mr President, I shall not pretend to make an explanation of vote in order to be able to return to the debate. You were against holding this debate; your strength lies in numbers, used as a means of violating the rules. You are winning here, as you won in Germany against the 'green' movement, as you won in France against the gists, flouting the laws of democracy and fair debate.

Mr President, we shall do our best to let people know at Passau, in his constituency, all about Mr Fuchs's 'nicht', the 'nicht' which he has been continually answering us with, so that our 'green' friends, the Christian Democrats and the Socialists all know exactly what Mr Fuchs is up to here. How many of you, who are voting in favour of plutonium today and in favour of uranium, how many of you have given explanations of vote? How many of you asked for a roll call? We know, and you know too, that we — we few — represent at least fifty percent, in many cases, of your voters. You are therefore aware that many people share our views and that many scientists see things as we do.

Mr President, I shall conclude by saying that if the Fuchs report had been put before Congress in the United States it would have been laughed out of every committee — whether of the right, of the left, whether pro-nuclear or anti-nuclear. You represent the foci of reaction, which, in those mines so dear to the conservative French Communists, ignored — in some cases in their tens of thousands — the miners who were dying, as at Marcinelle, because of capitalist exploitation, and who have continued to die. But now you want to transfer this particular reign of death from the pits and you want to spread it across entire regions, thereby sonning the death-kell of democracy and eliminating any chance of freely organizing our economies and our productive system.

For this reason, Mr President, I shall vote against, in the full knowledge that though there may be only 5 or 6 or 10 of us amongst 400 yes-men, we shall fight this out with you in front of your voters during the next election campaigns and during the next European Parliament. Then we shall see how many of you come back here to represent the people you are now betraying.

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

**Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul.** — (D) Ladies and gentlemen, I should like to explain why I shall be voting against this report. I believe that in its treatment of this report and in the subsequent voting, this House has wasted a great opportunity of tackling one of the great questions of the future, one which is of great interest to the people in our countries and particularly to our young people. The way in which certain elements in this House have dealt with the question of nuclear energy and in which certain amendments have simply been shot down in flames is an insult to the justifiable fear and concern felt by young people in our countries. I do not think this House can exactly bask in the glory of its approach to the question of nuclear energy.

The young people, and all those people in our countries who are against nuclear energy, hoped, when they elected their Members of this Parliament, that their fear and concern would find expression in our debates. You are shirking this responsibility; but let me tell you that we shall forego the respect of some sections of our people if we shirk our responsibilities and give this kind of treatment to problems which are vital to the future of our young people and future generations . . .

*(Mixed reactions)*

. . . Shouting your heads off is no substitute for giving some thought to the fact that you are damaging the standing of this Parliament by simply trying to dismiss a problem of this magnitude. That is why I shall be voting against this motion for a resolution, but I shall be doing so in the hope that opponents of nuclear energy will be better represented in future European Parliaments.

**President.** — I call Mrs Groes.

**Mrs Groes.** — (DK) Mr President, the way I intend to vote reflects the view that if the Commission and certain non-socialist Members of this Parliament were as interested in the development of alternative energy sources as they claim to be, they too would presumably have voted in favour of drawing up an alternative energy plan. They would presumably also have taken part in the work towards establishing the transparency in the budget which is necessary if we are to be able to adopt positions on oil substitutes, coal, nuclear energy and alternative energy sources individually. The fact that the various oil substitutes are all lumped together both in your budgets and in your speech makes it impossible for us who take different views to decide what line to take. It also makes it impossible for people who in fact share the same view to agree on a common policy. This is harmful, not only for the voting here in Parliament but also for the results in practice.

The reason for my voting against an increase in the appropriations for alternative energy sources is that, as Mr Tugendhat said this morning, he was not in favour of energy accounting for more than 2-3 % of the

budget but was, on the other hand, in favour of increased Community resources being devoted to this sector. This is something about which I am sceptical since it would, I think, weigh very heavily on those countries who are highly dependent on their energy imports. I do not think we can go along with this idea, and if an increase in the appropriations which we are voting on here is a surreptitious way of introducing these increased resources, I can have no part in it.

**President.** — I put the motion for a draft resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

*(Applause)*

I call Mr Irmer on a point of order.

**Mr Irmer.** — (D) Mr President, I am sorry to have to take this opportunity once again of protesting against the fact that my attempts to catch the President's eye from this part of the chamber are being ignored. I wanted earlier on to raise a point of order, which has since become irrelevant. But, not for the first time, it is evident that my attempts to speak from this place on the extreme right of the chamber are going unnoticed. Let me repeat that I am, politically speaking, a displaced person; but if I really have to sit here, I would urgently appeal to you to take notice of the fact when I wish to raise a point of order.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mrs de March.

**Mrs de March.** — (F) Mr President, following the uproar which interfered with the speech by the Communist Member Maurice Martin, I should like to raise a point of order. I do so, Mr President, with a certain gravity, as I have already done, in my capacity as Communist Vice-President, before the Bureau of the European Parliament.

It is becoming quite intolerable if part of this House, which has been elected by universal suffrage, in a country where we received five million votes, are permanently to be the target of an aggressiveness which does little credit to those members who indulge in such practices. There is a correlation between this aggressiveness and the plans we are debating. Our ideas contain a number of things which do not please certain political groups. For all that, we find ourselves listening with great patience to various ideas which we do not like either. We are for the exchange of ideas and not for anathematizing and political agitation, and we intend to carry our mandate through to the end with the utmost serenity and with the courage this requires. I feel it important, Mr President, to clarify

**de March**

this point because I am anxious that the Communist Members should be respected in this House. It is a question of the plurality of ideas, of democracy itself, and this is a major issue for the European Parliament.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Thank you, Mrs de March. It was high time someone raised this point.

I call Mr Pearce on a point of order.

**Mr Pearce.** — Mr President, at the time that I asked to raise a point of order, there was a French television crew in the Chamber which was filming documents on these empty desks here. I think it is intolerable that television crews should be allowed to behave in that manner, and I would ask you to give clear-cut instructions to television crews not to behave in that way in future.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I will refer that problem to the Quaestors, Mr Pearce. On the other hand, I would not chase our television crews, so we have to find a balance there.

I call Mr Prag on a point of order.

**Mr Prag.** — Mr President, the Rules are quite clear on explanations of vote: they should last for three minutes and no longer. It was also quite evident to me that one explanation of vote, from Mrs Bonino, lasted a long time more than three minutes. I would ask you to apply the rules strictly in these matters. It seems to me that we go on far too long, and it seems also clear to me that Mrs Bonino was going to go on as long as you were prepared to let her.

**President.** — Mr Prag, I think you are right that Mrs Bonino went on 30 seconds too long, because I was a little sleepy at that moment.

*(Laughter)*

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the motions for resolutions on the *safety of pressurized water reactors*.

I put to the vote the *Weber motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-705/79/rev.)*.

The motion is rejected.

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — I put to the vote the *Seligman motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-769/79)*.

The resolution is adopted.

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — I put to the vote the *Linkohr motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-777/79)*.

The motion is rejected.

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the motions for resolutions on *energy supplies*.

I put to the vote the *motion for a resolution by the Group of European Progressive Democrats (Doc. 1-776/79)*.

The motion is rejected.

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — I put to the vote the *motion for a resolution by Mr Vergeer and others, Mr Seligman and others and Mr Pintat (Doc. 1-780/79)*.

The resolution is adopted.

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — I put to the vote the *Damette motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-781/79)*.

The motion is rejected.

### 8. Organization of a special part-session

**President.** — After a thorough discussion of the matter the enlarged Bureau has decided to organize an extra part-session, devoted exclusively to agricultural prices. This special part-session will be held in Strasbourg on 24-26 March 1980, with the following agenda:

- Monday 24 March, from 8 p.m. until 12 midnight:
- debate on agricultural prices
- Tuesday 25 March, from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. and from 3 p.m. to 7 p.m.:
- continuation of debate on agricultural prices
- Wednesday 26 March, at 10 a.m.:
- end of debate and vote

During this special part-session no other matters will be discussed. There will be no Question Time and no oral questions can be tabled. The chairmen of the political groups and the Bureau have also agreed that it will not be possible to table requests for other items to be placed on the agenda under urgent procedure. The parliamentary committees can meet in Strasbourg on Thursday and Friday of the same week, immediately after this special part-session.

**Mr Sieglerschmidt.** — (D) Mr President, when is the plenary sitting likely to end on Wednesday 26 March — and I mean likely?

**President.** — Mr Sieglerschmidt, you have seen this afternoon that it is not really possible to predict when voting is going to finish. I certainly cannot hazard a guess, in view of the numerous amendments which are likely to be tabled during the debate on agricultural prices.

### 9. Fight against drug abuse — Public health policy (continuation)

**President.** — The next item is the continuation of the debate on the fight against drug abuse.

I call Sir David Nicolson.

**Sir David Nicolson.** — Mr President, both the questions asked in this joint debate have made reference to smoking. Now although I must declare a vested interest in the tobacco industry, I do believe that this complex subject should not have been linked at all with the question of the suppression of the traffic in hard drugs. I would like to help the House by mentioning a few facts which I believe are relevant to any future debate on the subject of public health policy.

We have in the EEC no less than 180 000 people employed in the tobacco industry and many more than that are involved in distribution and associated business.

It may interest you to know that total sales of tobacco in the EEC amount to 17 billion EUA out of which 12 billion EUA or approximately 70 % represents tax, the rate of which, I might add, has not yet been harmonized throughout the Community. In other words, this total tax figure stands at a level approaching that of the total European budget. Now I sometimes think that the tobacco industry is often attacked because it is big and involves multinational companies, rather than for reasons concerning its products and I think we must realize from the figures which I have given you that one of the prime activities of this industry is in effect to act as a tax collector for the government concerned.

This is something we are very much aware of and something which I believe the governments are very much aware of also. I therefore think that they will proceed very cautiously before they kill the goose which lays such a big golden egg. For this reason, I believe that any debate on this subject should be conducted in a careful and unemotional way taking account of all the facts involved. Now there is no doubt that excessive smoking, like almost anything else taken in excess, is bad for you. However, I would emphasize that there is no medical evidence to prove that a few cigarettes, say ten or fifteen a day, are bad for you and the key, as you all know perfectly well, in both smoking and alcohol is moderation. Those who don't smoke may be interested to know that the society called Action on Smoking and Health, the German society for Occupational Medical Matters and the United States Surgeon General have all confirmed that being in an area where others are smoking is not considered a health hazard. However, I don't propose to go further into this whole rather confused area today. The facts of the matter are that the tobacco industry is a responsible industry which spends millions on medical research and other charitable objects. It has collaborated fully with governments in all measures which they have suggested, including paying, I may say, the massive taxation which I have referred to. Its advertising policies are not intended to expand smoking but merely to promote individual brand market shares and furthermore and most importantly it deliberately creates employment by bringing industry to depressed areas and by increasingly diversifying its activities.

Now, Mr President, it is much easier to do harm and to make an industry go into decline than to build an industry up, and with unemployment at such a high level throughout Europe this is hardly the right time to do something like this without very great caution. You will see from what I have already said that the ramifications are immense and should be approached very prudently.

Nicolson

Furthermore, may I conclude by saying that the Treaty of Rome implies that it is not up to the EEC to impose health standards on individual States, but up to the States to make their own regulations, whether it be for seat belts, vaccinations, smoking or whatever.

**President.** — I call Mr Almirante.

**Mr Almirante.** — (*I*) Mr President, Mr Pannella in his speech this morning gave us all a lesson in morals, but instead of moralizing about the speculation of drug pedlars, he did so about the alleged speculation of those who, like myself — like us all in the Italian National Right — are in favour of heavy penalties for drug pedlars in the whole Community and, if possible, in all parts of the world.

Mr President, I am in a position to prove that shameful speculation lies behind Mr Pannella's motives and behind those of his fellow-thinkers. I will prove it by way of a recent article in the Italian press. The Italian newspaper 'La Stampa' carried the following item on its front page the day before yesterday: '300 delegates convened from 40 countries. Drug addicts meet in Holland to demand the legalization of marijuana.' I see from this article that the meeting was held by the 'International Alliance for Cannabis Reform.' This Alliance supports exactly the same views as those held by Mr Pannella and others like him, who have tabled a whole series of amendments in favour of the trade in cannabis.

If three hundred delegates from forty different countries met in Holland this means that, since they obviously did not go there free of charge, this world association of drug addicts is richer than the European Parliament. I do not think that the honourable drug addicts had their travelling expenses cut by forty per cent in fact I believe they went with all expenses paid to Holland to defend cannabis. If there is wide-scale speculation, it is on the part of the traffickers and their friends, as I will go on to show: at this meeting, the American delegates, Bob Pisani and the Reverend William Dean stated that, according to the Washington narcotics department, the soft drugs trade alone in the United States has a turnover of thirty-five billion Italian lira, equal to that of the third largest multinational in the world.

This serves our communist and socialist friends right—they who are always attacking the multinationals. We would like you from now on to include the drug trade amongst the multinationals, as it makes the traffickers rich.

That is why we were very disappointed, Mr President, on listening to the Commissioner's report, to hear him state that we can do very little in this respect, since the problem of penalties for drug traffickers touches on the internal policies of the individual Member States. I remember that we rightly discussed a problem which

touches even more closely on the internal policies of individual countries — that of terrorism — and we agreed to institute uniform European legislation against terrorism. Try to bear in mind — and I speak to you as an Italian Member, representing that European country hardest hit by terrorism at the moment — that drugs are one of the main causes of that terrorism which is unfortunately on the increase in my country. There is no doubt that it is young drug addicts who carry out such incredibly cynical and cold-blooded acts of terrorism — acts which could not even be laid at the door of a brute, were he not under the influence of drugs. These phenomena — the drug trade, terrorism, disorder and violence — go hand in hand, and we cannot strike at terrorism, nor protect ourselves against it, unless we hit the drug traffic hard.

We ask that a start be made along the path to uniform European legislation on the drug trade in the nine countries of the Community, and we also ask that no distinction be made between those who deal in so-called soft drugs and those who deal in so-called hard drugs — and no pity wasted on them either — for the problem is the same in both cases. We are extremely surprised and regard it as shameful to see that those who are fighting the good fight against hunger in the world, for the reason that hunger destroys the lives of millions of human beings, do not take account of the fact that drugs are also destroying the lives of tens and hundreds of thousands of human beings, and are even now damaging the lives and existences of so many young people in our countries and in the rest of the world.

IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

*Vice-President*

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

**Mrs Krouwel-Vlam.** — (*NL*) Mr President, my Group was amazed at this oral question with debate tabled by a number of members of the Group of the European Peoples Party. We were amazed, Mr President, because they are asking about things we know already. Only a short while ago, the Commissioner with responsibility for health matters gave an account of the situation as regards health policy in the Community in the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. Several health questions, such as the prevention of, for example, cardiovascular diseases, safety of medical equipment, organ banks and organ transplants, have already been discussed by the previous Parliament and these questions were only included on the agenda for the plenary assembly after they had been discussed and prepared carefully and in depth in the competent Parliamentary

## Krouwel-Vlam

Committee. This is the correct procedure, Mr President, and this is how we should continue with a view to establishing a harmonious and effective policy in the field of public health.

The Council of Ministers has only met a few times and has unfortunately got no further in its decision-making than research, study and surveys in Member States. I am not implying that this research is superfluous — **indeed, quite the reverse is true, but it is high time that a real policy was introduced with a view to protecting the health and well-being of the 260 million citizens of Europe.** A lot is already happening in the broad field of health protection within the Community and one of the reasons for this is the existing European Committees of hospitals, nursing staff, doctors etc. and the free movement of, for example, doctors, nurses and, before long, dentists. They all offer well-meant advice which puts the Community under an obligation to increase cooperation between the Member States and introduce measures aimed at solving the major problems. The activities announced by the European Commission strike us as a good initial step towards a European public health programme. My group would like to add a few further suggestions.

Firstly, the European medical card. The introduction of a document of this kind strikes us as extremely desirable in view of the major increase in transfrontier travel in the Member States as a result of holiday-makers, migrant workers and student exchanges etc. Is it possible to include on this document in addition to **personal and medical data an indication of whether or not the holder consents to the use of his or her organs for purposes of transplantation and the nature of the medical expenses for which he or she is insured, the latter in view of the reciprocal arrangements between the sickness insurance schemes in the Member States?** I am thinking here of the E-111 form. Overconsumption of medicines is extremely disturbing. It is vital that steps should be taken with a view to putting an end to overconsumption and wastage of medicines, in view of the major financial implications, among other things. We intend to support the Commissioner's intention to include action on this point in a programme. Would a preventive campaign to inform consumers perhaps be a good way of doing this? In addition, there must be some guidance as regards both quality and price control for medicines and in respect of advertizing by the pharmaceutical industry. This would also help in **combating the trade in illegally imported medicines** as currently occurs in border regions. A directive should **be introduced regarding compulsory labelling of packaged medicines** and the inclusion of a leaflet indicating the side effects of the medicine which is necessary information for the consumer.

In view of the fact that the people of Europe are, fortunately and rightly, becoming increasingly responsible in this respect, we regard it as right and proper that a European Charter should be introduced regarding the recognition and protection of the rights of the

patient. Does the Commission see any possibilities in this respect? Mr President, there are plenty more points which could be included in an action programme for a European approach to health problems. These subjects will, I have no doubt, be included sooner or later on the agenda after they have first of all been thoroughly discussed in the Committee on **Public Health. A debate on an oral-question is not, however, the time to go into this matter at length.** It is extremely desirable that the Community should adopt a more active and independent role in the field of health protection. I hope your action programme will be an initial step in this direction.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Ms Clwyd.

**Ms Clwyd.** — Mr President, before I start I would like to protest most strongly about the way this debate has been organized. It started on Tuesday and lasted for half an hour, we had three-quarters of an hour or even less this morning, then a long gap again until this afternoon. These are important subjects and the debate should have been organized in a different way. I am protesting most strongly to the people responsible for this way of organizing debates.

It has been interesting for those of us who have stayed the course: some of the things which have been said I have found very valuable and agreed with, other things I have disagreed with. Clearly, there has been some discussion over the last few years on the possibility or desirability of the EEC's making a formal move into the field of public health, on whether there is enough common interest among the Nine to justify an action programme on health such as already exists on environmental pollution, on industrial safety and in many other areas of social policy. The analogy with the poverty programme, with the rehabilitation of the disabled, with the coordination of policies in the field of employment and forecasting, with vocational training, with work humanization, with consultation on social protection matters, is a strong one. These are all areas where Member States have identified issues of common concern which justify regular exchanges of views and information.

Public health, I agree, seems to conform to this pattern. It is clear that an EEC public health programme should be a selective pragmatic one concentrating on clearly identified issues of common interest. We do not want to see paper mountains of directives or sweeping harmonization proposals to follow in their wake.

On the central issue of public health organization — and I speak here personally — the UK approach exemplified in our National Health Service is one of our most important socialist institutions. That does not

Clwyd

mean that the quality of the National Health Service is the envy of the world; it is not, but the principle, I believe, is still the envy of the world. The NHS was created to provide a comprehensive, caring, health service, free at the time of use and available to all the people, regardless of how much wealth they own. These are the principles of the National Health Service, and they are fundamentally socialist principles. Many doctors in the continental countries — in some of the countries of the Nine — resent the generally accepted view that the National Health Service is the ideal system of delivery of care for the patient. Indeed, directives from the EEC on medical education chose to ignore the National Health Service and proposed changes designed to perpetuate the self-employed doctor. As a member of the Royal Commission on the National Health Service, which for the purpose of its report made several international comparisons, I believe that health care in each of the nine countries will be better safeguarded by our own national democracies than by Brussels bureaucrats representing the private-enterprise forces of Europe. There is indeed a grave danger that if plans go ahead for harmonizing tax systems, then the whole financial basis of an institution which some of us value greatly will be threatened.

Since the Commission's programme talks specifically about prevention and vaccination, I would like to talk about both of those topics briefly. I think it is agreed by all countries that many of the main improvements in health have come, not from advances in medical treatment, but from public health measures — better nutrition and improvements in the economic, social and natural environments.

One of the most important weapons in prevention is the vaccination programme. For years, children and others have been immunized with increasing beneficial results, but the problem is that the numbers are declining because some parents have become anxious about the possible detrimental effects in a few cases. This anxiety applies particularly to whooping-cough vaccine, and we should, I believe, give priority to organizing a proper compensation scheme for vaccine-damaged children.

I was very sorry to hear from the other side of this House what I can only describe, despite the fact that the Member declared his interest, as a commercial break; it was a straight plug for the tobacco industry, and yet probably the biggest avoidable cause of ill-health today is smoking. Some national governments have embarked on negotiations with the tobacco industry, and these must be tough negotiations. Cigarette advertising should be restricted as closely as possible to the point of sale, and it should give information on tar content. Here I want to say a word about advertising — particularly drug advertising and the way it discriminates against women, because one of the most disgraceful adverts in the medical journals is an advert for a tranquilizer which shows a woman

pushing a baby in a pram. The suggestion is clear enough, and advertising of this kind should be very strictly controlled.

Health warnings should be much tougher on packets of cigarettes. I suggest something like this: Danger: cigarettes can cause bronchitis and lung cancer and can harm unborn children. No new brand of cigarette should be introduced with a tar content in excess of 15 milligrams, and a special tax related to the tar content in cigarettes should be introduced at that level. That means extending the 2-year derogation from the EEC rules on tobacco taxation, and also increasing its scope.

I pick up this morning the Commission's programme for 1980, and I see under the section on public health that during the first half of the year the Commission will draw up a programme for better health at less cost. I find that a very interesting assertion, because health services in all European countries are absorbing a continuously growing proportion of the resources even of the richest countries, although those countries which spend the most do not necessarily have the highest health standards.

The recognition that the important causes of ill-health lie in how people live and in their environment leads, I think, to two conclusions. First, that some countries are over-investing in the provision of health services in comparison with other methods of social investment to improve health. Secondly, that much of what is currently spent is not spent efficiently, even for the achievement of the somewhat limited objectives of current services. Then, of course, there are fundamental ethical dilemmas of medical practice, which unfortunately there is no time to go into now. The increasing specialization of health care and the development of complex technology and the associated demands for resources are international phenomena. In most countries of the EEC, an increasing share of the national cake goes on health services, and the same question is common to us all: how can we peg these spiralling costs of health-care?

One of the reasons, of course, for high costs is that progress in health-care seems still to be pinned to curing, as though good health were essentially a kind of sophisticated replacement, repair and salvaging operation for broken-down biological machines. Too much lip-service is paid to the idea of prevention and the even more complex notion of actively promoting health. Substantial damage is, for example, done to health by many of our current industrial and commercial practices, while tobacco manufacturers spend in excess of one million pounds every week to promote their products. It has been calculated that over 1000 people in one country alone die prematurely as a result of smoking-related diseases, and that is in one week alone. Instead of risking physical damage on the production lines, we need to organize work in such a way

Clwyd

that it is safe as well as productive. Industrial, economic and social policies are partly health policies.

Finally, Mr President, I want to stress again my central argument. Control of health-care in each of our nine countries must be maintained by our own national democracies, but cooperation is essential on many aspects, including medical science, health-care research, drug-abuse controls and — most important of all — patients' rights. Only through mutual cooperation at all levels shall we be able to improve health-care in each of our member countries.

**President.** — Ms Clwyd, you asked why this debate is being continued at this time. Due note has been taken of this question. You can consult the chairman of your group who, together with other group chairmen, was responsible for deciding how this debate was to be held. Next week, the Bureau in Brussels will devote an entire day to various matters including these very pressing issues.

I call Mr Vredeling.

**Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (NL) Mr President, I should like to begin by thanking Parliament for including this matter on its agenda although — as you have already said in your answer to Ms Clwyd — the debate has been conducted in a somewhat fragmented manner. Nevertheless, I think it is extremely important that we should not only devote our attention to topical matters, but should also consider questions such as the one before us now. I should like to begin by referring back to the general remarks I made at the beginning of this debate. I will not repeat what I said: I should merely like to make a few observations on the basis of the questions which have been put.

Firstly, in answer to Mrs Spaak who asked me quite specifically what our experience had so far been of the Pompidou Committee, I should like to say that since it was set up this committee which, as you know, was created in 1971 on the initiative of the then French President, Mr Pompidou, and consists of representatives of all nine Member States of the Community plus Sweden, has met five times at ministerial level to discuss problems such as those under discussion here today — for example, drug abuse. The Commission and Interpol are also represented on this Committee. The Pompidou Committee provides a framework for establishing contacts and promoting cooperation. The purpose of the meetings of this Committee is periodically to exchange experience, to promote the forming of opinions on the problem of drugs, to cooperate in combating this evil as effectively as possible within Western Europe and to discover new forms of action with a view to eliminating drug abuse. This Committee provides an opportunity for coordination and enables us as a Community to work together with third countries. A number of decisions taken at the most recent

meeting, which was held last November in Stockholm, relate to international cooperation in combating the illicit trade in drugs and intensification of action in this respect, the exchange, at international level, of information and experience regarding health education and treatment and rehabilitation — which are also necessary, as has frequently been pointed out here. The 'Pompidou Group' was quite explicit in its opposition to the legalization of cannabis. Reference was made in this connection to the gaps which still exist in scientific knowledge regarding the long-term effects of cannabis and its possible harmful effects in combination with other toxic substances. Closer cooperation in research was, I think, one of the demands discussed by the Pompidou Committee.

We can do various things in this field in cooperation with the Committee. A group of experts has been set up and given a number of tasks including an analysis of the pattern of drug abuse in the Member States. These experts are to draw up a report on existing and proposed measures at national level aimed at combating, the illicit production of, trade in and use of drugs. In addition, this expert group has also been requested to draw up proposals for further action. The work of the Pompidou Committee will in future be organized by the Joint Committee of the Council of Europe, and as from 1 January 1980 it has had the services of a permanent Council of Europe secretariat. The Commission will continue to be represented on this Committee as an observer. In addition, we take part in the work of a committee aimed at promoting public health and which also works on the combating of drug abuse. So much for my answer to Mrs Spaak's question.

In answering the questions put by a number of Members, I should first of all like to point out that I was very interested — from a political point of view too — in what Mrs Chouraqui had to say. She referred to the possibilities under Article 235 of the Treaty. This familiar article states that in cases where the Treaty has not provided the necessary powers, the Council can take decisions on a proposal from the Commission and after consulting the Assembly. I found it rather intriguing that the honourable Member, who is no longer here mentioned things such as the police and the law. I do not know whether she was speaking on behalf of her group, but I hope so. It is interesting that a suggestion to the effect that Article 235 offers possibilities for cooperation at Community level in penal and police matters should come from that quarter.

Much has been said about soft and hard drugs. Mr Pannella made a few points which I cannot dismiss out of hand. I have the feeling that some of the points he made may well be correct. It is indeed true that when discussing drugs people tend to make far too big an issue of hashish, which he referred to as one of the least harmful drugs in that it is a fact — and this is a positive characteristic — that it is not addictive. In addition, the consensus of scientific opinion regarding the effects of hashish is not unreservedly negative as

### Vredeling

it is in the case of alcohol and tobacco. I have already referred in my introductory speech to recent articles on this subject in *Le Monde* last week.

The question of the Community's powers in this field has also been discussed. Mrs Gredal said that the Council of Ministers does not meet to discuss questions of public health. This is not entirely true, Mrs Gredal. The Council of Ministers does indeed meet to discuss such matters when the Ministers of Health meet — as we say — in the framework of the Council. The Council of Ministers does have some powers in the field of public health — consider, for example, trade in pharmaceutical products, trans-frontier trade, the production of a list of drugs, standardization etc. These are all public health matters. The Health Ministers therefore take the view that, for example, trade in and production of pharmaceuticals is not exclusively a matter for the Council of Ministers of Economic Affairs but also concerns the Council of Ministers of Health. It is not true that we regard public health as lying completely outside the Treaties. This does not mean that it is not very often necessary to have recourse to Article 235 of the Treaty, but this is equally true in the case of environmental questions, for example. This article is frequently applied when matters which are essential for the smooth running of the Common Market are concerned. As you know, one of the aims of the Community is to raise the standard of living of the people of Europe, and public health has a direct bearing on this — which is why, in my view, public health is in fact an appropriate field for Community policy.

The subject in hand today is one of vital importance, and it amazes me that Parliament should currently be making so much use of what I would call makeshift debates. Someone decides we should discuss public health, so she puts an oral question and we end up devoting an entire debate to this subject. I agree with Mrs Krouwel-Vlam that preparatory work is needed here. After all there is a Committee on Public Health which was specially set up for this purpose. A debate is being held on this vital subject merely as a result of Mrs Squarcialupi's initiative. In my view it would be a lot better — and I am putting this forward as a suggestion — if Parliament were to work on the basis of reports and the views of experts rather than on the basis of a few odd remarks, which had more to do with drugs than with public health. It was only Mrs Krouwel-Vlam who touched on the latter subject. I think this is due to a great extent, Mr President, to the rather poor way in which a debate of this kind has been prepared, but I hope that Parliament will, in the near future, devote more attention to this question when it comes to discuss its working methods.

The medical card mentioned by Mrs Krouwel-Vlam strikes me as a very good idea. She referred to the E-111 form, which can be used in case of illness by people insured in a particular Member State in order

to obtain the same treatment as persons normally living in the country they are visiting.

The medical card in question contains essential information which might be necessary when for example, a patient is, unconscious as a result of an accident. In such cases, a doctor must be able to discover what he can and cannot do. It is important to know whether the patient wears a pacemaker or what medicines he takes since some medicines should not be combined with others. This is an extremely complex matter since it also involves the problem of medical confidentiality. **A number of Member States have already recognized** this medical card and I hope all of them will do so in the future. This, Mr President, is something which is more real to the people of Europe than the elimination of a few technical obstacles to trade which we discuss so often.

Mrs Krouwel-Vlam also asked about patient's rights and their protection at Community level. I can see how important this subject is but, Mr President, I do not think it is something we should start on.

Mention was also made of the need for an action programme in the field of public health. This is not an idea I would dismiss out of hand — indeed I hope that something will come of it. However, this is a relatively new field. At any rate, your suggestion has not fallen on deaf ears.

The British National Health Service has been rightly praised. This is perhaps not the best possible system but compared with systems in other countries of the Community, it is nevertheless one of the best systems I know. Public health in the United Kingdom is organized on the basis of principles which I feel sure should be generally acceptable. Historically, developments in other countries have been somewhat different, but the British National Health Service certainly has its advantages. Our proposal was inspired by the fact that the self-employed and those not in gainful employment in the United Kingdom are covered by the National Health Service, which means that Britons who are used to having medical cover in their own country receive no help abroad. Our proposal is currently before the Council and is coming up against objections which we are trying to overcome. I mention this merely to demonstrate the fact that we regard the British National Health Service more as a shining example than as something wrong-headed.

As regards the right of establishment for doctors, it should be pointed out that this should not be regarded as a way of promoting private enterprise. It is a question of developing free movement and free establishment. It is not intended as an attack on the British health system but as a way of establishing free movement not only for workers but also for self-employed persons and other professional groups within the Community.

## Vredeling

Mr President, these were a few points to which I wanted to draw attention. I will finish by saying that I hope that it will be possible to return to this extremely important subject on another occasion. It has already been said this week that if we manage to include subjects which mean something to the people of Europe — practical everyday matters — on our agenda here, this would in itself be a very good thing.

I hope therefore that the competent committee will go on with its work. We should be glad to provide any necessary information. I hope this will not be the last debate on this subject.

**President.** — Mr Vredeling, I hope that all the political groups will take note of your wish — which I second — for a short but well-prepared and wide-ranging discussion of public health policy.

I call Mrs Gredal.

**Mrs Gredal** — (DK) I am sorry, Mr President, but I want to ask the Commissioner if I heard rightly, i.e. that the Pompidou committee had legalized or had advocated legalizing the use of marijuana. This is utterly wrong. This was discussed at one meeting but not advocated. This is what I heard in translation, but I should like to know if what I heard was correct.

**President.** — I call Mr Vredeling.

**Mr Vredeling.** — (NL) I want to correct at once this misunderstanding which could be very dangerous. I misunderstood it or expressed it wrongly, and I apologize. The Pompidou group came out against the legalization of cannabis. This is the exact opposite. I simply added a personal comment to the effect that the greatest danger with drugs lies not in the use of hashish, but of other things.

**President.** — I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

**Mrs Squarcialupi.** — (I) Mr President, like Mr Vredeling, I too hope that there will be renewed opportunity for us to discuss the problems tackled so chaotically as a result of the way these proceedings were organized, not through any fault of the Members or of the committees concerned.

I think that today offers a typical example of how a subject should not be dealt with by a parliamentary institution. If the people who elected us knew that the debate began on Tuesday, has continued in two periods today, that we shall be voting on the questions tomorrow, and that the speaking time allotted to the political groups is ridiculously short, then I think they would feel that this institution is far removed from

their lives, despite their having helped to create it by their votes.

Two major questions have been mixed up together, and it was a grave error on the part of the Bureau, or at least an indication of bad faith, that someone was allowed to reply to one question and another to another, whereas the subjects we were dealing with were extremely important ones which deserved to be treated separately. One extremely pressing problem in particular, that of health, has been shamefully treated in this House this week.

As far as the Commission's reply is concerned, I must say that I do not find any great cause for satisfaction in it either. Perhaps because he had to answer two questions at once, Mr Vredeling's reply seemed somewhat lukewarm and evasive, and more centred on the drug question than on the other. I am afraid, however that we must also seek the reason for this in a certain reluctance to act on the part of the Commission, even if it did — I was pleased to note — on a full two occasions quote the Treaty of Rome, pointing out that in the field of health some powers might result from its correct interpretation.

As far as the Pompidou Group is concerned, if we remember that the European Community adopts position on all international problems with far-reaching implications and involving far-off countries, then I believe that the Commission should not just be content with acting as an observer in this group, but must definitely retain its freedom of action on the drug question.

Twelve speakers have taken part in this debate. With some very rare exceptions, I thank them all. I thank almost all of them and would like to emphasize that it is, for the most part, women who have spoken, and that this is no coincidence: lady Members of Parliament know how to bring the immediate needs of the population home to this House.

I think we have all mentioned the social causes of drug abuse and to the need for Community action but, for the very reason that drugs strike deep at the roots of our society, it is not enough to take decisions at national or Community level even supposing we can achieve this — but decisions and action must be taken at international level.

Almost all the speakers exercised great caution in speaking of the drugs problem. Only one expressed some major doubts. I refer to the motion tabled by Mrs Bonino and others, in which reference is made to documents dating from as far back as 1972 proving that hashish and marijuana are nearly harmless. Well, I can only invite her parliamentary group to purchase for the modest price of five dollars the latest United Nations report on the control of narcotics, in which they will learn that in January 1980 this type of drug is still considered extremely harmful — a fact which is

**Squarcialupi**

further confirmed by the members of the American Congress. We therefore reject those preconceived opinions, because we want the facts to be established through debate and through the large contribution science and research can make in this field.

We followed our question with a motion intended as the starting point for general discussion, through which we might reach the widest possible agreement on a phenomenon which is destroying thousands of families as well as thousands of young lives.

I will conclude by expressing a sense of deep dissatisfaction, but I nevertheless hope that in this House we can come back to subjects which are of concern to the public and which can affect the quality of life and even life itself.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Vredeling.

**Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (NL) I should merely like to say to Mrs Squarcialupi that the motion for a resolution tabled by the Committee in question has the full support of the Commission. I would not like to give the impression that we do not value the views of the Committee. For the rest, I can only comment on what Mrs Squarcialupi said, i.e. that the Commission should not be so passive but should play a more independent role. Various speakers have already pointed out that the possibilities afforded by the Treaty of Rome are inadequate, and this is also a point which Mrs Squarcialupi could have taken up. Some people have even gone so far as to say that the Commission can do nothing at all as it has no competency in this field whatsoever by virtue of the Treaty of Rome. I flatly deny this. The Treaty of Rome states what is in the interests of the smooth running of the Common Market and the achievement of its objectives. You should take a close look at what these objectives are. Thus the objective we are discussing here today can be achieved by means of a proposal from the Commission after consulting Parliament and subsequently by a unanimous decision by the Council. I realize that Denmark has certain objections but I by no means go along with them. Denmark should have realized that matters of this kind would come up before deciding to accede to the Community.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The motions for resolutions and the amendments which have been tabled will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

#### 10. Regulation on Community transit

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is the report (Doc. 1-544/79), drawn up by Mr von Wogau

on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the:

- proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-372/79) for a regulation amending for the second time Regulation (EEC) No 222/77 on Community transit.

I call Mr von Wogau.

**Mr von Wogau, rapporteur** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Davignon has apologized for not being able to take part in this debate because he had to keep another appointment. In my capacity as rapporteur, I regret the fact that Mr Davignon is not able to be present, but I must accept his explanation, as this report was originally on the agenda for Tuesday, was then withdrawn and is now up for discussion at a very late, unscheduled hour. I think this once again goes to show that we must really do everything in our power in the future to ensure that we stick to our original agenda. Some Members may not appreciate the importance of this regulation on Community transit; if so, I would draw their attention to the fact that this is a genuine Community regulation . . .

**President.** — I agree with you, and what you say is important. We are hours behind with this important debate because we spent hours discussing requests for urgent procedure and changes to the agenda.

I hope that all the groups will stop trying to change the agenda which we have spent a whole day preparing in the Bureau. We lost hours over this and all we achieved was a debate on the urgency of issues which we are not even going to be able to discuss tomorrow afternoon, because we have lost so much time.

You may continue, Mr von Wogau.

**Mr von Wogau, rapporteur** — (D) . . . Thank you, Mr President, for lending your support to what I am sure we all feel. The point I was trying to make was that we are here concerned with the making of European Community legislation — at least as far as we are able under the terms of the Treaties of Rome. I believe that, as directly-elected Members of the European Parliament, we cannot take these duties seriously enough — especially those who agree with me that the European Parliament's legislative powers should be increased.

The subject we are concerned with this evening is Community transit, something which should be viewed against the overall background of the opening of the Community's internal frontiers. We all know that, despite the existence of customs union and despite the fact that the transitional periods have now run out, the freedom of transit across internal frontiers within the European Community still leaves a lot to be

von Wogau

desired. Let us consider for a moment what the original ideas behind the Treaties of Rome and the Common Market were. What the founding fathers of the Community wanted was strong external frontiers, and if we are serious in our desire to achieve this aim, we must make more progress towards a Community customs administration and the harmonization of Community customs law, which should in turn include common penalties to be imposed on offenders to replace the current penalties which differ from country to country.

The reservations expressed by the Committee on **Budgetary Control in connection with the provisions** relating to Community transit are also bound up with this aspect of creating secure external frontiers for the Community. We must make our external frontiers secure to prevent the free trading facilities within the Community from being fraudulently misused.

On the other hand, within these secure external frontiers **there must be free movement of goods and services** in the European Community. The main benefits we anticipate from freedom of movement within a large Community market are lower production costs, free competition between manufacturers from all the Member States of the Community and better and cheaper provision of goods and services for the people of the Community. The Community's founding fathers also hoped that the Treaties of Rome would make Europe more competitive vis-à-vis other major world markets.

We all know that these aims have only partially been achieved. It is true that customs duties have been abolished within the European Community, but they have simply been replaced by other obstacles to free trade, such as different rates of value added tax within the Community, which have in turn set up bureaucratic obstacles at national frontiers. Secondly, there are the monetary compensatory amounts for agricultural produce. We paid a visit only yesterday to the customs post between Kehl and Strasbourg and were able to see for ourselves that the imposition of MCAs requires a great deal of paperwork, and that this is exacerbated by the fact that the daily fluctuations in the rates of exchange likewise affect the MCA rates.

A third obstacle to trade is the technical standards which are now being used to make European markets even more impenetrable. Ladies and gentlemen, we all realize that, before national frontiers can be opened once and for all, there are a number of tricky problems still to be solved. For instance, the harmonization of value added tax, the abolition of MCAs and other problems will require a substantial political effort and will doubtless take time.

The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs feels, however, that we could bring about definite improvements right now if we adopt a step-by-step approach. We therefore welcome the fact that the

Commission has submitted proposals for improving the procedure for eliminating technical obstacles to trade. The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs has formed a working party to tackle this very subject. We also welcome the fact that the Commission has submitted a multiannual programme for the attainment of customs union, the current updated version of which describes in detail the various steps that should be taken to open up national frontiers.

Ladies and gentlemen, the proposed regulation on Community transit which we are discussing now forms part of this programme. It is concerned, first and foremost, with the abolition of transit advice notes within the internal market. These advice notes would be replaced by the assumption that legal provisions have been complied with. We think this would be a neat solution which would also make it easier to prosecute in cases of fraud. Secondly, the proposal before you today incorporates the optional abolition of guarantees. The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs feels that, before guarantees can be abolished, it will be necessary to work out additional objective criteria to ensure that small and medium-sized undertakings in particular are not placed at a disadvantage. With this proviso, we go along with the Commission's proposals, although they do not — in our opinion — go far enough. We feel that, for certain goods, it would be quite possible today to abolish all formalities in intra-Community trade. The goods we have in mind are, firstly, those which are freely circulating within the Common Market; secondly, those which are not covered by the Common Agricultural Policy; and thirdly, those which are not subject to taxes other than value added tax.

For this reason, we call on the Commission to submit proposals on bringing about further improvements in this field by the end of 1980.

Ladies and gentlemen, the people of the European Community expect us, the first directly-elected European Parliament, to do something positive to open up the Community's internal frontiers. The proposal you have before you now is a step in this direction, and I would therefore ask you to give it your support.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* Earlier, Mr President, you were cross — and I can well understand your feelings — because this Chamber was practically deserted, as it is now. You have my full support on this point, because such absences are not in order. However, Mr President, I must point out that I was not here because the Chair had authorized a working meeting of the dele-

Pannella

gation for relations with Yugoslavia. I find it regrettable that I should be obliged to miss these debates and I trust that Members will be spared this kind of problem in the future.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, the point is that we have to solve the problem of the debates which occur every morning with regard to urgent procedure, i.e. alterations to the agenda. In the parliament of my small country it simply just does not happen. The Bureau advises a change to the agenda and the House simply votes on it. I really hope that this idea will sink in — that we should simply vote ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to proposals from the Bureau. We should gain an hour every day this way.

I call Mr Radoux.

**Mr Radoux.** — (*F*) Since Mr Pannella may be right on this occasion — although I am inclined to disagree — in pleading an engagement at a committee meeting, I have to come to the defence of the Chair. Either we have committee meetings or we do not have them. When the Chair refuses to authorize them, we are not happy either. We have to make up our minds what we want!

**President.** — Thank you, Mr Radoux, for defending the Chair in this way.

I call Mr Notenboom to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD).

**Mr Notenboom.** — (*NL*) Mr President, it seems almost shameful to speak like this on something which is our prime duty, namely passing judgement on proposals from the European Commission to the Council regarding regulations. That is, after all, still our main task, or at least one of our main tasks. I shall be brief, for I think it is humiliating for Mr Jenkins to have to wait so long, but it is our job to assess what the Commission has proposed with regard to European legislation. I really shall speak for only a few minutes, as the rapporteur has already given an excellent expose of the ins and outs of the question. Our Group supports Mr von Wogau's proposals on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and the Committee on Budgetary Control's amendments. I think it would be a good idea, however, to publicize the thought process behind this. That is to say, Mr President, that in our Group and in the Control Committee of which I am a member, we are faced with the question of whether to allow this extension of open borders and this reduction in administrative formalities to increase the opportunities for fraud. And our answer was yes, since we are here to extend this common market and make it larger and stronger, gradually eliminating any remaining barriers and moving further towards economic, monetary and political union. Our

approval of this proposal is thus in accordance with what we promised our constituents. We did not want to cut down on the Commission's proposals. We have accepted your proposals, Mr Vredeling, in their entirety, in the knowledge that some risk is involved in that border loopholes do result in a certain amount of crime. I am not referring here — and I have said this more than once before in this House — to the small-time smuggler trying to earn a few extra pennies but to organized crime. We therefore give our support to the Control Committee's amendments, which in no way detract from the Commission proposals or from the von Wogau report but simply add three points. We therefore think it is justified, and indeed desirable, to say yes to the Commission's proposals.

These additional points involve three requests, the first of which is that the Commission should continue with the centralization of anti-fraud operations, so that we do not have nine Member States each working separately to combat fraud, and it gradually becomes the Community's business to take action against fraud, eliminating all border problems and difficulties, so that cases can be taken to court in any country.

Secondly, special attention should be given to goods particularly susceptible to fraud. What the amendment says — the Dutch version is badly expressed although it ultimately comes from a Dutch original — is ‘goods which are particularly open to fraud’. What we mean by goods open to fraud, of course, is goods with which big profits can be made as a result of fraudulent practices. This is something the Commission must get to grips with.

Thirdly, a minimum percentage should be laid down for physical checks. Here too the Dutch text is odd, as it talks about ‘*materiële controle*’. This does not need to be a high percentage. Five, six or ten percent will do but it must be on a European basis, so that we no longer have 50 % being checked at one border and perhaps nothing at all at another.

A further wish is for the officials responsible — not, I hope, for much longer — for checks at borders to be properly instructed, as it is still quite common for customs officers to be under-informed on agricultural policy, which leaves the way wide open for fraud. They must be better informed. We have recently seen cases of information meetings not materializing because of organizational difficulties. All this is the sort of thing we want the Commission to look into. If the Commission takes this up we feel that the risks involved in extending the common market are justifiable and necessary in the light of what the voters of Europe expect. We have balanced the pros and cons of this, with the result I indicated to you just now. I feel it is worth making this clear here in public.

**President.** — I call Mr de Ferranti to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mr de Ferranti.** — Mr President, I too agree with you that Mr Notenboom's clarity and interest in this subject have made a useful contribution on the question particularly of the abuse of the freedoms that this new proposal will give. I would now like to turn my attention towards the thoughts and interests of the literally millions of citizens of the Community who cross our frontiers every day of the year or who send their goods or indeed their cash and capital across our frontiers every year.

Naturally, all those present today — and here I include all those who have been good enough to come to listen to our debate today — would not be here in this Chamber if they too did not believe in the idea of Europe and trying to create a common market and the free movement of goods in Europe.

But those millions of people crossing the frontiers — what do they think of our work when they actually have to submit themselves to the formalities of crossing the frontiers? What sort of a common market do they think we have managed to achieve when the frontiers are there just as they have always been. Of course if they are accurate and expert observers they will be able to see what a lot of improvements have been made. They will know that at Kehl the typical waiting time for a lorry is now only half-an-hour, Mr President. Only half-an-hour? Why, in heaven's name, is it half-an-hour at all? Why can't all of us engaged in this work make enough progress to enable that lorry to go **straight through the frontier at Kehl? How invaluable it would be if that lorry could be making some progress down a motorway instead of sitting there at the frontier.** It is not just a trivial detail, it is a matter of millions of pounds. It is a matter of bringing the consumers of Europe some real benefits from the reduction of frontier formalities and other barriers.

In this connection, Mr President, I should like to draw attention to the many, many thousands of people who are endeavouring to do something about this situation. Through Mr Vredeling I speak to all those in the Commission, where many people have devoted years of their lives and tremendous expertise to drawing up the necessary and detailed directives. And then there is the Council secretariat and behind the Council's secretariat the many thousands of civil servants who are not, as one might be tempted to think, simply devoted to trying to erect more barriers, but whose heart is in the right place in each of our Member States and who are genuinely doing a fine job in helping to reduce the barriers to trade. And then behind all of these are all the trade associations, the trade unions, the consumer associations, innumerable organizations and individuals who really are doing their best to improve the situation.

Now, as we all know, sometimes they get it wrong. Sometimes they introduce a measure of harmonization which really is not very sensible, and it is always when they get matters wrong that it hits the headlines. It is

then that the media and the newspapers refer to yet another piece of Brussels nonsense. This is the only story that comes out of Brussels. And it is not fair to these many thousands of people, who are doing a proper job and who are determined to see some improvement. And let us not forget in all this the important work of the Parliament and of our own staff. I know, sitting under the chairmanship of Mr Delors in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, how much work the staff there do and how unsung their work is and yet how important it is at the end of the day to be able to produce the results which we are going to be able to claim credit for when it comes to being re-elected.

I was lucky or perhaps sensible enough to accompany Mr von Wogau on his visit to the frontier at Kehl yesterday. And perhaps this is something that all of us could do when we have a moment crossing the frontiers: call in and see the customs officers and tell them that we appreciate the work that they do. We are not trying to put them out of a job — not at all. Value added tax is going to go on being collected forever, I am certain of that. So they have no fear from us about their jobs. But they may feel unappreciated, they do do their best at the frontier to do a good job and to implement those continued barriers to trade which we would indeed like to see removed.

What struck me yesterday about the frontier formalities at Kehl was not only the point Mr von Wogau made about value added tax, but the amount of time and effort spent on the monetary compensatory amounts. In fact it is very largely the compensatory amounts on meat crossing the frontier which is the cause of work, since they have to be calculated by a complicated procedure based on the latest exchange rate which comes through to them five or six times during the day. This serves to remind us once again of the importance of the EMS, and how important it is to work towards a European Monetary System which will enable us eventually to have one currency, something which would simplify procedures at the frontier perhaps more than anything else.

So I would like to thank all those people to whom I have referred, and to say that I am certain I can speak for the whole of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs in saying that we are determined, through the special working party that we have set up, to do all we can to make sure that perhaps even in our lifetime, when we visit the frontier at Kehl, all we will read there if we are going westwards is 'France' and all we will read if we are going eastwards is 'Deutschland'.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Vredeling.

**Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission.** — *(NL)* Mr President, my reply will in fact be partic-

## Vredeling

ularly brief. I am speaking on behalf of my colleague Mr Davignon, and Parliament can rest assured that I am not suffering from an excess of information on this subject. First and foremost, therefore, I should like to thank Mr von Wogau who, as rapporteur for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, expressed his approval of our proposals and also Mr Notenboom who, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, made a number of comments which are also reflected in certain amendments tabled by his committee. On behalf of Mr Davignon, I can confirm that the Commission is prepared to adopt these proposals. Mr von Wogau said that the Commission would have to make 'further improvements'. I can assure you that the Commission's departments are already working on the preparation of proposals which will come before Parliament at the end of the year. Furthermore, as far as Mr de Ferranti's personal experiences with the customs and at border crossings are concerned, it is of course true that these people have their job to do. Most people crossing borders tend to curse the officers on duty; to be honest, I must admit that I myself am sometimes guilty of this. The fact is, of course, that they are doing a job which they are meant to make themselves superfluous. This is perhaps something they have in common with doctors. The position is thus not all that serious. I think it is a good thing that Mr de Ferranti brought out his appreciation of this work. I should like to endorse this. Without customs we would also be without our own resources — just think of the customs officers at the Community's external frontiers.

I subscribe, therefore, to what has been said here and thank Parliament for its approval of our proposals. We hope in this way to make further progress on the road towards a customs union or, I should say, towards a Community which will go beyond this and develop into what we think of as political union — and in saying this I naturally look towards Mr Tindemans.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I imagine that Mr Tindemans will be grateful that you have not yet forgotten his report. There are no other speakers on the list. The motion for a resolution and the amendments which have been tabled will be put to the vote at 10.30 a.m. tomorrow.

The debate is closed.

## 11. Agenda

**President.** — In view of the urgency of the matter, I propose — pursuant to Rule 12 (2) of the Rules of Procedure — that the report (Doc. 1-793/79), drawn up by Mr Dankert on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the provisional twelfth be placed on the

agenda of tomorrow's sitting, for joint debate with the motions for resolutions on Réunion.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

**12. Activities of the Communities in 1979  
(Thirteenth General Report) and Commission work  
programme for 1980**

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on Mr Jenkins' statement on the Thirteenth General Commission Report on the activities of the Communities in 1979 and the Commission's programme of work for 1980 and the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Radoux and others, on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on relations between the EEC and Yugoslavia (Doc. 1-737/79/rev./II).

I call Mr Radoux.

**Mr Radoux.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the motion for a resolution submitted for your approval relates to the cooperation agreement between the Community and its Member States and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. This is intended to replace the trade agreement in force since 1973. It affords preferential treatment in economic, technical and financial cooperation. Its significance for the Community is due to the specific characteristics of Yugoslavia.

This is of course a nonaligned Mediterranean European state and a member of the Group of 77 developing countries. Our Committee on External Economic Relations has felt that Parliament should be involved in the outcome of the current negotiations which will hopefully be in the near future.

I feel obliged to express concern regarding the conditions under which our committee has had to work. If, as things stand, our Parliament can only be involved by passing a general resolution this is because of the procedure currently in force regarding its role in the Community's foreign relations. I refer to the Luns-Westerterp procedure. Under this procedure the appropriate committee of our Parliament may not know the provisions of an agreement concluded by the Community with a third country until this has been signed. This procedure was doubtless acceptable to the previous European Assembly. It is unacceptable to a Parliament elected by direct universal suffrage. This problem was referred to our Committee on External Economic Relations and it intends to submit a solution compatible with the responsibilities we intend to assume in our relations with the rest of the world.

Mr President, on another track and a propos these relations I would like to make one observation before commenting on the content of the resolution. There

were laudable efforts to enlarge the bases of our relations with Yugoslavia. I feel it should be stressed that if it is important and auspicious for the negotiations to be completed now and that special efforts have been made, particularly during recent weeks, it must have been as important and equally desirable for these negotiations to have been completed three or even four months earlier. By this I mean — with the proviso of course that it takes two to remove all obstacles in the path of a solution — that, in view of its economic and trading position, our Community should always be equally willing to create the best possible relations with third countries. One of the strengths of the European Community, one of the reasons for the weight which it carries in world affairs and the interest which it arouses almost everywhere, is precisely its presence through this type of relationship which it has chosen and, if one can judge by the impressive number of treaties it has been able to conclude, one which is appreciated.

I would now like to sum up the agreement as follows: firstly, it is a Mediterranean and preferential agreement. Secondly, it contains a mechanism for reducing levies on a certain quantity of imports of Yugoslav 'Babybeef' which is significantly larger than that under the present agreement. Thirdly, the draft agreement contains a financial protocol mainly intended for the development of the Yugoslav road network. Fourthly, it contains social measures which considerably improve the present situation of Yugoslav workers and their families. Fifthly, it provides for a regular exchange of information between the Yugoslav Economic Departments and those of the Commission of the Community. In fact in the institutional provisions of the agreement there is reference to a Cooperation Council, a management body empowered to take all necessary measures to facilitate cooperation between our Assembly and the Yugoslav Federal Assembly — the significance of this should not be forgotten by us.

Finally, a point which deals specifically with economic and commercial relations between one Community country and Yugoslavia. The agreement should contribute to the realization of the aims of the treaty and agreement signed at Osimo in 1975 between the Italian Republic and the Yugoslav Republic.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I will now quickly consider the text of the motion for a resolution which, as I said a few moments ago, is of a general nature for the reasons already given.

Firstly, our Committee on External Economic Relations regrets that the negotiations have already been in progress for too long. This is why a moment ago I said that we felt they could have been concluded more quickly and we hope that it will be possible to keep to the time currently envisaged for conclusion, i.e. next month.

Secondly, in view of the recent assessment of the situation by the Council of Ministers, we welcome the fact that the Council has resumed these negotiations. We also consider that there should be no further delay to these negotiations and urge that all steps should be taken by both the Council and the Member States to remove any remaining obstacles.

Mr President, this motion may be of a general nature but the detail is still very clear. This is why we hope that the agreement between Yugoslavia and our Community will be signed as quickly as possible.

I would therefore hope, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, that, if not unanimously, then at least by a large majority our Assembly will ratify the motion for a resolution presented to it by the Committee on External Economic Relations.

**President.** — I call Mr Haferkamp.

**Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (D) Mr President, thank you for the opportunity to say a few words on this item.

Firstly, the Commission welcomes the interest shown through the initiative of the Committee on External Economic Relations.

Secondly, we will try to consider the general wish for increased cooperation with the appropriate committees and this House. Without waiting for the formal decisions and procedures we have already found it possible to provide more information on negotiations with third countries than was previously the case.

Thirdly, as regards the progress of negotiations with Yugoslavia, as the rapporteur has just stated there have been considerable efforts in recent weeks. We have made significant progress. The last round of negotiations took place on 1 February. On this occasion the Yugoslav delegation described the offer from the Community as a good basis for negotiations. We were able to clarify a large number of questions covering all the areas mentioned by Mr Radoux. We are now trying to clarify and solve the remaining problems. The next negotiating session will take place next week in Brussels on 21 and 22 February. We hope that with this session the negotiations will be completed. The results of the negotiations could then be determined by the appropriate offices. We will of course keep Parliament informed.

**President.** — I call Mr Glinne to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Glinne.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr President of the Commission, my Group listened with great attention to your report on the Com-

## Glinne

mission's programme for 1980 and we appreciated your very detailed presentation of the problems facing the Community. However, the Socialists here regret that you were restricted to stating certain facts and we feel that there was a lack of consideration of the future.

One of the Community's pressing problems is unemployment. You were right to refer to it. This problem is one of our main preoccupations. With about six million unemployed in the Community it is obvious that the Socialist Group is particularly concerned with underemployment which, at our request, was debated **at length in this Chamber during the last part-session**. We had ample opportunity then to emphasize the need for an overall policy.

**However, it is not enough to show goodwill and make laudable but vague declarations on the fight against unemployment. The Community and its Member States must have the necessary funds to wage such a war successfully. The Socialist Group has made some very concrete proposals. We consider that a programme is required to reduce working time, promote further education schemes and create special programmes for young people looking for their first jobs, women coming onto the job market and persons wishing to prepare for retirement. However, we also think that as part of the general economic policy programmes are needed for effective action against unemployment as otherwise, according to Commission estimates, the Community will have ten million unemployed by 1985. Urgent measures must be taken.**

No one in this Chamber could pretend to have the miracle solution and there certainly is none. However, on several occasions the Socialist Group has made concrete proposals which could help solve the problem of unemployment. I refer to longer term structural reforms and planning of the economy in which public undertakings in certain selected sectors should play an essential role; the revival of demand centred on traditional unsatisfied requirements and in particular new requirements linked to the quality of life and common services, i.e. the search for a different kind of growth; the establishment of public control of the large industrial conglomerates, dominant positions and multinational companies; the investment process should be subject to the right of information and should be under the control of each state and the employees of undertakings so as to prevent transfer and flight of capital to third countries, to the detriment of those undertakings which have created the wealth. The necessary instruments must be created for the effective control of the machinations of multinational companies. At present virtually all world trade is in the hand of 1 000 multinationals over which neither employees nor public authorities have any kind of control. I would now like to put three very definite questions to the Commission. Our group, and particularly our colleague Erwin Lange, has been considering these for a long time.

First question: what action has the Commission taken on the European Parliament's decision, contained in the resolution of 19 April 1977, on the principles to be observed in international economic activity of undertakings and governments?

Second question: what has happened to the amendment of the rules on good conduct preventing recourse to corrupt practices in trading relations?

**Third question, and I wish to lay particular stress on this, how does the Commission monitor effectively observation of the code of good conduct by European companies established in South Africa, the code adopted by the Nine on 20 October 1977?**

Mr President of the Commission, we understood your report to be in favour, indirectly, of pay moderation. The position of the Socialist Group is clear on this. We agree that workers must be asked to show solidarity. However, I would emphasize straight away that insofar as they have accepted a moderate pay policy in virtually all Community countries, workers have already demonstrated solidarity which the managerial staff of multinational companies still have to show. There is no way we can accept a policy in which workers are asked to make the main effort whilst multinationals refuse to transfer the enormous wealth which they accrue in prosperous sectors — in particular the oil sector — to the poor sectors which are very often controlled by the same people or groups. In that case countries are subsidizing these sectors because of the 'employment blackmail' to which they are subject and they do so with taxpayers' money and mainly that of the employees. Since the beginning of the crisis, and this is worth noting, the multinationals' profits have increased considerably. Exxon's profits have increased by 59 % since 1973 by comparison with 1972, Texaco's by 45.5 %. There has been no cessation in the growth of these profits during recent years.

The price of petrol seems to us to have been a marvellous scapegoat. The international monetary disorder, inflation and the general crisis is all attributed to the sudden rise in prices at the end of 1973, beginning of 1974. It is all too easy to forget that the monetary crisis dates from 1971 and that the trend towards lower petrol prices which was characteristic of the 1960s took an about turn from 1970 onwards i.e. well before the beginning of the crisis. Moreover it is all too easy to forget to emphasise the links between the banks and the oil companies, the link between the increase in oil prices and the fantastic profits of multinationals whose movements are not under the control of public authorities. By virtue of their investment policy the transnational companies play an active part in industrialization, even in the process of restructuring industry at a world level which is closely linked to the international crisis.

The multinationals make major investments in third world countries—which would be very laudable if these

## Glinne

investments were made in the interests of the workers of industrialized countries and the peoples of the third world.

But three main facts must be remembered here: firstly, transnational companies prefer to invest in major exporting countries where foreign investment has gone from 36.5 % to 40.6 % of total investment, which has led to the tax paradise of 7 % to 13 % between 1967 and 1975.

Secondly, transnational companies prefer to invest in manufacturing industries which attract a growing proportion of foreign investment, particularly in Asia and Latin America. Japan, the Federal Republic, the United Kingdom and the United States devote 50.8 %, 60.4 %, 47.6 % and 39.1 % respectively of their investment in third world countries to the manufacturing sector. The proportion of foreign investment in industrial sectors in 1975 to 1976 was 100 % in Hongkong, 92 % in India, 80 % in South Korea, 77 % in Mexico and Brazil, 65 % in the Argentine and 60 % in Singapore.

Finally, transnational companies invest in the export sectors. In 1976 in South Korea their share of industrial exports was 32 % and 90 % respectively for machinery and electronic equipment and components.

As a result the level, orientation and valorization of industrial production depends on the overall strategy and interest of the companies and not on the potential and needs of the recipient countries nor of the employees in industrialized countries. Today multinationals control 55 % of trade in the third world and they favour, as I think I have shown, the richer countries. This immediately raises the problem of our relations with developing countries and the North-South Dialogue to which, Mr President, you referred in your report.

On the subject of this North-South Dialogue and during the debate on hunger in the world the spokesman of the Socialist Group emphasized the need to reexamine our economic and commercial relations with the third world. An economic and commercial system must be set up which allows for the full development of developing countries and which bridges the gap between rich and poor countries, as only a fair distribution of the world's wealth between industrialized countries and those countries supplying raw materials can safeguard our people's interests.

Over the last 30 years numerous attempts have been made at national and international level to achieve this.

Ten years ago the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted in international strategy to ensure the economic take-off of developing countries and to create conditions of stability and well-being for the whole human race. The question we must ask our-

selves is whether the international community and Europe in particular was capable of carrying out its tasks but also of making the most of its opportunities. The problem is certainly large enough: the developing countries' debt amounts to 600 000 million dollars; whole regions suffer from either endemic famine or catastrophic famine, the third world only accounts for 9 % of exports of manufactured products. One could say that international development strategy has had **virtually no impact on the third world**. It could be said that the political will of the industrialized world has not been sufficient to deal with the problems of developing countries.

It was thought by many that the economic growth we experienced, and which we are still experiencing to a certain extent, would inevitably benefit developing countries, that the effect of our prosperity — **although threatened** — would automatically profit the third world. This has not happened and the current economic crisis shows with even greater clarity that what is at issue here are the mechanisms of dependence rather than the immediate effect of our economic advances. It is not enough to move forward and grow to draw the poor countries along with us. 'Our' wealth, and this is relative to the extent to which it increasingly benefits a few privileged persons, is based on their poverty and if the poorest are to benefit from our expansion there must be a new philosophy and a real political will aimed chiefly at defining and validating a new international and dynamic development policy.

Since the crisis the situation of the developing countries has been exacerbated. The energy crisis, monetary instability and inflation show clearly that the uncertainties of our economies become the factors for underdevelopment in the third world. It is therefore **urgent and vital to fight for the setting up of this new international economic order**. In recent years the developing countries have clearly demanded from the **industrialized countries concrete and practical cooperation**. They are waiting for a clear and unequivocal answer. What sort of world is it that we wish and what sort of future for the coming generations?

Any strategy must go beyond a simple declaration of **intent and goodwill**. There should be **firm political undertakings and adequate instruments**.

The Community should make efforts to stimulate international aid and cooperation. A second Lomé Convention has just been signed to govern the economic, commercial and technological aspects of relations between Europe and the 58 countries concerned from Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific over the next five years. But whilst we welcome the experiences obtained under the first Lomé Convention, it must be said that the original contract although bold in some respects, between the industrialized countries and the developing countries cannot of itself resolve all the **problems of restructuring the international economic order**. This contract provides a framework for the

## Glinne

Community and the ACP states but it has limits: government aid from industrialized countries has not even reached the level of 0.7 % promised by the United Nations and the major part of aid to developing countries is through bilateral cooperation which the Community has not yet been able to shape and harmonize. It is reasonable to query the sense of harmonization at Community level of national policies which would tend to favour former colonies and maintain the power of the privileged classes, although it would seem increasingly clear that without an international strategy development cooperation risks becoming cheap consolation for our consciences.

I therefore see the North-South dialogue as fundamental. The attitude of industrialized countries should be based on responsibility and not charity or neo-imperialism and that of the developing countries should be based on confidence and openness. As a socialist I can confirm that, as in the past, our objective is to ensure a dignified and just life for all men with material and spiritual well-being.

As has already been stated by Kurt Waldheim, the current structure of international economic relations is unsuited to the needs of the world community. If Europe is given the opportunity to play a role in the international community, it is to seek out and activate all methods possible for establishing a new international economic order.

Lastly, a brief word, Mr President, on our institutions. You said that 'The Commission was neither the Council's servant nor Parliament's secretariat'. We hope that the Commission's clear independence vis-à-vis the Council, apart from being a laudable affirmation of principle, is borne out by the facts.

Must I recall how the Commission has been shown a humble servant of the European Council when it came to fixing the amounts for the European Regional Development Fund?

On the other hand, even if there is no question of the Commission being the European Parliament's secretariat — and we are amazed that the Commission draws some kind of parallel between its relations with us and its relations with the Council — it is reasonable for us to expect the Commission to pass on some of the basic lines of thought of our Assembly. The budget provides us with an up-to-date example. The Socialist Group has never made any secret of the fact that it would not hesitate to enumerate all the consequences of lack of Commission support in this area. We will consider the declaration made by Mr Tugendhat this morning in this light.

I will conclude by dealing with institutional problems and recalling the decisions which must be taken regarding the composition of the next Commission. Mr Jenkins is of the opinion that the new Commission should in any case appear before Parliament before

taking up office. We feel this is the least that should happen, in fact the most basic level of courtesy. I would like to know the present Commission's opinion on the possible participation by our Parliament in the appointment of members of the new Commission. In passing I would point out that two members of the Socialist Group, my colleagues Mr Hänsch and Mr Van Miert, have made excellent suggestions in the Committee on Political Affairs.

Mr Jenkins added that without proposing anything as formal as a vote of confidence, the next Commission should nevertheless be sure that it has been accepted by the representatives of the citizens of the Community. Mr President, in all honesty and frankness, we do not like ambiguity. Let the next Commission present its programme to us as quickly as possible. We will be able to judge if they are responding to the aims of our Parliament. And, as in the case of the budget, we will not hesitate to exercise our powers.

## IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Jonker to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group).

**Mr Jonker.** — (NL) Mr President, on behalf of my group, I would like to thank the Commission for its 13th General Report and Mr Jenkins for the detailed speech he gave on Tuesday. Some of my colleagues will deal with the speech in detail in the discussion which follows and touch on a number of important points in the report. It is the first time that the Commission has presented a report to the directly elected Parliament and it is my task tonight to consider relations between the Commission and the newly elected European Parliament. I want to emphasize that we are not just here to monitor the Commission but also to support it, and may I say in advance that if we make some criticism this evening because we are not satisfied with the state of things in all sectors, this must be seen as an attempt to give constructive criticism.

I would also like to say at the outset, Mr President, that I personally very much regret that Mr Jenkins had to wait so long before we started this debate. If we continue in this way with verbal onslaughts, it is to the detriment of our supervisory task with regard to the Commission and Council and we risk becoming a puppet of the institutions we should be monitoring. We must try to organize our activities better.

As second point I would like to raise, Mr President, is that neither in Mr Jenkins' report nor in the report of the three wise men was anything fundamental said on

## Jonker

the position of our Parliament. I would therefore like on behalf of the Christian Democrats to present our views on this subject so that the next Commission knows how we view the construction of Europe. If our Parliament wishes to be really credible in the long term it must participate in all decisions taken in the Community. It must also be able to express its views on all those things about which the Council of Ministers (which is the worst functioning institution of our Community) takes no decisions. As a Parliament we must not only have a voice in what is decided there but also with regard to the subjects on which no decisions are taken. I want to say this right at the outset, Mr President. I then see three possibilities for our European Parliament to extend its powers.

The first opportunity lies in maximum utilization of the Treaties, the second expansion of powers through the normal consultation procedure with the Council, as happened with the budget, and thirdly — this must not remain taboo when there is nothing else to be done — expansion of powers through amendment of the Treaty. We cannot go back home after 4½ years if we have not made it clear to constituents that we have made every attempt here in Strasbourg to take over parliamentary control as national parliamentary controls are reduced. Over the next 4½ years our group will press for implementation of the final communiqué of the 1974 Paris Summit in which the Heads of Government state, and I quote, 'that the Assembly's powers should be extended particularly by recognition of certain powers in the legislative process of the Communities'. What has happened to this agreement, Mr President? Or were the Heads of Government frightened by their own courage in 1974? I can assure you that our group will keep on coming back to this.

A word, Mr President, on the position of the Commission itself. Here I agree with Mr Glinne: there have not been major exploits and I can honestly say that we too have the feeling that the Commission has not yet really grasped the position of the directly elected Parliament. I want to give three examples of this, not to hold a post mortem on them as that would be pointless, but so that the position is understood and to prevent the same faults recurring in future.

The first example is the accession of Greece. The Council and Commission negotiated with Greece on enlargement. The Council and Commission took the decision on the conditions. The Council and Commission said that there would be 24 Greek Members of Parliament. Everyone in the Community discussed it except the European Parliament. This is a matter which affects us and it was decided over our heads and without us.

*(Applause)*

A second point, once again not for the purpose of a post-mortem, relates to our experiences last year with

the agricultural prices. The Commission said that the Council had taken a decision with which they did not agree. The Commission then sent documents to us and said: 'these are the consequences of the Council's policy; we do not agree but the Council has made the decision'. As Christian Democrats we would reply as follows: the Commission must keep the initiative, the Commission must not run out of time, the Commission must submit its proposals as, without Commission proposals, the Council cannot take any decision at all. I wanted to mention this as the coming months could perhaps produce a similar situation.

Thirdly, Mr President, the same point already touched on by Mr Glinne: Parliament's task and the Commission's role. If the Commission had ever read the sections on the subject in the EPP manifesto, for example, this shows that it should mirror the political composition of Parliament and the Commission. We had discussed this in our group and had really expected that the Commission would contact the group chairmen and would have said: 'What is our position in the structure as a whole? And I am quite sure that the group chairmen would have said, 'keep your seats'. But the Commission did not consult them. It thought up all sorts of reasons, but its policy failed, as it could have assisted us in future discussions on the appointments. Let me be honest, Mr President, and here I am completely in agreement with Mr Glinne, our group will demand that the chairmen of Parliament's political groups be consulted and taken note of before the governments, through the Council, take decisions on the appointment of a President of the Commission and on the political composition and colour of the Commission.

Finally, Mr President, a few more observations on the relationship between the Commission and Parliament. A strong Commission will strengthen Parliament and a strong Parliament will have influence on decisions of the Council, the worst functioning body. Mention was made of this in the report by the Three Wise Men. We do not understand why Mr Jenkins is now calmly saying 'yes, that must be examined' and almost nonchalantly 'we hope that that can be put into actual practice'. There are some things, Mr President, in the report of the Three Wise Men which I would at least have expected to cause violent protest (if one is not to behave like a diplomat but a politician). Let me say first that our group is prepared to accept the report from the Three Wise Men in principle. I rather have the feeling, but then I am perhaps one of the old-fashioned and classic Europeans, that gradually those things are starting to be treated as sacred which have grown up crookedly over the years in the institutions. Mr President, there are three things in the report which I would like to comment on. The first is the 'Luxembourg compromise'. We must go back, there is no compromise. There are two points of view on one piece of paper and nothing more.

*(Applause)*

We must go back to the Treaty and to normal voting procedures.

A second point in the report, Mr President, concerns the delegation of powers to the permanent representatives. I realize that this grew up over the years, but I would suggest that this is basically in conflict with the Treaty. The Treaty states that when the Council of Ministers wishes to delegate power, then it must do so to the Commission.

And now to the point which I thought would arouse protest, Mr President, the position of the European Council. I accept the Council as a reality. But when the Three Wise Men say that the European Council will draw up a list of priorities on which decisions are then taken in the Community, this is, in fact, an erosion of the Commission's right of initiative, even if the Commission is involved and even if the Commission provides the basis for this list of priorities. I thought that there would have been a speedier reaction to this, Mr President. And if this point is accepted then I can tell you on behalf of our group that the Commission will not present a list of priorities to the European Council without having consulted the European Parliament and without having obtained Parliament's approval for it.

*Applause)*

This brings me to the point covered by Mr Vredeling in his speech in Antwerp. I would like to know whether this important speech by Mr Vredeling was discussed in the Commission and what the Commission's views are. In this speech the Vice-President of the Commission basically says the same as I have said in relation to this list of priorities. Mr Vredeling said, 'we are to take Parliament seriously then we must first of all make proposals to Parliament and when we have the approval of the European Parliament then these proposals can be sent to the Council.'

Mr President, this can happen. The Treaty only says that the Council must decide on a proposal from the Commission after consultation of the European Parliament. Nowhere in the Treaty is it stated that it is the European Council which must ask our opinion. And I think that if the Commission follows Mr Vredeling's line it will give considerable support to Parliament's view.

A few brief remarks in conclusion. We will be discussing the Spierenburg report later. We support the report although the reduction in the number of Commissioners will make it more difficult for us to exercise parliamentary control as it will become more difficult to distribute the portfolios and these will be more important. Perhaps there can be joint consideration of posts for some kind of secretaries of state linked to the Commissioners. My second brief observation concerns

the ratification of international treaties by Parliament. Here I am in complete agreement with Mr Radoux's comments on the agreement with Yugoslavia. This problem has already occurred in relation to GATT, also with ASEAN and now, once again, with Yugoslavia. Is the Commission prepared to help us to ensure that the treaties do not come to us in their final stage before Parliament has given a definite comment?

The third point, Mr President, is related to the subject mentioned by Mr von Wogau and Mr Notenboom in the previous debate. Where does the average European citizen come in our list of priorities? Europe is not there for us, Europe is there for the citizens. Is the same thing going to happen this year in the holiday period at the border posts, when the pretty girls from our Information Office distribute leaflets on the wonderful Community while we all have to wait for two hours to cross the border? I would ask the Commission to give special attention to this sort of thing and, in any case, to include in the list of priorities matters like the restrictive measures at the border, passports etc., the environment and everything which citizens notice and which affects them directly.

*(Applause)*

You will have realized, Mr President, that these are the classic remarks of my group based on the Tindemanns report. Our manifesto is based on the Tindemanns report. Whenever we talk about European politics and European structures etc. in my country and in other circles, we say we are still living according to the gospel of the apostle Tindemanns. But, Mr President, should there therefore be no discussion with us, are we immovable? I do not think so. The institutional structure of Europe can be discussed with us subject to one condition, which is that the decision-making body, whether it be the Council, the European Council, the Commission or whatever, should be subject to parliamentary and democratic control by a freely elected European Parliament. Mr President, we are not saying this because Europe is an end in itself for us, we are saying it because we feel that freedom and security in the world can only be served by a strong democratic Europe.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — Mr President, I agree with what Mr Jonker said in his speech concerning the relationship between the European Parliament and the Commission. In particular I join him in saying to President Jenkins how grateful we are that he is here and that he is going to stay throughout this debate. I apologise for the time at which this debate is taking place. We really must look to our own house and put it in

**Scott-Hopkins**

order if we are going to be taken more seriously than we are at the moment.

At the same time I would like to take this opportunity at the beginning of what I intend to say to congratulate the Commission on what they have done in 1979. It is an impressive performance, and it would be quite wrong for this House not to acknowledge it. Five extremely well worthwhile achievements; I do not need to go over them. President Jenkins himself mentioned them in his speech. I would also congratulate the Commission for the way they have moved in that field.

But then I turn to the present and the future. Here it is not quite such a happy story. Under the Treaty the Commission has the task of being the engine room of the Community. I regret, however, that in his speech the President did not portray the Commission as a powerhouse of ideas and initiatives on the big issues of the day — unemployment, energy, economic integration, etc. Of course I agree with the President that 1980 will be a decade of change, and that some of the problems confronting us are absolutely awesome. But was it really necessary for him to appear quite so daunted by it all? The phrases and the words that he used, Mr President, such as — and I quote — ‘the break up of the established economic and social order’, ‘dislocation’, ‘eventual collapse’, sound like the epitaph of a man on his way to oblivion. He gave the impression of a Commission, whose engine is not merely just idling or hardly ticking over, but almost going in reverse. Instead of bold, imaginative and inspiring new initiatives, I fear that all we had were rather pious hopes and tentative ideas for the future of the Commission during the remaining months of its life.

As a Community, Mr President, we have to rise to the occasion and respond to the challenge that was outlined by the President of the Commission. This requires an act of faith — I fully accept that — faith in the good sense of our elected leaders and representatives, and faith that our people will understand the implications of the changes that lie ahead. But the situation requires leadership, and that leadership should come not only from this House but from the Commission as well. As for the Council, as we all know, and as we heard from the previous speaker just now, they are hesitant and timid, behaving more like reluctant virgins than virile leaders. But let the Commission in its closing months strive to achieve that climax of activity and point the way ahead.

Of course faith is not enough. We have got to plan and work for our future. The Community must search its own soul and question its own motives and objectives. We must not allow the ideal of a united and a vibrant Europe, striving to improve the quality of life of its people and of the world at large, be obscured by current difficulties. The Community must act, Mr President, when nation states either will not or cannot.

This is the only sphere in which the Community can and should act. But that gives a wide field of possible scope for action in the months and the year ahead.

Despite the outbreaks of nationalistic pettiness I am confident that the leaders of all our countries still believe in the European ideal. It is after all the only real hope that the ordinary citizen has of winning through to happier times. Individual nations, even **great and powerful nations like the Federal Republic of Germany or the Republic of France**, cannot cope alone with the pressures which are upon them and upon us all at the moment. I don't really need to mention them all in detail. We know them only too well: unemployment, declining industries, fragmenting societies, internal disorder, terrorism on a European scale, and as we have just heard in the debate today, escapism in the form of drug addiction. But together we can, and we simply must, win these particular battles. Let the Commission have courage now. Let the President go back and ask his colleagues, some of whom are sitting here, to have the courage to propose measures for sweeping away, for instance, the barriers to trade inside the Community. My God, we talk enough about them, let us have some proposed action on it! Let us have proposals for funding new and modernizing old industries, for rationalizing the financial mechanisms of Member States, for removing exchange controls throughout the Community and for providing **equal treatment for the sick and the old**. There is so much that could be done and should be done. The economic disparity between our countries is still too wide. We have had debate after debate on this matter. Some have gained disproportionately by membership — good on them! Some bend our laws to suit themselves, that I do not welcome. Some have become poorer, and that I do not welcome either. The Commission must not flag in its efforts to eradicate these discordant and disruptive attitudes and aspects of the Community.

There is one initiative which I applaud from the President, and that was the proposal to put a tax on energy and take measures to promote sources other than oil, and indeed to conserve energy sources. But how soon shall we learn from him the details of these tax proposals? We had a debate on it earlier, when Commissioner Brunner spoke. We want to know what the reaction of the Member States is, what the situation is and how it is going to develop and how soon we can have this information. I would remind the President that in February 1979, exactly a year ago, he said, and I quote, that ‘we have little time left and if we do not take action soon there can be no doubt that during the 1980s we shall enter into a permanent and enduring energy crisis’. Well, he was right then, the oil will run out, and he is right now. But a year has gone by and one has not seen all that much initiative, and one wants to know a little more about the details of what he is proposing. Let us have proposals in the very near future.

**Scott-Hopkins**

Clearly, Mr President, the things that I have been talking about will all require funds from the Community. The present 1 % VAT limit cannot be regarded as sacrosanct. Let the President and his colleagues face this situation and put forward proposals. They may even come into operation in 1980 or 1981, but it is going to take time to discuss this. We all know that if we are going to have a vibrant, progressing Community, then we have to have the funds in order to deal with matters and implement these policies. So, let him take his courage in both hands as President of the Commission and start putting proposals forward. Let him start the dialogue, not only with Member States but with this House. How right Mr Jonker was when he spoke about bringing this House into the discussions, not only about treaties before they are signed and so on, but on financial matters and on agriculture, which, as we all know, consumes 84 % of our budget.

There are just three fundamental points I want to mention very briefly. The first is that I do really hope that he will use all his considerable powers of persuasion to hold to the Commission's proposal put forward by Vice-President Gundelach, to reduce agricultural spending as a percentage of the Community budget to under 70 %. Let him hold to that and we shall begin to see some light for the future.

The second point I would make, which may be rather a minor one but is still important, concerns the export of butter to the USSR. He mentioned it before the Political Affairs Committee at a public hearing in Brussels but it was not mentioned in his work programme. What is actually happening? What is going on? How much butter has been exported to the USSR since 1 January? I think we have the right to know and the sooner the better. Moreover, would he define what traditional patterns of trade there were? Would he please enlighten us on this point? I was pleased also to hear the President refer to the Rule of Law. We would like to see that one government which at the moment is not observing the rule of law, even after a Court of Justice ruling, adhering to it. I make no personal attack on any one Member State, but if we do not honestly observe the rule of law, then this Community will really begin to go into decline and I would ask President Jenkins to take whatever action is possible to prevent such an occurrence. Maybe it should be to bring in a sheepmeat regime or at least make new proposals to this effect. At all events, I hope he will think about it and take the appropriate action. On the whole, I must say that his plans for the consumer and environmental fields are to be welcomed.

If I may now finally turn, in the brief moment I have left, to institutional questions, also raised by the President, I am already on record in recommending that the House should play some role, indeed a fundamental role, in the appointment of the next President and his colleagues. This is not a matter of self-aggrandizement for this House, but I really do believe that in the difficult years ahead the Commission will have to have

the support of the House behind it if real progress is to be made, for which reason it is my firm conviction that we should have an opportunity of voting and showing our confidence, first of all in the President himself, whoever he or she may be, in June or July of this year, and later in the colleagues who will be appointed to the Commission. That I think is absolutely vital to us. The only way to make quite certain that this continues and that the creative tension between our two institutions, the Commission and this House, is not destructive is to ensure that we have mutual respect and confidence in each other.

The President of the Commission has enormous powers under the Treaty to influence the Council, and we believe that the exercise of those powers can no longer be the sole responsibility of the Commissioners. We want to play our part in that. Let those powers now be deployed with the sanction of a democratically elected Parliament, which is what we are, and that means the Commission striving to follow Parliament's opinions on draft legislation and referring back to Parliament when it wants to change them or disagrees with them. Only in this way can we avoid the tremendous difficulties we have had in the past.

Mr President, where national governments dither, this Parliament and the Commission now have the opportunity to lead. What Member States cannot and will not do alone, the Community has a duty to undertake collectively. I am confident that this House would acclaim bold initiatives, should they be proposed by the President, and I believe too that our parent nations would respond to those initiatives.

**IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE**

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Gremetz to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

**Mr Gremetz.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, scarcely eight months have gone by since the elections to the European Assembly when the French communists put our people on their guard against the promises offered by Europeanists from all sides. According to them, Europe would mean peace, cooperation, progress and independence. We said to our people, 'look out, you are being lied to, you are being deceived'. We were right. The contrast between the situation as it stands today and the promises made then speaks volumes.

You promised a Europe of social progress and full employment. Today there are seven million unemployed in Europe. There are one million nine hundred

## Gremetz

thousand in France. According to official figures there are one million in the Federal Republic of Germany, but we know how zealous Mr Schmidt's government is when it comes to reducing figures; the number is in fact one million eight hundred thousand. And Community officials are even anticipating a considerable increase in unemployment in the 1980's. We must recognize the full dimensions of this increasing problem. But we must also identify those responsible for this situation of crisis, a crisis which today affects all sectors of activity and is felt first by those men and women who are least well off. According to a recent study carried out by the Community itself, every second person is making cutbacks in important areas of day-to-day living. Every fourth person considers that his income falls below the necessary minimum. This study reveals the drastic deterioration in the standard of living over the last few years. For millions of working families this means misery, hardship and uncertainty about what tomorrow may bring. For young people it means anxiety about the future. Discussions about women's liberation, the elimination of inequality and the struggle against outdated moral values have little bearing on the cold facts of reality. Poverty and unemployment represent a real and unmistakable issue of massive proportions which is growing ever larger.

It is not a matter of fate or an unavoidable evil. These evils have a cause and someone is responsible. The main cause lies in the implementation of austerity policies, coordinated at Community level, which result in continuous pressure on salaries and incomes, rising inflation, a reduction in financing for social services, a deterioration in public services and an increase in taxation which hits workers in the lower-income groups as a whole. The responsibility therefore lies with those who implement these austerity policies to the greatest advantage of a small few. You promised a Europe of economic development. But industry is in the firing line at the moment, as Mr Davignon knows. The present centres of concern are the so-called industrial restructuring policies, planned and coordinated by Community bodies for the sole purpose of increasing the profits of a few multinational companies. Mr Jenkins forecasts a future of crises which may lead the countries of the Community towards a breakdown in the economic and social order. In his opinion, our society is in danger of collapsing. We are certainly not overjoyed to hear such statements. But it does confirm what we have been constantly telling those who govern France today, 'you are leading our country on the road to ruin'.

It is a fact that one cannot claim to solve a crisis by using means which aggravate the situation causing it. The approach which Mr Jenkins has outlined for 1980 is clear, since it involves taking further, more determined steps along the same road. With this in view, the intention is to destroy the remaining positive aspects of the common agricultural policy and to grant larger European funds to the restructuring process

which is being carried out in the iron and steel industry, the shipbuilding industry and the textile industry today, and which will affect other sectors tomorrow, including growth industries.

And the same is true with regard to consumer prices. The rise in prices was greater in 1979 than it had been in 1978; the increase in the FRG, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg was of the order of 4 to 5 %. In France and Denmark it was between 10 and 11 %. And in Ireland and the United Kingdom it was between 13 and 15 %. Your Europe is a tough Europe for the workers! The OECD acknowledged last December that the outlook offered little cause for celebration. The solution which the experts came up with is more or less the same as that offered by the ministers of the Nine: absolute refusal to grant any wage increases and more energy saving. It is no secret that those economies don't hurt the rich. Such a policy is unacceptable. It contributes further to the crisis, to unemployment, to the rural exodus and to regional imbalances. Your policy will mean the destruction of Lorraine and ruin for the peasants in the South of France. It has a hand in the demolition of industrial sectors which are vital to the economy of our countries, and it strengthens the dominant position of West German capitalism and the Mark in Europe. It thus calls into question the independence and the very future of France.

You promised that national sovereignty would be respected, but as soon as the European Assembly had been elected its sole concern was to grant itself new powers and new areas of responsibility without any legal authorization, in order to set itself on the road towards supra-nationality. In defiance of the law this Assembly assumed for itself the right to pass judgment on everything and to set itself up as a kind of international court of law. You promised a dialogue with the Third World, but the Community continually decides on policies of confrontation with the developing countries. Whether with regard to OPEC, during the negotiations of the Tokyo Round, of UNCTAD, of UNIDO or Lomé, it has always sided with the United States in rejecting the demands of the countries of the Third World, whether within GATT, with regard to wheat prices — which is appalling — or with regard to other vital questions concerning development.

You promised greater cooperation, but you are ready to cause starvation, using food as a weapon against Vietnam, Afghanistan or the Soviet Union. You promised Europe human rights, but you who are so keen to censure the rest of the world should try taking a look at your own countries! What do human rights mean to those seven million unemployed and those tens of millions of poor people in the Community, to those democrats who are barred from their professions in the Federal Republic of Germany because of their political views, to those trade union members victimized by their bosses, to those patriots who suffer brutality in Northern Ireland, to those thirty five thousand pol-

**Gremetz**

itical exiles in Greece, the country which you are anxious to welcome into the Community?

You promised an independent Europe, but the Community is totally involved in the imperialist bloc policy. An 'independent' Europe, a Europe 'of cooperation', Europe as a 'privileged partner of the Third World', these are all myths fabricated to conceal the truth, which is an Atlantic Europe ruled by American demands and multinational companies. The Franco-German statement signed by Mr Giscard d'Estaing and Mr Schmidt provides a perfect illustration of this. They both swore an oath of allegiance to Mr Carter in reaffirming the commitment of France and the Federal Republic of Germany to the Atlantic bloc. Through its expression of their support for Mr Carter's policy and through the progress which it represents towards a common European defence system, this agreement confirms the allegiance of the Community countries to the United States and their intention to respond to their people's desire for change by playing European policemen.

You promised a Europe of peace, but for months now your efforts have been directed towards backing up American attempts to return to the tactics of the cold war. You are attempting to reintroduce the unacceptable notion of a European defence system, which calls into question an independent French defence system. You supported the NATO proposals for siting on this continent the American nuclear missiles requested by the German Social Democrats. You have clearly granted Mr Carter, and Mr Carter alone, the power to decide on a nuclear war with the peoples of Europe as hostages. You stood up to be counted when Mr Carter called for a boycott of that unique celebration of youth and sport, the Olympic Games.

We have certainly come a long way since those eloquent speeches bestowed upon us during the European electoral campaign! Our peoples can certainly expect nothing from this Europe of big business, of austerity, of unemployment, of privileges for the powerful who are opposed to the liberty of the new nations, from this Europe which falls into line behind Washington!

In accordance with the commitment we have made to our people, the French Communist party opposes and will continue to oppose any threat to the independence and sovereignty of France. We demand the immediate cessation of plans for restructuring unemployment and austerity programmes. We demand strict application of the treaties, which prohibit any creation of cartels and any excessive concentration. It is possible to develop a Europe on the basis of principles other than austerity and the profit of industrial and scientific co-production. Agreements between states applying extensively to the public sector would help to stimulate production and growth in every country. But you don't want that, because such a policy also implies that the income and purchasing power of workers must be increased immediately.

We, the French Communists, reject the European coordination of poverty and unemployment. The fight against unemployment and underemployment should take account of worker's demands, the 35-hour week which has been much talked about, working conditions, the right to a retirement pension and the new rights which allow workers to participate and to have a real say within an undertaking.

Democracy, that is what our policy implies. Only the struggle of the workers in the towns and the country will achieve the Europe which they hope for, a struggle within each country, characterized by solidarity between the working classes and the peoples of Europe, a fight against the suffocating authority of multinational financing, a fight against the plans for social regression and economic decline, a fight against the dangerous and expensive arms race, a fight against peaceful relations between states, whatever their social and political systems, a fight for human rights, everywhere in the world, starting with the countries of the Common Market.

The members of the Communist and Allies Group stand, as they have always stood, firmly on the side of right, on the side of those who work with their hands and those who work with their brains, on the side of democracy and national independence, on the side of the forces of progress, of peace, of cooperation and of international solidarity.

*(Applause from the extreme left)*

**President.** — I call Mr Berkhouwer to speak on behalf on the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mr Berkhouwer.** — *(NL)* Mr President, my colleagues in my group and I were rather struck by the central theme of Mr Jenkins' speech, because it is a rather ominous one. It means, in essence, that we are facing the impending collapse of our existence, of the Western European economic and social system. I quote his words: 'The crisis is ahead. Looking ahead we face no less than the break-up of the established economic and social order on which post-war Europe was built. The warning bells have been sounding for a decade.' This is all rather ominous, Mr President. The 60's were characterized by growing prosperity in Western Europe on a scale hitherto unknown. In the 70's came the reaction. Now it is no longer a question of prosperity but of the quality of life. Our contention has always been that prosperity and quality of life go hand in hand. We are now witnessing the confounding of the doom-laden prophecies of those who wanted to do away with economic growth. All of a sudden, economic growth is no longer a dirty word. Everywhere everything is being done to prevent economic growth from falling below a certain minimum level. Mr President, if the situation is as ominous as that then we ought to have specific, far-reaching measures put

**Berkhouwer**

before us, these prophecies of doom should be accompanied by imaginative proposals. On this point I associate myself with previous speakers who described Mr Jenkins' speech as disappointing because it confined itself to these prophecies of doom and to general considerations and failed to outline any specific policy proposals in the programme for 1980. Mr President, **where is the Commission's courage, where is its intention to do something in response to the wishes of Europe's citizens?** After all, the Commission has no need to worry about being sent packing. What can happen to it now? It need have no qualms. Its term comes to an end this year. The Commission can therefore afford to be courageous in the knowledge that nothing can happen to it now.

Mr President, I should like to take a few examples. I see that 25 million EUA have been allocated in the budget for infrastructure. Which specific areas of communications and Community transport infrastructure is the Commission working on? During the last few days we have had a long debate on energy, and all one can say is that all is decidedly quiet on the Western front. What tangible results has the debate of the last few days produced? A levy on oil imports was discussed. I should like to say, on behalf of my group, that we have serious reservations on this question and that for the time being we certainly cannot agree to such a proposal. This is by way of information for Mr Brunner. Imagine if we in the Netherlands were to propose a levy on imports of gas from outside the Community. If we imposed levies on all imports of energy from outside the Community we should quickly slide into protectionism.

Mr President, a word now about what the political outlook will be for Europe in 1980. I ask this question in connection with the workings of the Community institutions. At the end of 1974 we had the first European Council. Where was the European Council in December 1979 and January 1980 when the free world was shaken to its foundations by a number of alarming events? Of course, we must not simply follow the United States of America. We can and must play our own European role. Mr Jenkins spoke, for the umpteenth time, of solidarity and the famous single voice, but after Afghanistan what do we have? A definite American-British line, a common Franco-German position? After Afghanistan and the exile of Sakharov, solidarity and a common position are just phrases. But if one advocates — as we do — a common European position in the present situation of real political crisis and confrontation with the West, then this separate position, while maintaining the efforts towards détente, can be no other than a Community position of the Nine, a position which is not separate from, far less in conflict with that of the United States, but at least — and I am choosing my words with care — parallel with that of the United States.

1980, according to the European Council of 1974, was to have been the year of European Union. Mr Tinde-

mans produced a famous report, the fruit of truly Herculean labours. I should like to ask the Commission what it has done in recent years to put into practice all the decisions of the summit conferences, Councils and the like. Mr President, if the decisions of the 1974 Council had been implemented, we should all now be in a virtual European paradise. Mr Tindemans would be an apostle no longer, we would be living in a perfect world. I mention this because we again have some new reports before us: the Spierenburg report and the report of the Three Wise Men. I wonder, Mr President, whether we have been made any the wiser by the Three Wise Men, but, in any event, we do not want the Spierenburg report nor that of the Three Wise Men to suffer the same fate as the Tindemans report, which we shall have to dig out of the drawer again one of these days.

Mr Jenkins used a nice expression. He said 'The Commission is neither the servant of the Council nor the secretariat of the Parliament.' **Who ever said it was? We wonder, though, whether the Commission is in fact alert enough to avoid being downgraded into a secretariat of the Council or of the European Council. Does it generate enough initiatives of its own? Does it not wait too often until problems have been pre-digested by the administrations of the Member States?**

I should also like to know what the Commission is doing to stop the abuse of the Luxembourg agreement, because the Luxembourg agreement, Mr President, may be applied in the Council, by the smaller countries as well, when vital interests are genuinely at stake. But it has come to be abused, to the point where nothing can be done unless there is unanimity. What is the Commission doing about this? As far as the position of the new Commission is concerned, we consider that Parliament should at least be able to express a vote of confidence. But I think that today is not the time to deal in detail with the reports by Spierenburg and the Three Wise Men, because these are now before the Political Affairs Committee. We consider that these reports should be studied in detail in the plenary sitting of Parliament.

It is a tradition in the British parliament for a speaker who takes the floor after someone who has made his maiden speech to express his praise of that maiden speech. I think that the speech of my Dutch colleague, Mr Jonker, can be considered more or less as his maiden speech, and I shall not stint my praise. But I note at the same time — and I do not claim to be an apostle or a disciple, far less an evangelist — that I had a good pupil in my friend Mr Jonker. You see, I have been proclaiming that message for years now like a voice crying in the wilderness, if I might thus quote — as is everyone's right — from the scriptures. As for Mr Jonker's comments about digging the passport union out of the administration's drawer, I think I more or less have the copyright on that idea. All of you by now have been held up at the border at Kehl. I have been held up there hundreds of times, I am stopped there

**Berkhouwer**

every time. Even now I am always stopped by the customs officials and border police between Arnhem and Kehl. The trains are full of these people, while we sit and perorate about some customs proposal or other. What are we to do with these people? They have all got to go, they no longer belong in our Community! I still remember, after the creation of the customs union, being stopped by one of these customs people at the border between Luxembourg and Thionville. I said: 'Do you know that we have a Customs Union now?' He replied: 'What's that? What's it got to do with me?' And, you know, they are still saying that.

But the point here is that the Commission cannot say that. The Commission has to make a whole lot of things work, which is especially difficult when the big things are not successful. Then they can present to those who earn their living by the sweat of their brow an image of that citizens' Europe: 'A citizen's Europe', 'A European civil law' 'A European legal space'! Altogether splendid things, Mr President, but what has this Commission done about all these things up to now?

Yes, Mr Jenkins, I see you smiling, but I am serious. And I repeat: You can afford to display so much courage in your final year. I shall take note of your smile in the hope that it is the smile of an Erasmus. There is nothing finer in life, Mr Jenkins, than the human smile and I hope that you will keep it for the rest of the year and that it will be the symbol of a Commission prepared to be courageous for the remainder of its term of office.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Nyborg to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

**Mr Nyborg.** — *(DK)* Mr President, as you yourself indicated, it is rather a thankless task to follow such a colourful speaker as Mr Berkhouwer. However, I would like here to comment on a few of the points mentioned by Mr Jenkins in his speech and also on a few points which he did not mention.

It is clear to all of us that the energy issue as such is one of the most important problems which we have to tackle in our present-day society because everyone depends to such an unbelievable extent on energy, both industry and private individuals. My feeling is, however, that the Commission is placing rather too much emphasis on the various forms of energy and perhaps not quite as much emphasis as I, at any rate, would wish on energy conservation. The Commission's report mentions a number of figures with which I do not entirely agree on account of various studies which, according to recent information I have received, have been carried out both in Europe and the USA. Some scientists in the USA have shown, for example, that it is feasible to save over 40 % of our

current energy consumption without this entailing any inconvenience at all. This is not just an assumption, but something that has been proved.

Energy policy is a typical matter for the Community because it is an issue that very few of us can resolve in isolation. If we stand together, we have a chance of resolving the problem. This leads me to another problem which we cannot resolve alone either but must tackle jointly, i.e. environmental problems, to which I feel very little importance was attached in the statement we heard. Environmental pollution is unfortunately in many cases a phenomenon that crosses national frontiers.

Agriculture was, of course, another subject which was mentioned, and agricultural prices are a matter that is uppermost in people's minds at the moment, particularly after the information divulged by Commissioner Gundelach and the Commission, which is creating a great deal of dissatisfaction in many quarters. Farmers have now had to show restraint for a couple of years and not only do without any rise in earnings but, into the bargain, experience a drop in income. This policy is now to be continued. Yet, why should farmers be regarded as pariahs? Why should they not be placed on an equal footing with other citizens in our society? Instead of now giving farmers far less than they feel is reasonable in order to cover their increased costs, the cry should be: No, they have now lagged behind long enough, now we must give them 8.5 % or perhaps as much as 10 %. I am fully aware that people will say that this will increase consumer prices, yet these prices also go up when costs rise in industry. When it becomes more expensive to buy industrial goods, it becomes more expensive for all of us, for consumers in general. There is nothing that can be done about the fact that agricultural products become dearer when costs are rising. We cannot in all decency say — nor do I feel that it is compatible with the agricultural policy we have pursued to date — that farmers must the whole time exercise restraint.

At the same time, we are saying that Community farmers must become as efficient as possible and step up production, only they must not do so for the present in the dairy sector. If they have become efficient in this sector, if they have complied with our past appeals to improve efficiency and produce better and more goods, etc., they are to suffer for it and the more efficient farmers will be penalized in favour of the less efficient. However, we will have an opportunity to discuss this matter in detail at a later date so I will not dwell on it any longer. I was, however, surprised to hear very little or, rather, nothing at all said about the internal market.

The customs union is one of the cornerstones of the European Community. We all know that tariff barriers have been dismantled, and yet they have been replaced by these accursed technical barriers to trade which are undermining the efforts that have so far been made to

## Nyborg

achieve free movement of goods within the internal frontiers of Europe. I would strongly urge the Commission to make an even greater effort than in the past to identify and eliminate the technical barriers to trade which, in countless cases, flourish clandestinely, because it is realized perfectly well that such measures **are not permissible under the Treaty. However, it is not enough for the Commission simply to await outside notification of such instances. It must be active in the field or, at least, draw the attention of the parties concerned to the fact that they are more than welcome to bring their problems to the Commission.**

Transport is another area that has not seen much progress of late. It is regrettable that there is, for example, to be no liberalization of the road haulage industry and that we must continue indefinitely to contend with problems such as cross-border road haulage permits. The Commission even scaled down its demands last year. Until then, it had been in agreement with Parliament that a 110 % increase was reasonable. It then suddenly reduced this to 20 %, thus playing the Council's game, all because the Council is simply unable to agree on a transport policy. This is a matter of considerable regret to us here in Parliament.

I was disappointed to hear no mention in the statement of what action it intends to take against the Comecon countries. The Commission is very well aware that the Comecon countries are pursuing a policy of dumping in the transport sector, both on land and by sea. A few minor steps have been taken to try and monitor in some small way what is actually going on. However, no proposals have yet been put forward indicating how it is intended to cure this affliction or propose how it be cured. In the meantime, the Eastern bloc countries are simply continuing their policy with the result that our own people are going under. Unfortunately, Mr Jenkins, speaking time is limited and I cannot deal with other topics which I would very much like to have raised; I will, therefore, have to stop here.

**President.** — (F) I call Mr Pannella to speak on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Mr President, I think that of the three European Institutions, Parliament, the Council and the Commission, the Commission is certainly the least deserving of any indictment. For the simple reason that the nature of the Commission is determined by the Council, the Governments of the Nine and the political forces in power in the nine countries, through the choice of Commissioners, the policies of the Council or this Parliament's actions. The conditions of this debate bear witness to the political power of the dominant political forces in this Parliament and in Europe.

Well, Mr President, in the handful of minutes available to us, am I to go through the false and hypocritical ritual of analyzing President Jenkins' report? That would make me false, hypocritical and presumptuous! We are not allowed serious debates or serious analyses here. Rule 28 allows all the parliamentarians of the majority as such to speak, all, first the EPP Members, Socialists, Conservatives or whoever, but our electorate voted for us precisely so that we could speak on these important issues.

It is absolutely scandalous that everything should be decided according to Rule 28 which benefits the large groups by depriving certain parliamentarians of the right to speak. And then, the second point, our group is allocated, with no kind of respect for our ideas and our positions but with a butchering approach, which turns this Parliament into a butcher's shop, a mere 7 or 6 minutes to express our opinions on Europe, on the Commission and on the 1980s!

We are being silenced, Mr President, as Sakharov is being silenced elsewhere! But here it is also felt necessary to silence diversity and difference in Europe, first by fixing the elections and then by fixing the regulations! Parliament is therefore in no position to throw the first stone at the Commission, whose reports show us day by day and year by year how the distinction between our needs and our desires grows ever wider.

You are the ones who, in the name of Christianity, socialism or liberalism, engage year after year in hypocritical discussions about extermination in the world in the context of a debate on hunger. And then the Council of the Nine, the Council of the Social Democrat Schmidt, of the — apparently — liberal Giscard, of the Christian Democrat Cossiga, and of the Conservative Margaret Thatcher — this 'European' Gang of Four informs us each year that the mortality rate in the world has risen while we are told each day of the great battles which must be fought. Your victories truly represent the road to death, just as your power represents the road to ruin for this Parliament.

At the beginning of every session, Ladies and Gentlemen of the majority, you say you are afraid of us waifs and strays, you fear that we might say just a little too much, while your leaders and your chairmen inundate us with requests for urgency, with work that we cannot complete, so much so that tomorrow there will be at least twenty-odd votes which cannot take place because all you will want to do is clear off and catch the Friday morning plane, for nothing serious is ever done here on a Friday . . .

Mr President, I would just like to add one more word about Yugoslavia. We have this question of Yugoslavia. It is an interesting one. It is the Council which possesses the directives of the agreement with Yugoslavia, and this masterful Parliament, with its masterful

**Pannella**

majority, makes us discuss Yugoslavia after Mr Jenkins' report, and not after Mr Ruffini's report. That is the wisdom and the conscientiousness of this Parliament. But we know very well that in reality Mr Ruffini, together with Mr Jenkins of course, will be going on the 22nd to initial an agreement concerning 'baby beef' or not, an agreement which has already been drawn up, therefore, and has already been agreed to in practice.

And we from Trieste, we from Italy, we from Europe, we are not afraid of this agreement with Yugoslavia. No, we are afraid of your inability to produce rational and positive agreements! We are afraid that where you intend to create order, you will, as everywhere, create disorder.

You generally do so, Commissioner Jenkins, and you do so too, Mr President, whatever might be your individual abilities — and I often compliment the Commissioners on their abilities, for I do not feel that they can be suspected of being in connivance or in complicity with you. I have none, thank heavens!

And here it should be said that every day we are given tangible proof that the Europe which you represent, the Europe of the Commission, the Europe of the Council, the Europe of the Parliament, is generous towards those who hold power, whether they hold power in the field of arms, whether they hold power in multinational companies, whether they hold power within Comecon — oh yes, Mr President — whether they hold power among the ruling classes, or whether they are large drug companies, with them you are cowards and do nothing, but you are arrogant and savage when it comes to the rights of citizens, of ordinary men and women, and your policies make you the murderers and assassins of 30 million men and women in the world whose only fault is that they do not have the strength to tear from your hands the bread which you continually throw unthinkingly into your wasteful system, into your dustbins!

Your Europe is a Europe of madness and a Europe of violence! In Italy and elsewhere you are reaping what you have sown: trouble and strife. I am sure that the violence in Europe is your violence.

Even within this Parliament, the Europe of ecologists, of true Christians, of true socialists and of true liberals can, I believe, exist only as an alternative to the old conservative and Stalinist left wing whose voice is still heard sometimes coming from that parody of communism that sits on the left wing here — I don't know why it doesn't sit on the extreme right. Mr President, we know that people retain one hope, that contrary to your wishes and in spite of you we might achieve something positive . . .

**President.** — (*F*) Mr Pannella, I have something very interesting to tell you. You have protested at the fact that you did not get the speaking time you wanted. Over the past 7 months I have had a breakdown made of speaking time minute by minute. The Liberals with 40 members spoke for nine hours . . .

**Mr Pannella.** — (*F*) You are the President, you are naturally the defender of a part, albeit a majority part, of this Assembly . . . I did not criticize the presidency, I criticized the political standpoints! If you wish to be the representative of a political majority, you may be, but then you will not be my President!

**President.** — I have had some information prepared for the Bureau, Mr Pannella. I am going to read to you an official document. Our services have calculated for the Presidency, and not for me, that the Non-attached group, with 9 members, has, since July, spoken for 4 hours and 31 minutes. Your group, with 11 members, has spoken for 8 hours! The EPD group, with 22 members, for 7 hours and 20 minutes, the Liberals, with 40 members, for 9 hours and 40 minutes, the Communists have spoken for 10 hours and 40 minutes, the ED group for 18 hours and 20 minutes, the EPP group for 18 hours and 40 minutes and the Socialist members for 25 hours. You should study this document!

**Mr Pannella.** — (*F*) Thank you for this compliment to our ability, Mr President.

**President.** — (*F*) You know me; I always compliment you on your abilities.

The proceedings will now be suspended until 9 p.m.

The house will rise.

*(The sitting was suspended at 8.05 p.m. and resumed at 9 p.m.)*

**President.** — The sitting is resumed.

I call Mr De Goede.

**Mr De Goede.** — (*NL*) Mr President, in the few minutes I have I should like to confine myself to one point which was not brought out explicitly by previous speakers, namely the competitiveness of our Community. An important point because it provides part of the answer to the question of whether we can look for-

## De Goede

ward to a better Europe, a more prosperous Europe in the future, or whether things are going to get worse. Mr President, it does not look as though the alarming employment situation is going to show any substantial improvement in the short or even in the longer term. We already have six million unemployed, plus several million 'invisible' unemployed. They represent an extremely heavy burden on the social policy of the Member States and of our Community. In the debate this week on the shipbuilding and textile industries I expressed my fear that these two sectors will produce a further two million unemployed. On top of this, the Community is threatened with a further deterioration of its competitive position, caused by higher prices of oil and raw materials, lower economic growth over the coming years and increasing competition from other industrialized countries, such as the United States and Japan and the newly-industrializing countries of the Third World. What is needed is not a deterioration but an improvement in our export position vis-à-vis third countries, because otherwise rising oil prices and a steadily worsening balance of trade will force us to pursue a drastically deflationary policy with all the disastrous consequences this implies. That is why it is crucial for us to strengthen our competitive position. On which factors should we concentrate in this connection? Let me mention a number of points very briefly:

## First:

For a long time we have concentrated far too little and far too vaguely on the production of investment goods requiring skilled labour. The United States and Japan have taken a sizable lead.

## Second:

The ratio of working population to total population is less favourable in the Community than in the United States or Japan. As a result the base of our prosperity is becoming steadily narrower and the dangers greater.

## Third:

Geographical and vocational mobility — which is severely restricted in our Community — must be encouraged by closer coordination of school systems, better organization of the labour market, better planning of housing, retraining facilities, greater wage differentials, more emphasis by management and government on new developments.

## Fourth:

I should add immediately that the increasing competition within the Community, while it causes problems because of a greater degree of integration, has nevertheless made European industry gear itself up to larger markets. That has been a positive effect, and without it we would be experiencing

even greater problems in each of our Member States than we are. This is why protectionism must be combated vigorously.

## Fifth:

Healthy small and medium-sized undertakings make a valuable contribution to our economy and therefore to our competitiveness. The United States, Japan and also the Federal Republic of Germany are examples of this.

## Sixth:

Innovation. Admittedly this is primarily a matter for individual firms, but the Community, its institutions and the individual Member States must provide greater impetus.

## Seventh:

Structure of our product range. We need to identify in good time which new products are likely to be in world demand. Where are the possibilities for expansion? Our trade with Third World countries has not developed well. Japan excels in this field. Can we not learn from this?

## Eighth:

Export promotion. Not only through new products but also through more attention to quality, delivery times, export credits, after-sales service, prospecting of markets and advertising. These are ways of stepping up our export activity.

## Ninth and last, Mr President,:

Control of production costs. Wages costs and labour productivity are both important. As far as wages costs are concerned we are now in a bad position vis-à-vis the United States, partly as a result of the sharp decline of the US dollar. This is another area which warrants our attention. Mr President, I felt it was useful by means of a number of specific points to outline possible ways of strengthening our competitive position and of combating inflation and the economic recession which threatens us all in the near future.

**President.** — I call Mr Arndt.

**Mr Arndt.** — (D) Mr President, what I am going to say is probably rather unexpected. But before the House rose we spoke with the chairmen of the political groups and reached the opinion that there was not a great deal of sense in continuing the debate at this point, and so we wonder whether, since all the political groups have now made a contribution, we should close the debate and ask Mr Jenkins to speak, for we still have a large number of requests, reports and decisions before us, and in this way we would probably be

**Arndt**

able to manage better with the time available to us. Since I am the first speaker concerned, it is my view that this House should now decide that the debate is closed and that Mr Jenkins may reply to the points raised in the discussions, so that we could then move on to the remaining items on the agenda.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — In accordance with Rule 32 we shall hear one speaker for and one against Mr Arndt's motion.

I call Mr Spinelli.

**Mr Spinelli.** — *(I)* Mr President, I think that a request can be made for the debate to be closed when no further Members have put down their names to speak, but that we cannot prevent people from speaking if their turn has not yet come.

If our colleagues in the Christian-Democratic and Socialist Groups wish to save time, they have only to invite their colleagues to give up their turn. For my part, I am not going to give mine up.

**President.** — Mr Spinelli, pursuant to Rule 32 a procedural motion requesting, for example, the adjournment of a debate has priority over the main question and suspends discussion of it.

**Mr Spinelli.** — *(I)* Mr President, 'closing the debate' cannot entail taking away someone's right to speak.

**President.** — I call Mrs Walz.

**Mrs Walz.** — *(D)* I am the next speaker, Mr President, and I must agree with Mr Arndt. I, like Mr Arndt, am prepared to forego my speech. I think that we have reached a fairly impossible situation as a result of this morning's proceedings; we will not get to the end of our programme, and when Mr Jenkins replies there will probably be virtually no one in this chamber apart from him. I do not consider that satisfactory and would therefore be in favour of drawing to a halt now. I second Mr Arndt's motion and ask that you put it to the vote.

**President.** — If we close the debate, I think it is impossible to ask the Commissioner to reply. Either we continue the debate, inclusive of the reply of the Commissioner — that seems to me at least the logic of the debate — or we close the debate without giving the President of the Commission an opportunity to reply.

I call Mr Radoux.

**Mr Radoux.** — *(F)* Mr President, may I point out that the verb used in the Rule to which you referred is 'suspend'. The debate is suspended, but not closed.

**President.** — I think that we will be better able to consider what course of action to follow if we adjourn the sitting for some moments.

The House will rise for five minutes.

*(The sitting was suspended at 9.15 p.m. and resumed at 9.20 p.m.)*

**President.** — The sitting is resumed.

I call Mr Arndt.

**Mr Arndt.** — *(D)* Mr President, since my motion has met with opposition from some Members of this House, I consider that it has been overruled. In my opinion, we could have saved this Parliament five hours for matters on which it would have been able to reach a decision, but if it is felt absolutely essential that people be allowed to speak, then I consider it appropriate under a parliamentary system that they should do so. I may have cause to refer tomorrow to the way we have spent the time which could have been used for decisions of Parliament.

With regard to the Commission's programme for 1980, the Socialist Group considers that the major problem before us is the fight against unemployment. Mr Jenkins said that our economic system cannot solve the problem of unemployment without state intervention. We are disturbed to note that the figures for 1980 are worse than those for 1979. But one can talk for a long time about the causes of unemployment, as we have done in this House. One thing is clear, however, the energy crisis is certainly not the cause of unemployment, but rather — as the President pointed out — new technology. My group certainly believes that new technology is necessary, but this House and all politicians concerned with the problem should realise that technological development is intended to serve man and not vice versa, man should not serve technological development. This means that we should give much more thought to maintaining jobs whenever necessary advances are made in technology. The proposals contained in the speech by the President of the Commission are insufficient in our view. It is all very nice to explain the unemployment problem to employees and the unemployed themselves, but it certainly does not offer the unemployed any consolation.

Secondly, Mr Jenkins suggested that mobility should be encouraged. The work force is already mobile, Mr President. I come from a town where foreign workers and their families make up 20 % of the population.

**Arndt**

They come from Italy, they come from Spain, they come from Portugal, they come from Yugoslavia, they are mobile. It is the employment opportunities, the undertakings and the factories which must become mobile. It is senseless to bring our friends from Italy or Spain to Germany, it must be possible for us to make jobs available in Italy, in Spain and in Portugal so that this workers' mobility is unnecessary.

*(Applause)*

Thirdly, you said that we must reduce the length of time for which people are unemployed. That is true, but we must see to it that whenever possible unemployment does not occur in the first place. We have discussed in this House the question of working hours and the 35-hour week. This topic has not been exhausted and we in this House shall have to give further consideration to how the available working time can be more fairly divided among the work force of Europe. The problem will therefore remain with us, and I can assure you that a renouncing of wage increases, of which we hear mention from time to time, cannot save us, for renouncing wage increases cannot in the last resort prevent the loss of jobs. I hope that the Commission will make further proposals on this subject. I believe that we can make significant progress in the area of employment policy with a conscious restructuring of our economy. This means that we must develop further the regional and structural policy. The investments and investment aid which we give should not be simply short-term aid to save a job for one or two years. This aid should ensure that jobs are secure in the long-term or that new jobs are created in the longterm.

Mr President, the Socialist Group thoroughly supports the view that economic growth is necessary. But we also consider that economic growth must be quantitative and not just qualitative. Economic growth for the sake of profit alone does us no good; economic growth must serve the interests of mankind. Let me give you an example. The increased oil prices mean quantitative economic growth, they mean growth of the gross national product. We in the Socialist Group are not opposed to profit, but the extra profit which the oil companies unashamedly make out of the oil crisis is unacceptable. These oil companies long ago ceased to provide any solid foundation for our economic system.

Mr Jenkins spoke of a tax on energy. You will have our support, Mr Jenkins, if this tax limits the profits of the oil companies. You will not, however, have our support if European consumers bear the brunt of the taxes.

*(Applause from some quarters)*

So now we come to the subject of energy policy. It has been discussed many times in this House. The President of the Commission made a point which in my

opinion should be given much greater emphasis. It may be appropriate to argue here about the pros and cons of nuclear energy. But we should all be clear about one thing — whether we are for or against — we must save energy at all costs. The figures given by the President of the Commission were very impressive. He said that through normal saving it would be possible to reduce our oil consumption by 20 % in 1990 if we take proper measures. I would even say that the figure you gave, Mr President, is a very cautious one; it could be still higher. And in my opinion it would be a very good thing if those who expend all their energy and zeal on arguments about nuclear energy could show the same enthusiasm for energy saving measures. Europe would then be making some progress.

*(Applause)*

This brings us to the matter of environmental protection. It is not just in the energy sector that environmental protection is necessary. We must re-establish the ecological balance. Insufficient attention has been paid to this in the industrialization process and the development of transport systems. We in industrialized Europe have gone far beyond the acceptable limits and we must all put thought and serious effort into solving this environmental problem so that one day we shall be able to look our children and our grandchildren in the face because we have not destroyed their world.

I believe that these are important points. The proposals regarding the agricultural policy will be discussed in detail next month. May I just say one thing now. We accept that all the proposals made by the Commission have given attention to the economic situation and to stabilization of consumer prices. What concerns us and will be our criterion in judging these proposals is whether the income of smaller farmers in particular will remain comparable with the income of other workers in Europe. This will be the yardstick we shall use in assessing these proposals.

A final word on the financing system, convergence and the British contribution. The Socialist Group has made many demands for a revision of the system and considers that the present arrangements for the United Kingdom are unacceptable. But we also feel that the proposals made by the British government in Dublin are unacceptable. We adopt the view that this money cannot be made freely available to one government, compensation must be made through Community programmes and proposals, since this money belongs to all the European taxpayers. The rich countries cannot say we must get back exactly the amount we put in to the Community, European solidarity must see to it that citizens in areas of Europe less advanced than the industrialized areas also have a reasonable level of income. This means that the rich nations in Europe must show solidarity with the others and ensure as far as possible that all the citizens of Europe enjoy the same standard of living and the same level of income. I hope that 1980, and the Commission's policy, will be

**Arndt**

directed towards achieving this goal. We in the Socialist Group will offer our assistance.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Walz.

**Mrs Walz.** — *(D)* Mr President, we would like to thank President Jenkins and Mr Brunner for yesterday's speeches, both of which were sombre in tone, probably with good reason. But we regretted that neither made reference to the fact that those being criticized, those who — in the energy sector for example — bear a large share of the responsibility, were the relevant Councils of Ministers. Very extensive and indeed practicable proposals — for energy saving, for example, Mr Arndt — were made by the Committee of Energy and Research after the first energy crisis; we submitted several motions containing such proposals. But they were almost always destined to failure because of disagreement within the Council of Ministers, and the Council of Energy Ministers could not even manage to agree on the coal package, although we and you are constantly saying that coal is now the most important concern. The package could not get the approval of the Council of Ministers. But the reverberations from Afghanistan must have made it clear to even the most reluctant government that only a common energy policy can guarantee supplies and that a solitary stand won't work. Here too I would have liked to hear some criticism of the Council of Ministers, but there was none forthcoming from the Commission.

Certainly there are very large differences between the energy policies of the have-nots, but our interests are the same, to obtain a secure and socially acceptable supply of energy. And with regard to social acceptability in particular I should say to the ladies and gentlemen of the Socialist Group that they are concerned only with reactor safety. We are concerned about safety, but also about the safety of the jobs involved. Yes, just listen. Ask your trade unions, they will be the first to tell you.

Agriculture was once a strong uniting factor in the Community, and in spite of the differences involved even then, it was used as a means of uniting the Community; today a common energy policy must assume the same role, for only together can we support the costs of severing our dependence on oil; whether this will be achieved through a loan or through taxation is yet to be decided. We feel that loans would be better. If this common effort continues to be thwarted by supposed personal interests, and Article 235 continues to be used not for granting special powers to the Commission but to veto decisions, then those countries who do consider it necessary must work together. Also, provision must be made through international agreements for European countries not belonging to

the EC to be able to join this energy community. Employer's associations and trade unions should be involved in this policy, on the model of the OECD. Energy savings have fallen far short of the figure forecast by the EEA and the EC countries themselves, -4 to -5 % for 1979. Luxembourg stands at the top in splendid isolation with the figure of -8.1 %, followed by the USA with -5.1 %. But the Netherlands, for example, with +8.8 % and Belgium with +15.7 % have so far been unable to meet the commitment made at the Tokyo Summit.

Anyone who asks that priority be given to coal — and I have just heard it said again — that is what we are all asking for — is also backing nuclear energy, even if he juggles with the figures for the remaining demand which must be satisfied. This is made quite clear not only in the German Federal Government's coal-processing programme of 30 January of this year, for example, but also in the recently published study by the National Academy of Sciences in the USA. It is a fact — according to this major study — that coal and nuclear energy involve considerable risks; for coal the difficult and dangerous work of the miner and the climatic problems of carbon dioxide pollution which are considered by climatic experts to give reason for concern, and for nuclear energy the danger of proliferation — not of safety, but expressly of proliferation. To quote from this study: it is difficult to say which represents a greater threat to peace, nuclear proliferation or intense international competition for fossil fuels in the event of there being no universally adequate system for producing nuclear energy. I think we need only look at the present situation in the Middle East to understand what this study is referring to. As a long-term prospect coal is a far too expensive raw material to be used primarily for producing electricity. The vaporization and liquefaction of coal are possibilities for the future which in any case also involve considerable environmental pollution. It is also a fact that given the restricted volume of the market, early priority must be given to coal imports.

President Jenkins spoke of the dialogue with the OPEC countries, while at the Davos Management Congress last week Sheik Yamani spoke of the establishment of an international conference for cooperation between the OECD, OPEC — and this you will certainly not be pleased to hear — and representatives of the multinational companies. Exploratory talks with the Gulf States and Iraq on economic and commercial cooperation agreements should start as soon as possible and should not be obstructed by any government; even if things continue to go well in the coming year — and we hope they will — steps must be taken in good time to minimize the effects of the next crisis.

**President.** — I call Sir Peter Vanneck.

**Sir Peter Vanneck.** — Mr President, I am very glad to be following Mrs Walz and her speech on the need

## Vanneck

to balance the relative importance of different energy resources. I want to speak about the President's wholly correct emphasis on nuclear energy. I speak as my Group's *soi-disant* specialist — I do not say expert — after the Fuchs report that was debated yesterday.

The use of electricity generated by nuclear power is a proven tool in today's society. A dynamic programme for the construction of stations and use of nuclear energy within the Community is imperative if existing social and economic life is to be sustained. Nuclear energy is already filling a vital need at just the time when substantial non-oil energy resources are required. So we must be aware of the urgency of providing more of it if we are to preserve our standard of living. In this respect the idea of Mr Coppieters and his colleagues that the Community should declare a moratorium on the building of new nuclear power stations is patently absurd. It is a negative ostrich-like attitude. I do not know what the motivation is behind it, but on the face of it, it is a symptom of a really ridiculous approach.

There are, however, two facets of this subject which I wish to illuminate. They are what I might call the personal political opposition and the party political opposition. As far as the first goes, one quite understands people's concern for their personal safety and for the environment, and I am not suggesting for a moment that anybody who is opposed to the provision of nuclear energy is *ipso facto* a communist. It is our job, however, to reassure them, at whatever cost in publicity — but hopefully not in time — that every practicable precaution is being taken in the provision of nuclear power.

Let me quote from the British Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution, bearing in mind the implicit criticism of my country's nuclear programme contained in Mr Linkohr's oral question of yesterday. In the Royal Commission's conclusions it is said: 'The risk of serious accident in any single reactor is extremely small. The hazards posed by reactor accidents are not unique in scale nor of such a kind as to suggest that nuclear power should be abandoned for this reason alone'.

Now I believe that continuing and adequately publicized examination of those risks is vital to reassure those who earn their livelihood in the electricity industry, the nearby population in particular, public opinion in general and ourselves that we are determined to minimize to the best humanly achievable level the risk of failure leading to a serious accident, that is, an accident that could result in death.

As far as the second goes, the motivation is really quite sinister. I have a view which I must quote at length. There exists a political interest on the part of the Soviet Union in exploiting shortages in the West. Policy makers always assume, not without reason, that one of the many factors determining the political in-

dependence of a country, its military and diplomatic strength and its international influence is the level of its economic development and its economic independence.

This assumption is doubly valid in the case of two world systems opposing each other. But the level of a country's economy is determined by its energy technology, that is, by the utilization of oil, gas, coal, uranium, thorium, and perhaps deuterium and lithium, when very complex technical problems of controlled thermo-nuclear symphysis have been solved. Therefore I assert that the development of nuclear technology is one of the necessary conditions for the preservation of the economic and political independence of every country, of those, who have already reached a high development stage as well as of those who are just developing.

For the countries of Western Europe the importance of nuclear technology is particularly great. If the economies of these countries continue to be in any important way dependent on the supply of chemical fuel from the Soviet Union or from countries which are under her influence, the West will find itself under the constant threat of seeing these channels cut off. This will result in an humiliating political dependence. In politics one concession always leads to another, and where it will finally lead is hard to foresee.

Those words, Mr President and colleagues, are the words of the distinguished Soviet physicist, Professor Andrei Sakharov, a man whose voice is now strangled into silence by his exile in the closed city of Gorki. We must not now risk this potential political blackmail by dragging our feet in the field of nuclear energy.

**President.** — I call Mr Spinelli.

**Mr Spinelli.** — (I) Mr President, I am intervening on behalf of the Italian Communists. I did not want to relinquish my turn to speak, and I shall speak because I think that we have something to say which might perhaps prove interesting to the Commission.

We cannot conceal our profound dissatisfaction at the Commission's programme for 1980, because of the huge rift which exists between our awareness of the proportions of the crisis towards which we are moving and the action which it has proposed to take. On the one hand, the President, Mr Jenkins, forecasts nothing more nor less than the possibility of the collapse of the economic and social order on which post-war Europe has been based. And we are convinced that he is absolutely right: the few figures which he gives are frightening in themselves.

Certainly, no-one can expect the picture which he gives to be changed radically through courses of action undertaken just in 1980. But the action taken during this year must nevertheless be such as to meet the problem; it should, that is, be the vigorous begin-

## Spinelli

ning or continuation of courses of action which will then be continued for a number of years. However, it is precisely the description of what the Commission proposes to undertake which perplexes us, because of the inadequate and imprecise nature of its proposals.

The President, Mr Jenkins, is right to place the energy problem at the centre of the Commission's activities for 1980. We agree with him that a strong investment policy is needed for this sector. And it is fair to say, on the one hand, that we cannot rely just on the effects of the market for this and, on the other, that the Community as such must intervene.

But a good deal of the rest is obscure! There is not a word about the necessity for harmonizing Community policy on energy costs. And yet without such a common policy no further action can be taken. There is not a word to tell us whether encouraging the burning of coal means acquiring the coal necessary at the lowest possible price, which means importing it, or whether it means introducing highly protective measures for Community coal. There is nothing to indicate the extent of the financial outlay which the Community would have to make in order to begin this huge investment policy. And finally, there is a worrying mention of the fact that the money needed could be obtained through a tax on energy consumption or a duty on imported energy. We should like to know where the logic of such a proposal lies.

Energy is becoming too expensive. We are already having difficulty in absorbing the increases which have taken place, and in many cases there are still intervention policies which hold the price down and prevent a balance being achieved between demand and supply. Are you really then suggesting that the cost of energy should be raised a few more points by imposing a tax or an import duty on it?

There is a wide spread of direct and indirect taxes, part of which could be transferred to the Community budget to allow us to follow a reasonable investment policy, but you insist in asking not for an effort on the part of the economy as a whole, but that the cost should fall in the precise area where you would like prices to be reduced!

But at least, when speaking of energy, Mr Jenkins' speech contains some ideas to be followed, which might need to be defined or even perhaps corrected, but which are there nevertheless. What should we say about other matters which are also very serious? We have asked in vain what instruments the Commission proposes to use to reactivate our economies, and what the particular role of the Community is

We must certainly help to restructure or close down obsolete industries, and to encourage capital and labour to move towards new undertakings. But the amount of legislation and finance in the Community at

present devoted to structural policies (including social and industrial policy, research, agriculture, regional policy) is completely insufficient to make this encouragement really valid.

Mr Jenkins tells us that the recovery of our economies can no longer be separated from the development of the poorer countries, and from increased demand. Certainly, but what is the minimum commitment necessary in order to bring this development about? We ought to be considering a large-scale plan for transferring resources for thirty years to the developing countries, and instead of this the allocations for this in our Community budget and in our national budgets are quite clearly derisory. And so? We have looked in vain for even a sketch of an answer in the programme which the Commission has presented to us.

And yet 1980 has one special characteristic for the Community and the Commission, as during it not one but two Community budgets must be discussed, and therefore we shall have two opportunities to decide on how much money to spend and on what to spend it.

Certainly for the 1980 budget the most important matter will be to take advantage to the rejection of the budget, in order finally to exercise control over the crazy support system for agricultural prices. And we are counting on the fact that, in its forthcoming drafts, the Commission will create a strong link between its prices proposals and the proposals on the co-responsibility levies, as this alone can guarantee that all the Community's resources are not swallowed up in financing stock-piling and the sale of agricultural surpluses. But in 1980 we shall only be able to take the first steps.

In the 1981 draft budget, we shall have to think of the real scale of the problems which the Community must tackle in order to decide on the finance involved.

I must note that the Commission had promised to put forward a proposal to increase its own resources before the end of the year; then it postponed this until February; now it seems to have been postponed until June, going by the attached memorandum. This is not how they should prepare to tackle the problems raised by the President of the Commission himself.

We well understand that the Commission is only partly responsible for the indefinite nature of the programmes. The real difficulty lies in the fact that the Commission is not in a position to say, or even to imagine, that policy the Council is prepared to follow in one sector or another. The Commission is like an aeroplane which flies through the fog without radar, and which certainly does not know where its blind flight will eventually take it. This is the real reason why the programmes presented every year have so little political value.

At this point we come to the institutional problem.

**Spinelli**

Once again, Mr Jenkins is right to raise it. But his way of presenting it to us is quite inadequate.

I shall not mention the report of the three wise men and the Spierenburg report. Both of them are so marginal when it comes to the real institutional problems of our Community that they are really not worth considering.

The first institutional problem, which is a central one for 1980, lies in the fact that a new Commission will be appointed at the end of this year. All that Mr Jenkins can suggest is that when the new Commission has been appointed, it should present itself to this Assembly. This will not of course be for a vote of confidence but to find out whether it is acceptable to Parliament through a debate like the one which is being held today. No. The new democratic life of the Community requires a bit more imagination.

In our countries, each new government certainly presents itself to its parliament, but this is the act which concludes a process of drawing up plans and appointing ministers which takes place at elections, party conferences, agreements between the parties when there is a coalition (and at the Community level we can only have coalitions) and undertakings between government and parliament on the programmes to be followed. This whole mechanism does not yet exist at the Community level, or exists only in embryonic form.

The Commission, which is the political driving force which has the duty of putting forward proposals and initiating courses of action on the policies to be followed, has until now always been chosen without previous debate, either by the Parliament or the Council, on its policies or its members, and without any commitment on the part of Council or Parliament to support it in one direction or another.

However, this Assembly, which is made up of the legitimate representatives of the people of Europe, should insist that the governments should have to face a debate in the Parliament before deciding on the Members of the Commission and not afterwards, so that the Parliament can make clear its requirements on the policies and membership of the Commission.

Given a reasonable procedure for cooperation, it should be possible to reach an agreement between Parliament and the governments of the Member States, and, therefore, to create a Commission which knows, on the one hand, that it has been appointed in order to bring about a certain set of policies and, on the other, that Council and Parliament are both committed to helping it to achieve these.

We shall put forward proposals to this end and shall ask this Assembly to discuss them promptly, so that in 1980, that is before the Commission is appointed, and not in 1981 after it has been appointed, the Parliament

can show that there is now a new tide of democracy in the Community.

*(Applause)*

IN THE CHAIR: Mr ROGERS

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Maher.

**Mr Maher.** — Mr President, I am glad to have the opportunity of making a few comments on the excellent speech made by the President of the Commission yesterday. However, not everything that I have to say will be exactly complimentary but I hope that President Jenkins will take it in good part. I know that he said when he began that he was not taking a Cooks' tour or that he was not going to deal with every aspect. So I do not want to be seen to pick out small points but want to put some emphasis on some important elements that I feel he ignored or, for one reason or another, did not include in his speech. I was quite disappointed, for instance, that the Commissioner showed perhaps an uncharacteristic lack of imagination in relation to the future. I would ask him, for instance, how he thinks that this Community is going to progress towards integration if we cannot have more of our own resources to enable it to work? He made no mention of this most important aspect. In fact, instead he seemed to put emphasis on the need to transfer resources from one area to another. And in that context he mentioned specifically the question of the agricultural policy and its cost. And he said — and he said it very emphatically — that the cost must be reduced. When President Jenkins said that, he sounded very British. Now I know he did not want to sound British and that he is a good European, but frankly that is what we have been hearing from the British benches in the main ever since they came to this Parliament. They were almost like crusaders who came out here and were going to change everything overnight. Let us face the facts. I think, we need a lot more transparency in relation to what we are doing. Have we for instance ever seen any figures from the Commission showing what might be the cost to the national governments of operating independent agricultural policies as compared with operating a common agricultural policy? I would certainly like to see some such comparison indicating what it would cost governments to operate national agricultural policies. After all, we all had our separate policies before we came together in the European Community. And I would hazard a guess that they were even more expensive than the present common policy. Perhaps Mr Jen-

**Maher**

kins could give us some idea of what the cost is of operating different policies at national level? Admittedly, the CAP is transparent because it is the one common policy that we operate on a unified basis. But we cannot see the other policies, we cannot make comparisons, we do not have any statistics to assist us. Certainly they are not readily available to show what the cost is. For instance, it could be argued that today almost all the member countries of the European Economic Community are subsidizing shipbuilding. I know it is only one element. There are too many ships everywhere, there is an excess of shipping capacity, but the governments continue to build ships. Why? In order to safeguard employment. I do not disagree with that, I think it is very important to safeguard employment. But could we have some figures showing the amount of resources going into this area, and into the various other national policies, to enable us to make some reasonable comparison. If we say that the CAP is too expensive, what are we comparing it with? We do not have any other policy to compare it with.

I would like to remind Mrs Walz who spoke about energy and indeed all the parliamentarians here that the first and most important source of energy is food. We might get on without oil or coal but we will not get on without food. Food is the most important source of energy of all. We need it every day. But, for goodness sake, when we are looking at the question of energy let us look at that of food too. It would indeed be wonderful if today we were talking about a surplus of energy in this Community. We would not be fearful about the future and we would not be worrying whether the Russians were going to control us or not. However, we have enough food, indeed we have a little too much, and we are determined to get rid of it, determined to reduce it. Mr Jenkins, you never said one word — and I am open to correction — about a food aid policy. We have a food aid programme here because we happen to have some surplus, but although people are dying of hunger we have no food aid policy. We make no plans to produce year in year out. We pass lots of votes of sympathy in this Parliament. We are always expressing regret. Only today I heard behind me the need to send food to Cambodia urged by the very same people who are saying we have got to get rid of the food — no more surpluses — eliminate them so that we will have nothing to give to these people in future.

Ladies and gentlemen, let us be consistent. If we are to play our part in the world, if we are to take account of the more needy people, the first thing they want is food. And we will not have the food unless we produce surpluses. But, for God's sake, let us produce them on a planned basis and have the political will-power to play our role in the world, on the basis of not a huge nuclear arsenal but in a peaceful way by supplying the needy with the necessities of life on a consistent basis.

President Jenkins argued strongly in support of Mr

Gundelach's proposals and I accept that it is a difficult problem, but both Mr Jenkins and Mr Gundelach seem determined to take action against what they call surplus food producers within the Community, whereas timidity is the order of the day as regards any action against producers from outside who are contributing largely to our surpluses. Nobody can take action against the Americans or against the other suppliers of food products into this Community. When we suggest they ought to pay some extra levy in order to help us to deal with the surpluses, this cannot be done. But you will take action against farmers within the Community not realizing, perhaps, just to what extent the fabric of life throughout our regions depends on them. For every farmer on the land there are five more people employed downstream in the food preparation and distribution industries. What about them? How are they going to be affected? Do we have any measurement? Do we know the impact of these policies? Suppose, for instance, we put the lid on milk production. If we were only dealing with milk it would be simple, but we are dealing with people and families. What are the farming communities going to do if they cannot get an increase in price and they cannot increase production. How do they live? How do they pay their costs? Would the Commission be prepared, in fact, to work an extra day for nothing or be asked to do what the milk producers are now being asked to do — to pay the dairies to take their extra production? It is ludicrous. No trade union would accept this kind of situation but that is what we are being asked to do when, in fact, a solution is there. If it is a question of providing enough resources to get rid of the surplus, let us all bear the burden — the producers within the Community and those on the outside. And in that way we share it and, in fact, make a real contribution towards the advancement of this Community.

IN THE CHAIR: Mr DANKERT

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Blaney.

**Mr Blaney.** — To the President of the Commission and to my colleagues here might I just say very briefly that the achievements outlined by Mr Jenkins, if taken in isolation perhaps, could be something of which he might on behalf of the Commission and on behalf of all of us feel justifiably proud. However, when I reflect on these achievements — the institution of the EMS, the forthcoming accession of Greece and the promised accession in the not too distant future of the other two countries, the renewal of the Lomé Convention and the strengthening of relations with the 58 ACP coun-

## Blaney

tries — I wonder whether in congratulating ourselves we have in fact overlooked the fact that these very things that we congratulate ourselves on are creating new and additional hazards for us in the future. Now, I am not in any way saying that none of these things should have been done. But what I would say is that the projections for 1980 do not quite fall into line with what we have been slapping ourselves on the back for having done in 1979. Money stability has gone, and here I quote roughly from the terms used by Mr Jenkins, an energy crisis is upon us, our economic growth is declining to a dangerously low level, unemployment is rising steadily, inflation is moving upwards again, and our trade deficit has I believe gone up from 8 billion to approximately 20 billion. All this is happening very fast. Given this outlook, we must look very carefully at what has been achieved and ask ourselves if we are really in a position to afford the things that we have brought about in 1979. To bring things nearer home, I think it is true to say that in Britain and my own country, Ireland, inflation has climbed to 17 %. The averages referred to by Mr Jenkins are way below what is being suffered in some of our countries at the moment. The same is true as regards unemployment. Unemployment as an overall Community average is far lower than what it is in my country and indeed in Mr Jenkins' country.

And when we talk about energy, might I say that we don't seem to be uttering anything other than pious platitudes about what we are going to do about energy and its conservation in the future and developing alternative sources of energy, in which connection I would ask this House why it is that there is no lack of investment in nuclear energy whereas the alternative sources offered by the wind, the waves, the sun, etc., are never considered for investment.

By all means let us congratulate ourselves on our achievements but at the same time let us prepare for the future realistically.

**President.** — I call Mr Gendebien.

**Mr Gendebien.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we have followed Mr Jenkins' speech with interest and have noted a certain number of constructive proposals which he has made. Nevertheless, I consider that he has been silent on an important matter: the regional policy of the Community, and I should like to approach and concentrate on this sector this evening.

The problem of inequalities between regions in Europe is growing. It has become hackneyed to say this. I should like to say in this connection that regional inequalities are not only on the increase in the so-called 'outlying' areas of the Community, but also in the central states and what until a short while ago were considered the rich countries of the Community, in particular Belgium.

It is known that there has been a serious collapse of industry for some years in Wallonia, due in large measure to the lack of interest of the ruling majority in the country and to the lack of action on the part of the Belgian government in respect of regions in difficulty. On the other hand, between the Commission of the European Economic Community and Wallonia, central Belgian governments have set up an insurmountable barrier.

At European summits, the Belgian Ministers do not mention Wallonia as a region with problems, and its share of the different funds is particularly derisory. The law of 1970 on economic aid and on regional development areas in Belgium has, as is known, been attacked several times by the Commission because of the unequal treatment given under that law to the different Belgian regions. Since that time, the government has not complied with the Community's order, and this is a matter of some concern for us. As is well-known, the reason for this refusal on the part of the Belgian government to comply with the injunctions of the Community is the veto of the Flemish majority in Belgium.

At all events, for our part we should like Wallonia to enter into a direct dialogue with the Community's authorities and, on an more general level, we should like these regions to be considered more as representative by the Commission. I happen to believe that Europe has a great mission to fulfil towards these regions, which have been left abandoned both because of lack of action by their countries and by the blind interplay of the laws of the market which have caused capital and labour to move towards the favoured areas. In fulfilling this mission the Commission should not be the expression of a business-oriented Europe or a Europe of centralized nations, but, on the contrary, a Europe of peoples. This gives it a greater independence with regard to governments.

To bring this discussion of European regional policy to an end, I should like to put forward some constructive suggestions which might help progress in this important sector.

First of all, the Community's appropriations for regional policy must be increased and, with this in mind, I am delighted at the positive attitude of the Commission, and in particular that of Mr Giolitti.

Secondly, we must at once make use of the 'non-quota' section, and on this matter I regret the rumours which say that Mr Cronin's report will not be considered during this part-session.

*(The President urges the speaker to conclude)*

Thirdly, the Commission staff must be increased considerably, in order to allow the Commission to put its policies into practice effectively, and Parliament gives its full approval to this objective.

Fourthly, the Member States must be prevented from misusing funds, that is, they must not be allowed to claim reimbursement from regional policy funds for expenditures which they have had to make for measures within their own countries.

Fifthly, Mr President, we must prepare for the regional consequences of the enlargement of the Community. We must at once calculate . . .

**President.** — (*F*) Mr Gendebien, I am sorry but your speaking time is up.

I call Mr Puletti.

**Mr Puletti.** — (*I*) Mr President, Mr Jenkins, I listened to your report with great interest and I find firstly that there is a kind of split in it. In the early part, you list what the Commission in fact accomplished in 1979, that is, its successes as you see them, including approval of the European Monetary System, the accession of Greece, emphasizing that this accession proves how attractive the Community is for other European countries, the Tokyo Round, the signing of the second Lomé Convention, the agreement on cooperation in the field of energy and, lastly, the election of this Parliament. But immediately afterwards — with an about turn which does not seem to follow on logically — you stress the difficult situation in which the Community, and not only the Community, could find itself in the face of what you consider, and I quote from your own text, the crumbling and the collapse of monetary stability after the Bretton Woods agreement, and you recall the economic crisis, which was not only economic, of 1973.

After this introduction, in order to avoid repeating what my colleagues Mr Glinne and Mr Arndt have said, there is, in my opinion, a huge gap in your report concerning Community policy towards other countries: that policy which in the printed edition of your report is called 'foreign policy'.

I certainly do not want to assume responsibility for the expectations and hopes of the so-called European Federalists, i.e. of those who see the Economic Community as a first stage and a beginning to the political unity of the continent. But in the tense circumstances in which we live, we have to confine ourselves to resolutions — like those that we shall vote for tomorrow morning, if we vote for them — to indicate the absence of an overall Community foreign policy, the policy swings in different countries and the wide gaps between them, and even the elusive fact that you, Mr Jenkins, in your conclusion refer in a generalized way to the need for this unity when you say that 'we can achieve nothing unless we act in the spirit of solidarity. That solidarity depends on respect for the rule of law, not only in our own society but in the world as a whole. Our Community institutions — the symmetry

of Parliament, Commission, Council and Court each operating within a common framework — are our foundation. We depart from it at our peril.'

At this point I should like to say that I do not understand whether your comments concern the workings of the institutions or a coherent common policy for the nine countries. This common policy is all the more important when we are faced with a challenge which threatens the very nature and freedom of the Community.

A few minutes before I began to speak, Mr Maher, even if he belongs to a political group which is certainly very far from my own, stressed that we cannot have sufficient economic autonomy if there is no guarantee of security alongside this. And it seemed to me that when, right at the beginning, we in this Parliament indirectly discussed the arms industry, we already saw then that these same forces held illogically to opinions which we cannot share. Today they justify aggression in the world and maintain that this Parliament does not have the right to discuss topics such as that concerning the defence of the Community as a whole. In my opinion a gap of this kind in the debate — and I found this even in the statement of the Italian President of the Council — showed that we are here still explicitly concerned with the economic sphere, or that we are still talking in abstract humanitarian terms which in such harsh and tense times as these cannot have any impact on practical politics.

**President.** — I call Mr Travaglini.

**Mr Travaglini.** — (*I*) Mr President, colleagues, my speech will contain some brief comments on that part of Mr Jenkins' report which dealt in particular with the economic problems of the Community.

Even though concise, the diagnosis was clear; all the economic indicators are negative. This was the case for growth, which was forecast at below 2 %; for unemployment, which for the first time was placed above 6 %; for the inflation rate, which could in turn go above 11 %, and for the sake of brevity I shall not mention those countries like my own where the figures are much worse than the average Community figures.

1980 will therefore represent a difficult period for the Community, as is inevitable within the general state of crisis of the society in which we live.

But it is impossible to reverse crisis only if we give in to them, and only if they become in themselves the reason for dejection and loss of hope. We should rather be encouraged to adjust our courses of action and our systems and to take confidence in our recovery. This is even more the case with regard to the economy, where every action very quickly gives rise to reactions and often, fortunately, also to measures

## Travaglini

which were previously considered impossible. We only need a good deal of awareness of emerging situations and the existence or creation of suitable structures at the right moment to support, encourage and guide every sign of new activity and to give shape to public initiatives and put them into practice promptly and in a suitable manner.

The question which might arise seems to me to be this: what has the Commission in mind to provide or to begin to provide remedy to the crisis which has been analysed point by point?

Others have spoken about the problem, which is essential for the future of the Community, of energy resources, which has been given priority by the Commission report itself; and this is right. But the solution to this problem, however much desired and difficult, as even the report states, cannot fulfil the need for a more incisive Community economic policy.

I think that on this matter it can be said that the report was not as complete and all-embracing as it was when it analysed the present state of things.

Already this Parliament, on many occasions, has debated the economic situation as foreseen for 1980, the situation with regard to unemployment, convergence policies and the monetary system and, in particular at the time of the budget, distortions of Community economic policy.

Everyone is very well aware of these problems, which are dealt with to a greater or lesser extent in the Commission's report. But the mere fact that they are raised so constantly perhaps indicated that far greater space should have been allocated to proposals for resolving them. The difficulties arising are clear, and it would be light-minded to underestimate them; but it is not difficult to foresee that, without a more marked effort to move perceptibly, clearly and urgently towards a genuine Community economic policy — both as far as rules and legitimate privileges are concerned — an effective remedy will not be found, either now or in the future, to the problems analysed.

But what do we need for this vital step towards a more incisive Community policy to be taken? The matter should be dealt with at much greater length than is possible here, but, putting it briefly, the following points seem to me to be basic.

First of all the Member States must work together to this end. On the one hand they must aim to maintain their solidarity, and on the other they must attempt seriously to correct those Community structures which do not at present work well. Secondly, the economic and monetary system must be made properly effective, and a decisive step must be taken towards that second stage of implementation which seems of fundamental importance for the very survival of the system. There is also the consideration, obvious but never sufficiently

stressed, that there can be no effective and lasting monetary policy unless there is an underlying general economic policy and that, conversely, a common economic policy needs a common monetary policy which is consistent with it. Thirdly, the Community budget must be strengthened and put into final shape in a more balanced way and the necessary corrections made without harming or weakening the policies which are already in existence, so that it can become a truly valid instrument of fundamental importance for the application of that Community economic policy which is becoming every day more and more indispensable.

Mr President of the Commission, a completely new stimulus must be provided for those common policies which are laid down by the Treaties, but have still been considerably delayed. And at this point I must stress the need to place a policy for regional balance in a prominent and central position.

The Commission has recently returned firmly to the matter of applying structural policies. I have here the Commission document of 5 February, which has just been distributed, on convergence and budgetary matters, which many colleagues will perhaps not have seen yet, where the Commission concludes clearly by saying briefly and incisively that it will in any case be necessary to make effective progress towards greater balance between Community policies, by strengthening present structural policies and initiating policies which are certainly very much needed, but on which the Council has not yet succeeded in reaching agreement.

We would ask you, Mr President, to provide us with more details about the terms of these problems. We must ask for greater speed and promptness from you and from the Council.

If the present crisis provides new stimulus, within the terms already stated, for Community measures — and above all for the Member States — we shall be able to overcome the crisis; patiently and with determination, without underestimating the difficulties, but without giving in to them.

Honourable Members, this Parliament must make even greater efforts to stimulate the political initiatives of the Community; let us take on this responsibility with even more conviction and in an even more constructive — and I underline constructive — way as imposed on us by the mandates we received, and in full awareness of our duties.

**President.** — I call Mr Cecovini.

**Mr Cecovini.** — (I) Mr President, I am speaking in place of Mr Bettiza who has been called unexpectedly to Milan. I shall not therefore deal with the Jenkins

**Cecovini**

report, as I would consider it irresponsible to improvise on this matter.

I shall instead deal with the matter of the agreement between the EEC and Yugoslavia, particularly with regard to its effects on the border region of Friuli-Venezia Giulia, which is part of the Community and is also my region. It is a very sensitive region whose recent history has been difficult and which, especially in the city and port of Trieste, its regional capital, has been in a state of serious decline from the end of the war until the present. It is a region which needs aid. It is however a region which should concern the Community because its eastern border is that of both Italy and Europe with the non-Member country, Yugoslavia.

The EEC is now drawing up an agreement with Yugoslavia with the intention of helping its attempts to renew its economy, and also with a view to the fact that it is the first western outpost towards eastern Europe and Asia to be the object of the aggressive attitude of the Soviet Union.

Italy, as a Community country, the Friuli-Venezia Giulia region and the Italian and European city of Trieste are all in favour of this agreement. The entire region and Trieste would nevertheless like to indicate that there are two matters which might give rise to concern: the mention in the agreement of the previous treaty signed at Osimo between Italy and Yugoslavia, and the financing of the roads which should link the European Community to Greece through Yugoslavia.

In its protocol, the Osimo Treaty provides for the setting up of a free industrial zone straddling the border, half in Italian territory and half in Yugoslav territory. The citizens of Trieste are completely against this zone, which is on the Carso, a unique natural asset. It involves destroying the Carso, it means polluting the atmosphere and the water of Trieste, and it also means political pollution. Trieste is afraid that this zone might come to represent a territorial claim by Yugoslavia over that small part of the Carso which is still Italian, behind Trieste. It therefore wishes that the zone should not be mentioned in the agreement or, at least, that another zone rather than the Carso should be chosen.

Trieste paid heavily for defeat in war: 350 000 Italians from Istria left their homes — Mr Barbi is one of these — and therefore it considers that it should now be helped and not harmed. Now, the road to Greece across Yugoslavia, if provision is not made for helping the port of Trieste and the Friuli-Venezia Giulia region, would cause irreparable damage to the region and port. The Friuli-Venezia Giulia region considers that the Adriatic is the real road from Europe to Greece, the Middle East and the countries east of Suez: it is a way which, as I said yesterday in my speech on Mr Ruffini's statements, also involves great savings of energy.

Tomorrow I shall speak to an amendment which I have put forward to the regulation on special action for border regions, an amendment which includes Friuli-Venezia Giulia among the regions which require aid. We consider that the Adriatic route could supplement and not replace the overland route through Yugoslavia, which is a non-Member country. Certainly let us provide financial aid for Yugoslavia but let the Community also, and at the same time, provide finance for its own road to the south, to be included entirely within the Community. For it is a basic principle of Community policy that its own enlargement should not lead to harming one of its own border regions.

Trieste and Friuli-Venezia Giulia trust that the Commission and the Council will take this into account in the final draft of the agreement between the EEC and Yugoslavia.

**President.** — I call Mr Romualdi.

**Mr Romualdi.** — (1) In my opinion, Mr Jenkins' report has, if nothing else, the merit of analyzing problems in a simple and precise fashion, without illusions but not, therefore, without optimism, even while being aware of the very many serious difficulties which must be tackled. We are in agreement with this report by Mr Jenkins, but I should, however, like to put some questions to him.

At the beginning he spoke of the successes achieved in 1979: the EMS, the accession of Greece, the Tokyo Round, the new Lomé Convention and the fact that direct elections were finally held to our Parliament. I agree, but what are the positive results of these successes if they have not succeeded in helping us to move beyond the crisis in which we are, in allowing us to put up a strong and united front in order to face the new rise in the cost of energy, which is so great that if we do not manage to solve this problem over the next year we could be faced with total collapse? What, in the opinion of Mr Jenkins, has prevented greater cooperation between the Nine? Is it enough to have faith in the law, as he nobly says, when there are those who violate it with impunity?

We should like to be able to reply to these questions, but for the moment we can only see that the Commission and this Parliament must do more, very much more. We must convince the Council and our governments, on whom everything depends, to do far more for their part than they have done up to now in order to create solidarity in Europe and the West. This is our duty.

**President.** — I call Mr Balfe.

**Mr Balfe.** — Mr President, when Mrs Castle was scheduled to speak this evening and asked me to take

## Balfe

over, her parting words to me were 'Please listen to it, it will be rather late.' I intend to speak reasonably briefly and I hope very directly, but also I must indicate the points on which there is broad agreement in our part of the group.

This is the fourth report which Mr Jenkins has given in his capacity as President of the Commission. It is, however, the first one that I have been able to listen to. I listened probably more as a sceptic, whereas Mr Jenkins, as is well known, is a strong supporter of the European Community. But I must say, while trying to be objective, that his speech gave rise to more fears than hopes in me. I certainly salute the frankness and honesty with which he has confronted the problems which the Community and Europe face at the moment. I should like to quote one part of his speech which has already been quoted, but it was one which certainly struck me most forcibly. I quote: 'Looking ahead we face no less than the break-up of the established economic and social order on which post-war Europe was built. The warning bells have been sounding for a decade.' I think Mr Jenkins is most certainly right. What we have to show, though, is that it is the European Community, as opposed to the individual states, that is listening to what he has to say, and that it has a response thereto.

The third point which occurred to me was whether the European Community as an institution would respond, or whether there would be the temptation which overcame Europe the last time this happened in the 1930s to retreat into their respective nationalisms. Such a reaction would be understandable but nonetheless it would not aid the overall solution of the problems. I must however make some points which I think are relevant to the Community but also are often, within this Chamber, spoken about as though they were national points. Although we have had some sympathy, the fact of the matter is that the future of the European Community cannot be built on a system under which any single Member State bears an undue proportion of the burden. This has been recognised widely within this Chamber, by the Dutch for example and by the Italians. In the November part-session Mr Ruffolo made this point very clearly. But what I do think we have to bear in mind is that there is an urgency for a solution. It will not do the Communities any good if a solution to what I would call the British problem is brought about, not because the Communities adapt, but because Britain wins a solution through **sheer bloody mindedness and arrogance**. In other words, if the Communities are to adapt as an organism, they have to show themselves to be able, and prepared, to recognize and cope with an injustice, with something other than a pistol at their heads. In this context the recent Commission paper is certainly a welcome step forward, although quite clearly, like any supplicant, one finds things which one disagrees with. Although I cannot say that the paper constitutes a full basis for everything that Britain has asked for, I will say that I hope that the positive nature of that paper

receives a positive response within the Council of Ministers.

Like many of my colleagues I have severe doubts about what one might call the package of measures in kind. What I would say is that within this Chamber — certainly on this side of it, maybe on others — the understanding of the need to rejuvenate industry in Europe has never been stronger than it is today. To an extent we have to start looking to those areas outside Europe which may well be guilty of, let us say, unfair competition. The need today is to rejuvenate, bring employment back to Europe. The need also must be to adjust the common agricultural policy, somewhere in the light of the communications sent to Britain in the late part of 1970 when our original negotiations for membership were coming to a conclusion, communications which look to a much different spread of Community spending. Those communications were written, I believe, in good faith. It is the system that has got out of hand, not the ideals of the people who wrote those letters at that time.

I would certainly not object — I do not think many people would — if national governments chose to provide greater national support for their agricultural sectors than they are currently doing. If we continue to use the CAP in the way that it has been used and allow it to expand in the way that it has been allowed to expand, it will not do the ideals, and any of the creators of Europe, any good at all. Anyone who wishes to confuse the perpetuation of the CAP with the ideals of the Treaty of Rome is deluding himself. It is only right that it is understood throughout the Communities. I speak now in a neutral capacity, because I regard what I have said as analysis, not as politics.

Let me say, finally, that the recent budget marks the end of Mr Jenkins' term of office as President of the Commission. We have reached a historic point in that for the first time we have rejected a budget and for the first time we have been offered a budget which moves some way towards Parliament's express desires. What I would say is that Parliament must not now weaken in its support for the opinions it expressed last year, which led up to the rejection of that budget. If Parliament weakens or connives with the Council to defeat the movement within the CAP, to defeat the change of direction, then, although we may not like it, although we may not think it is enough, although it may look mild to us, all the gains of last November will have been thrown away and much more besides. It is only by standing together now, and fundamentally challenging the CAP and the direction in which we have gone up to now, that we will be able to emerge from this last year and say that the final message that Mr Jenkins delivered to this House was the message which marked the turning-point in which these Communities started to measure up to the challenges which face them throughout the next decade.

**President.** — I call Mr Beumer.

**Mr Beumer.** — (NL) Mr President, in its comments on employment the Commission spoke of the importance of information at a European level. My question is as follows: Does it have a specific programme? Are funds available for it? Are the two sides of industry being consulted? I ask this because I noted references in points 18 and 79 of the explanatory memorandum to information and consultation with workers in undertakings. Does this mean that the situation where undertakings consult only with national trade unions is to be improved so that they will also be able to talk with the international trade union movement and thereby use the information to better advantage? That is my first question.

My second question concerns the remark in your report that the average time during which a person is unemployed should be reduced. My question is whether there is not a need above all to strengthen the cross-border sectoral policy and for the Council, the Commission and both sides of industry to agree on the broad lines of a policy on employment and investment? Is the Commission prepared to encourage the setting up of joint committees — where they do not already exist — and to promote their activities? Third question: Would you indicate, now that the Council is to hold a special meeting on employment issues, exactly which questions the Commission wants to see given priority and where it wants answers?

Fourth question: You say in your report that the relatively high level of State investment is necessary in order to maintain growth. I can understand that, because otherwise you could get deflationary effects. On the other hand, the reverse is also possible, that is to say, you could get inflationary effects. Would the Commission indicate how it assesses State expenditure and what criteria it takes into account? The penultimate question: The Commission said that it is examining the social consequences of the telematic revolution. My question is: How much coordination is there on this matter between the Member States and the Commission, and is it aimed at avoiding costly overcapacity, which can also lead to unemployment?

My final question, Mr President, concerns regional policy. Is it not the case that an effective regional policy cannot be created unless it is part of the macro-economic policy? Surely, therefore, when we speak of industrial policy, energy matters, environmental policy and agriculture, regional policy must similarly be treated as a specific component of this policy. Would that not lend the regional policy more substance?

**President.** — I call Mr Purvis.

**Mr Purvis.** — Mr President, I must admit to developing a certain sympathy for the President of the Com-

mission as the evening has gone on and he has faced a lot of critical speeches. I think we should bear in mind that in many cases the Commission has come up with proposals that have been frustrated in getting the Council and the Member States to face their responsibilities, and perhaps it is this frustration that goes part of the way to explain Mr Jenkins's despondency for the future. I hope we in the Parliament can help to bolster his and the Commission's confidence and determination rather than further dragging them down. I would like to see the kind of spirit that would lead to 1980 being a climax to their four years in office. Certainly Mr Jenkins has emphasized the seriousness of our condition, and he rightly identifies energy as the key problem facing us in the immediate future.

We can hardly accuse the Commission of not trying to make us face up to it. Energy is critical to our economic future. A successful economy is critical to the political future of the Community. And the political cohesion of the Community is vital to our continuing to live in freedom and democracy.

But to get anywhere at all, to get further than the hot air and the pious platitudes, all the parties concerned must be prepared to look to their real long-term interests. It is in none of our interests for certain sectors, countries or regions to insist on prospering on the basis of the hardship of others, and if we all look to our consciences none of us is lily-white. I wish we could get the message across to the Council of Ministers, to our respective national governments and to our electorate that if we don't quickly bury the hatchet, sink our differences, be less selfish, pool our resources to the benefit of us all and work assiduously together, we shall all sink separately into an economic, political and social Slough of Despond. And this is why we must maximize the use of our indigenous energy resources.

It is tragic that despite all the warnings — many of them from the Commission — we are content to allow the flaring of precious natural gas, the under-exploitation of our oil-fields, the denial of our ample coal resources, skimping on energy research, a procrastinating approach to nuclear and alternative energy sources, inefficient electricity generation, an abominable wastage all round. Is there an energy crisis or isn't there?

As Mr Maher said earlier, was the common agricultural policy not instituted with one of its main aims to provide security of food supplies? Is security of energy less vital to our economic well-being and to our political independence?

The President of the Commission has fully recognized the categorical imperative that faces the Community and every one of its inhabitants. The Commission has made concrete proposals for meeting the financial demands that are necessary. We must put money

**Purvis**

where all too often our mouths have been but not our actions or decisions.

We in this Parliament, representing the people of Europe, must put some political steel behind them and hound the Council and our national governments to activate their proposals with the utmost urgency.

Their proposed oil or energy tax, in whatever form it finally takes, could provide the funds to help finance extensive submarine gas-gathering grids, to finance Europe-wide distribution grids for gas and electricity, to procure higher total recovery levels from our oil-fields, to finance essential nuclear generating stations, to finance conservation programmes and combine heat and power schemes research, to finance development of our coal reserves and the technology to make it fit our European industry. It could further convince us of the need to save energy.

Some fear that OPEC will respond adversely. But for years they have chided us for not adequately valuing their oil, for wasting it and using it profligately. And they are right. We are now beginning to respond to their advice. The Commission's proposal will let us help those parts of the Community which lack energy resources. It will let us help those peripheral regions where, as it happens, the national resources are located. Indeed, Scotland, my country, is one of those. It badly needs the infrastructure development and the encouragement of its new oil-related industries to replace those older industries that are declining inexorably. But for anything to happen, and to happen in time, people and governments must recognize the problem and appreciate the potential to solve it; they must be prepared for the commitments and, yes, the sacrifices it may entail. Some will have to provide the financial resources, some will have to provide access to their energy resources, albeit they are resources that would otherwise be wasted or under-exploited, but all will benefit. The alternative is too drastic to contemplate — except that it must be contemplated, it must be faced squarely and it must be defeated.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr De Keersmaecker.

**Mr De Keersmaecker.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I shall try in a minimum amount of time to put across the viewpoint of my group on the comments made by Mr Jenkins and Mr Gundelach on agriculture. President Jenkins had very little to say on the matter. He commented only that in 1980 the most important thing would be to create a better relationship between expenditure on agriculture and expenditure on other sectors.

You know, Mr Jenkins, that we consider that this unsatisfactory relationship is not the fault of agricul-

ture and that agriculture must not be made — since such is the conclusion of this argument — to carry the other sectors of the European Community. The bad thing about the European Community is that there is no formulation, let alone implementation, of policy. When you say that agricultural expenditure will fall this year for the first time, you know that this will affect the incomes of farmers and horticulturalists. Indeed, that was confirmed by the analysis of Commissioner Gundelach. Mr Jenkins, I must say that I believe that no single social category in the European Community would go along with proposals regarding its income of the kind being put forward for farmers and horticulturalists. We are not a group of technocrats, we are representatives of the people, and we want to let you know that the farmers and horticulturalists are against these proposals, which are causing a great deal of agitation.

I turn now to Commissioner Gundelach, who based his argument on the objective method of calculation, but in fact this whole argument breaks down because of a number of, particularly budgetary, considerations. We do not accept that agriculture should foot the bill for all the problems of the European Community. I wonder whether Parliament, and through it public opinion, is being properly informed on this matter. According to Mr Gundelach's reasoning an increase of one point in agricultural expenditure comes to nearly 140 million EUA, whereas in the budget an increase of 2.4 % is calculated at 77 million EUA; in other words, a 1-point increase in fact means an increase of 32 million EUA. The second reason for not taking the objective method to its logical conclusion is related to the market economy, namely, market equilibrium. Mr President, we are prepared to make efforts in certain sectors; indeed we ourselves have made proposals in this connection.

It is acceptable that different policies should be pursued in different sectors, but this reasoning cannot be used as an argument to justify a general reduction of price levels in all sectors, and definitely not when there is such a big difference between the 7.9 % obtained by the objective method and the 2.4 % in the Commission's proposal.

A third reason is inflation. Here you contradict yourself completely. You said yourself in your introduction to the price proposals that farmers bear less responsibility for inflation than other sectors. You draw the conclusion that in order to avoid further inflation greater pressure has to be exerted on prices. Surely it is one thing or the other, but my conclusion from this reasoning is that the farmers, who are least responsible for inflation, are being made to carry the can for the consequences of inflation in the Community as a whole. That we cannot accept. One of the basic premises in the discussion on incomes policy is that the net income of farmers and horticulturalists has fallen over the past year, an estimated drop of 1.7 % in 1979. I ask once again whether this information is correct.

**De Keersmaecker**

Our figures indicate that the real fall in income in 1979 was 7.5 %. Your figure of 1.7 % — and this will interest our British colleagues — takes account of a drop in the net income of the British farmers, and I see in the British government's white paper that this drop is in fact 16.9 %. Perhaps we should both check out figures to see what conclusions we must draw from them. Reference was also made to the world market price. Who can say anything now about the world market price when it is being manipulated for strategic reasons? Apart from that — as Commissioner Gundelach knows far better than I — the situation in the Community and the Community's price policy are among the factors which determine the world market price. We must accept the consequences of this. Mention was also made of the need to reduce consumer prices. We all know — and for those who do not know it is important to bear these figures in mind — that expenditure on food makes up 20 % of the cost of living, and that an increase of 1 % in the price of food leads to an increase of 0.05 points in the cost of living. And if we look in this context at the difference between producer and consumer prices, we can see that agriculture is totally different from the other sectors as regards its effect on the cost of living.

Finally, Mr President, we must express our disappointment at the fact that the Commission apparently does not have — or at least has not outlined — any policy concept for 1980 as regards the influence of agriculture on employment, the strategic planning of food supply, the problem of environmental protection or the problem of sales.

Our group cannot accept this proposal. Naturally, this is not our last word, but we hope this proposal is not the Commission's last word either. In expectation of this we have already begun discussions in the Committee on Agriculture.

**President.** — I call Mr Prout.

**Mr Prout.** — Mr President, I should like to congratulate the President of the Commission not only on the quality of his speech, but also on the fortitude he has shown in listening to our remarks.

*(Laughter)*

May I reflect for a moment upon your assertion concerning the political independence of the Commission, with regard especially to its power of initiative.

It is, of course, true that the Commission once possessed this independence, but now it seems to me to be little more than an illusion. In the early days the Commission initiated legislation under strict and detailed Treaty obligations to fulfil particular transitional programmes with specific timetables. These obligations have now been fulfilled. Now the Commission's power

of initiative exists either in purely technical areas or in areas which are politically extremely controversial. These controversial political areas are governed by Treaty provisions of extreme generality, disciplined by no timetable — Article 100, for example, in relation to harmonization. Now, in these controversial areas the Commission seems to me to have lost almost all real power of initiative. Indeed, on occasions it seems totally subject to the will of the Council, seeking not the best solution for the people of Europe, but the solution which represents the lowest common denominator for the representatives of the nine Member States.

May I suggest, with the greatest respect for your immense collective reputation, that 13 governmental appointees will never regain their own initiative until they seek and gain, independently and collectively, the full confidence of this House and retain it at every step. If there is to be again real political initiative, independent of the Council, it is here that it will emerge, in this House. The legal powers of the Commission under the Treaty, which are considerable, harnessed to the political legitimacy of the Parliament, would make a formidable marriage. You have the power under the Treaty, but we have the will to use it. The President of the Commission, a historian of distinction, will understand me when I say that constitutions must be dynamic to survive. The old independence of the Commission is now sadly a thing of the past.

**President.** — I call Mr Almirante.

**Mr Almirante.** — *(I)* Mr President, I should like to thank Mr Radoux, whose resolution I signed, for expressing the protest of the majority on the Committee on External Economic Relations against an absurd procedure — which belonged to the previous parliament and cannot belong to the Parliament of the people — under which we give our opinion on international agreements after these agreements have been concluded and without being informed by the Council of Ministers.

The protest is particularly worthy of note in this case, first of all because the agreement between the EEC and Yugoslavia is important politically and not just economically: secondly, because of the need to keep in mind the very tricky situation in one of the Member countries, Italy. Yugoslavia must be brought within the European economic sphere, even without becoming associated, so that in future it might even join the European economic sphere or at least have its equilibrium assured, in order to make a possible Soviet attack, either economic or political, difficult or even impossible. To this end, the Italian National Right — which thinks in European and Western and not in nationalistic terms — is in favour of the agreement and indeed considers that it is urgent.

### Almirante

However, the border at Trieste must become a calm one which can allow passage both ways. This is not the situation today because of the previous mistakes of Italian governments, which have become embodied in the unfortunate Treaty of Osimo. The majority of the people of Trieste are against this treaty. We hope that the Treaty of Osimo will be supplanted by the agreement between Yugoslavia and the EEC, as the Treaty of Osimo is no longer either necessary or useful for Yugoslavia, whose products will be able to enter the European Community on preferential terms for Mediterranean products as, I repeat, we think is right. We also hope that Trieste and Friuli-Venezia Giulia will be designated an outlying area of the EEC, like Southern Italy. The mayor of Trieste asked for this at this meeting, and we are in agreement and put forward a formal request in the interest of that social and economic balance which is the basis of peace between peoples.

**President.** — I call Mrs Gredal.

**Mrs Gredal.** — (DK) Mr President, I would like to make a few comments on the report we have received from the Commission. I will confine myself to four areas in particular, which we feel to be very important. These are employment, energy, agriculture and environmental and consumer affairs.

Let me start with a few words on employment. We attach overriding importance to resolving this problem. Unfortunately, the report contains no specific proposals for alleviating the employment situation, but only a few vague phrases about better information about job opportunities, the need for greater mobility and the desire to reduce average periods of unemployment. I feel that we should be entitled to demand that the Commission pursue an active employment policy accompanied by specific proposals as to how the problem is to be tackled. It is no longer enough merely to record the employment situation as it stands, practical measures are also needed. Highly detailed statistics have been compiled in recent years within the Community on the very topic of unemployment. There has also been a great deal of research in this field. I would, therefore, like to ask why use is not made of these findings in specific action programmes at Community level. Why should we confine ourselves to stock phrases and familiar proposals when, precisely in this field, a great deal of new pioneering research has been carried out, embodying interesting proposals for improving the employment situation.

In connection with employment problems, it is sufficient to mention the question of female unemployment, which is a major problem. Not one single line is devoted to outlining how the Commission has envisaged its contribution to solving this problem. This leads me to the question of equality of opportunity. The women's bureau still has a staff of only two

women to solve the problems of the 130 million women in the Community. Why does not the Commission make a greater effort to tackle this problem? Perhaps greater resources will be provided in the forthcoming budget; this is something we might learn this evening.

The second important point is energy. This part of the report is much more detailed. Although I do not agree with all the points of detail, it is nevertheless a positive factor that the scope of the problem is recognized and a solution is being sought. I believe that the Community should authorize considerably more expenditure both on investment in energy and on energy research. I also feel that much greater priority should be given to alternative energy sources in the use of these research funds. Many opportunities for harnessing alternative energy sources are being wasted solely because the funds are not available.

The third important point is agriculture. Here we can, in the present circumstances, in principle support the Commission's proposals. However, the cautions price policy should be followed up by a larger reduction in positive monetary compensatory amounts and the Commission should also have endeavoured to cut down the number of national aid schemes. We are still awaiting a statement giving details of the various arrangements at national level. We would also, at the same time, like clarification of the extent to which multinational companies — as middlemen and suppliers — are directly or indirectly drawing on the Community's agricultural budget. Overall, we want the common agricultural policy to be maintained, but not abused. In the longer term, it must be readjusted with greater emphasis on a structural policy that encourages the viable and versatile family farm. Such a development is possible, even if agricultural spending is restricted.

The last point I wish to mention is an area which is not mentioned at all in the report, i. e. environmental and consumer affairs. In the Socialist Group we attach great importance to resolving the problems in these areas. One is entitled to feel surprised at the fact that they have been omitted altogether from the report. If Community consumers are not to be left in the lurch, they must be protected from free market forces, and this is plainly a Community problem. Similarly, to ensure that environmental problems do not run out of control, we must make a start on resolving them by joint action. If we do not tackle these problems together we run the risk, firstly, that the costs involved will become too heavy for the individual countries and, secondly, that those countries which make an active contribution to combating pollution will be penalized in that their competitiveness and hence their jobs will be undermined. We are aware that the Commission's Environment and Consumer Protection Service is working on these questions and has come up with interesting findings, but it looks as though the Commission gives very low priority to this work, with

**Gredal**

the result that the service concerned is very badly placed in purely financial — and hence also in staffing — terms. Furthermore, the Commission seems to be pursuing a deliberate policy of downgrading and delaying the findings reached in this department. During examination of the budget we tabled amendments seeking to expand the Commission's environment and consumer protection service, and one is entitled to ask whether the Commission will continue to disregard the consumer's voice in the Community.

The four areas which I have singled out for attention here are extremely important to us and we expect the Commission to take these matters more seriously.

**President.** — I call Mr Sarre.

**Mr Sarre.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the decision by the Commission to abolish, as from 2 February, the refunds on butter sales to the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and Afghanistan astounded me. For my part I unequivocally condemned the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, but it seems to me that the measure which has been taken should be condemned as dangerous. This is the case on the political level, since the Commission is beginning a policy of reprisals towards the Soviet Union. This is the case on the technical level, since the question of marketing dairy surpluses is again raised.

I shall therefore put three questions. First of all, is not the Commission exceeding its authority by deciding on such a basic matter of foreign policy? The choice of sanctions is a political choice which cannot be taken by the Commission. This decision seems to me to be contrary to the statements made by several governments of Member States, and in particular that of France. It is not permissible, in the difficult and dangerous situation in which we find ourselves, that decisions of this kind should be taken by the Commission, which is not politically responsible.

My second question relates to the countries concerned. Why did the Commission include Eastern Europe alongside the USSR? Is this a matter of organizing sanctions between power blocs? I think that this is acting blindly and absurdly. It is not in our interests to lash out at everybody in Europe. This political tendency represents a further step in the process of deterioration of détente.

Finally, my third question concerns the marketing of stocks. At present, there are 340,000 tonnes of butter stockpiled in the Community. Mr Gundelach acknowledged this on 25 September last. He said that as long as we have surpluses we must keep up exports. These exports can only continue if we give refunds. Has he changed his mind? Moreover, exports of industrial products to the USSR are twenty times greater than the whole of our agricultural exports to the East. Are you going to apply these same measures to the

reduced credits granted for these industrial exports? Again on 25 September, Mr Gundelach stated on this subject that we cannot have one policy for the marketing of agricultural products which is determined along political lines and another for industrial products. Will you then refrain from contradicting yourselves?

**President.** — I call Mr Henckens.

**Mr Henckens.** — (*NL*) Mr President, I should like to devote my comments to the subject of education, convinced as I am that a sound education policy can help to solve at least part of the unemployment problem, and in particular the problem of youth unemployment. I base my comments on three points, which were in fact made by Mr Jenkins in his speech. The first is that young people under twenty-five make up 25 % of the population but 40 % of the unemployed. Thus, in relative terms, there is excessive youth unemployment.

Second point: despite the fact there are more than 6 million unemployed, there are nevertheless more than 1 million unfilled vacancies, which apparently cannot be filled by these 6 million unemployed. It is obvious, therefore, that there is an imbalance between demand and supply on the labour market. Third point: unemployment in the next few years is expected to assume enormous proportions in the traditional industries, and the Commissioner mentioned examples of this.

If we now look for explanations for the three phenomena I have mentioned, I believe that one of the main factors is the rapid pace of technological development. The Commissioner himself spoke of the telematic revolution. That is certainly one of the prime causes.

A second factor is clearly insufficient mobility and adaptability of our workforce. A third factor is too low a level of education or overspecialization in a narrow field of activity. Lack of adequate skills increases the likelihood of being unemployed. Poor education and too narrow specialization are also factors which can lead to unemployment.

I should like to outline briefly three things that can be done in the education sector to bring about greater mobility and better adaptability of our workforce. In the first place, I think that basic education and vocational training must be as broadly-based as possible and should under no circumstances lead to excessive specialization in a limited field, because this decreases mobility and makes unemployment more likely. What is needed first of all, therefore, is a broadly-based education.

Secondly, I believe that the period of education and training of our young people should last as long as possible, because it is obvious that the higher the level of education and the more extensive the training, the less likelihood there is of them being unemployed.

**Henckens**

Lastly, Mr President, my third suggestion: more attention should be paid to practical measures in the area of retraining, in-job training, and ongoing vocational training of our workforce, to provide better protection against unemployment. Those were my suggestions in the field of education.

**President.** — I call Mr Alber.

**Mr Alber.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, President Jenkins did not mention environmental protection in his speech, although the subject is referred to in the activity report and the complementary memorandum. The Commission intends to concentrate on the main issues, and that is all to the good, because one institution cannot solve all the many problems on its own. Nevertheless, I feel it would be appropriate to add a few comments.

Firstly, I feel that there is a need for an overall concept. In the last analysis, environmental protection means human protection, and therefore it cannot be run on an ad hoc or pragmatic basis. It is necessary to define and establish priority levels, calculate what the environment will tolerate, analyse costs and benefits, consider alternatives and so on. This also naturally means that people must be informed and educated, for without that there can be no real environmental consciousness. Indifference and utopianism are both equally out-of-place. Man cannot live by industry alone, but then nor can he live only on birdsong. The need to establish balanced priorities is inescapable. The paradoxical nature of the situation for some is illustrated by the fact that nowadays a person is applauded if he says that he has aborted a child, but stoned if he admits to having chopped down a tree.

(Applause)

Another indication of how paradoxical the situation has become is the fact that no environmental issue is safe from being abused by some as a means of relaunching their ideological bandwagon. These groups are just as great a danger to the environment as the polluters themselves.

It is a good thing that environmental policy has gone beyond the purely defensive stage of bans and making good the damage. Environmental policy must take the offensive, prevention is better than repairing the damage. Preserving the natural environment is more important than putting it right again afterwards. I believe we are frittering away too much effort in the field of research. There is no reason why so much research should be going on simultaneously and into the same areas without any coordination. Money is wasted and vital time is squandered. Of course research needs to be free, but better coordination would be most desirable.

The problem of cross-border pollution is also important. This problem cannot be resolved on a national basis, and anyway the mentality that prevails is that of the gardener who always puts his compost heap in the furthest corner of the garden, as close as possible to his neighbour's fence. It is the same with many of the nuclear power stations and heavily polluting industries.

More attention should also be devoted to the legal aspects and considerations of competitiveness. What is the point of environmental protection if it increases the price of a product, which can then be undercut by cheaper imports from other countries who do not have such restrictions? We must examine the case for counteracting this with measures similar to the levies imposed on agricultural products. We must also examine our patent and licence laws to see whether they are appropriate for today's conditions. It must be made easier to exploit inventions that replace environmentally dangerous products. I do not have the time now to go into details and discuss the consequences, but I feel that this is the direction in which our thoughts should be going.

This is why I feel that all these points must be incorporated in the Community's programmes. Without them the protection of the environment would be a patchwork affair, and surely no-one wants that.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Aigner.

**Mr Aigner.** — (D) I was chosen by my group, Mr Jenkins, to act — as they say in the sporting world — as sweeper. But I do not even have the time for that. Instead I should just like to put a few comments to you. I think that what you presented to us was an extremely lucid analysis of the problems. But, President Jenkins, it was all too pessimistic. We are not the prey of anonymous forces; we are masters of our own fate, if we only have the political will to be.

(Applause)

The problem lies in the institution: for you have the will, but your institution is not strong enough to carry it out — that is the crux of the European Communities' problems. President Jenkins, you expressed an underlying theme for which I, on behalf of my group and, I believe, on behalf of this Parliament, should like to thank you. In your speech you sounded a final chord. It was like a vow, or an appeal perhaps. Yes, that is what it was: an appeal to the European Court of Justice. 'You, Peter, are the rock on which I shall build the European Communities.' What did you mean by that? You meant that this Community has a foundation which is unshakeable. This foundation is the law and the Treaty, and this law and this treaty can only endure and develop through the rule of law. This is an excellent thing to hear, Mr Jenkins, at a time

**Aigner**

when we have just witnessed the brutal action of another ideology. This appeal to the law is in fact an appeal to Europe's future, to the future of the free world. I should like to express my most sincere thanks for that.

But, President Jenkins, be thankful that I do not have the time to deal with the negative aspects of the Commission's work over the past year. I shall sum it up in one sentence: Mr President, because of the laxity and the lack of courage — I really had another word in mind — shown by the Commission, you have destroyed the balance of the institutions of the three European Treaties and in so doing have affected the legal basis of Parliament. You — that is not you personally but your institution — are becoming increasingly — and I apologise for the expression — a servant of the Council, and I consider it an intolerable development that the Commission, for instance, should have to seek backing, advice and information from the Council before it can answer questions from Members of Parliament. This is unthinkable. The strength of the Commission lies in the full backing of the European Parliament . . . . .

*(Applause)*

. . . . . and the rights of the Parliament are inseparably linked to the preservation of the legal status of the Commission. Unfortunately, the Commission has put its legal status in jeopardy. President Jenkins, I know how difficult your position is. You have no power of directive, you are legitimized not by the majority of this body, the European Parliament, but by the political will of the nine parliaments or governments of our Community. What is needed for the new Commission is for its President to have a power of directive and for it to be legitimized by this Parliament. Your existence ought no longer to depend on the nine capitals, you must be dependent upon the political will of this European body, the European Parliament.

*(Applause)*

I should have liked to hear just some passing reference to this vision of European development, that is to say the vision of a political will; if this political will is manifested, you will have the combined strength of the European Parliament and the Commission and then we will remove the issues which you rightly mentioned — monetary union, budgetary policy, industrial policy and security policy — from the national level, because they can no longer be solved there, to the European level. I am sorry to have to say that, regrettably, there was in your report no sign of this visionary power — and you, after all, are the initiator, the motor of the European Community, since you alone have the right of initiative. If I may put it humorously, it had something of the sadness of a swansong or of a Lohengrin saying 'My time is up'. No, the time of the Commission will not begin until we rediscover a balance in the European Community and see again the vision of a

vital Europe. That is our collective task, Mr President, and it is a pity that nothing of this great vision came out in your speech. I understand your position, we all understand the difficult problems that face us, but we are not pessimistic, otherwise we would not be here. We believe in the vitality of this Europe, and know that it has an indispensable role to play in the world. — We are not prey to malevolent forces — on the contrary, the world is determined by our political will, if we have it and are prepared to use it. That is our task and we must look to the future to carry it out.

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

**Mr Berkhouwer.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I simply wanted to bring it to the attention of the President of Parliament and all those present that it is not right that more than half the speakers who commented on Mr Jenkins' report are no longer in the Chamber. I feel that the Bureau and the political groups should do something about this.

**President.** — I call Mr Jenkins.

**Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission.** — Mr President, we have had a long debate. We have had many speakers. We have had a wide-ranging tapestry with a vast number of subjects. I have little time, and make no complaint about it, because I believe in short speeches and do not believe that the Commission should greatly exceed its time. Nor do I believe that the Commission should aggravate what, if I may be permitted to say so, seems to be a danger for this House at the present time, namely, that by letting its timetable get out of hand, it does not make as big an impact as it could as a vital new Community institution.

*(Applause)*

Several people have asked me to talk freely about a number of things and I am replying to the debate on the last programmed speech that I shall make in this mandate so I also venture to express my view to the House. I know there has been great dispute about this in the past, but the House, from its own point of view, makes a great mistake by insisting on separating the speech from the debate, taking the debate a great deal later and having it almost squeezed out at the end of the week.

*(Applause)*

I know there are differing views. We have tried different systems over the past four years, but with four years' experience, and not speaking in any self-interested way for the future, I assure the House that in my humble belief it would make a greater impact if — and

## Jenkins

this would not be an impossible intellectual feat, particularly as the speeches are sometimes said to be a little platitudinous and to some extent what is coming can be foreseen — the House were to attempt the intellectual feat of debating the speech straight after it is made.

*(Applause)*

Now there is one other point which I want to make. It is an almost procedural point, and it concerns the position of the complementary memorandum in conjunction with the speech which the President makes. I am grateful to Mr Albers for expressing the point, if I may say so, absolutely accurately. Mrs Gredal, I think, did not perhaps fully allow for the point in some of her comments about consumer affairs, which rate a substantial number of paragraphs in the speech. The speech is intended to be taken in conjunction with the complementary memorandum. Now it may be said that if something is not mentioned in the speech it means that it is not as important as if it were both in the speech and in the complementary memorandum. But without addressing the House for several hours there is no conceivable possibility of mentioning every important subject in the speech unless, as I ventured to say on Tuesday morning, the speech is a catalogue without any argument or any theme or any point of interest in it at all. And I therefore must ask Honourable Members not to accuse us of not being concerned with matters which are mentioned in the complementary memorandum, but are perhaps not fully dealt with in the speech.

Now the debate, as is natural and right I think, has turned on a mixture of institutional and economic questions. Let me say a few words about institutional questions to begin with. Mr Aigner concluded most eloquently on this matter. There is the difficult balance between the Council, the Commission and the new Parliament. It is certainly my desire to see the Commission play its full role in an independent sense, and it is my belief that the new Parliament, to a much greater extent than the old one, can provide an extremely valuable element in this balance, and that the Commission has everything to gain from an increasing influence on the part of the Parliament. That has certainly been my view and my attitude ever since this Parliament was elected.

At the same time there is something in what Mr Prout said. The earlier Commissions in some ways had an easier task, because they were carrying out according to a timetable certain clearly defined functions designed to achieve the clearly defined objectives of the Treaty, whereas we are having to make our way towards new horizons. Energy policy is a very good example of a topic about which little is said in the Treaty and where we are operating in a different way in more uncharted ground. Now we will try to do this with all the independence that we can.

I do not think that this Commission could be accused of being afraid of governments. I have never been afraid — and I believe those who were in the previous House and others will acquit me of this charge — of telling two British Governments, one of my own party, one of which I have previously been a member — I criticized them even more than I criticized the present one — when I disagreed with them. Nor have we hesitated to attack governments who do not obey the law — that was the impact of the concluding passage of my speech — or to tell them that the rule of law is the rock upon which the Community is founded.

I do not think that we can be accused of being afraid of governments, even those governments amongst the Nine which most value their sovereignty.

*(Laughter)*

I said *those* governments, not *that* government.

*(Laughter)*

I think that the point has been sufficiently clearly made.

I think this Commission shows a desire to work closely as possible with this Parliament. I wish that this Parliament could focus itself more sharply on some issues than it does at the present time.

If I may say so, I thought the Parliament focused remarkably soundly that morning when it decided, with a very great sense of responsibility and with very impressive statements, to reject the budget. Not the Commissions's budget, but the Commission's budget amended by the Council. I thought that there was then a major political impact. And because it was concentrated before a vote and there were short and powerful statements of decision, I thought that Parliament was then operating more impressively than I have mostly seen national parliaments operate. But I think the Parliament spreads out its debates too much, and loses the impact which I would wish it to have from this point of view.

*(Applause)*

But that impact should be as great as it possibly can. We will work in every way to achieve it. But at the same time we do have to work with the Council. We have a responsibility to the on-going business of Europe and while it is necessary that we chart out new routes for the future, it is also necessary over a lifetime of the Commission that we get the Council to agree to a number of practical steps forward. I think it was Mrs Walz, in a speech which I enjoyed and mostly agreed with, who said why do we not criticize the Council more. We do criticize the Council, certainly by implication and sometimes directly. It is no good just saying how often we have criticized the Council. It is no good just saying how many proposals we put forward

## Jenkins

if we had none of them to implement at the end of the day. I think it is important that we get a right balance between charting the future courageously and being able to make realistically some practical progress so far as the building of Europe is concerned. It would not impress anybody if we came to this House in the fourth year of our term of office and said that we had achieved nothing practically. The EMS, that did not come off; we failed to get an agreed basis for a mandate for renegotiating Lomé; we failed to conclude the Treaty of Accession with Greece; we failed to conclude the MTNs; we failed everywhere, but it is all the fault of the Council — we could not get them to agree — so we wash our hands of the whole thing. I do not think that would be a very impressive statement of position or a very good balance to strike: criticism of the Council, but no real achievement to show.

Now of course I agree with Mr Aigner and I agree with the thought in Mr Scott-Hopkins' mind: the same thought was expressed, to some extent, in several other speeches.

One must not be too despondent and downhearted. I am not, but I make absolutely no apology at all for having sounded some fairly sombre warning bells in the course of my speech. While we have made considerable achievements, I believe that Europe — and not Europe alone but also the developed world as a whole — does face some very menacing challenges in the course of the decade which is now beginning and in the few years ahead. I think it would be quite wrong for any one in my position, or any one else, to try and disguise the extent to which those challenges, if badly dealt with and neglected, endanger the very basis of what we have achieved, the very basis of our society.

*(Interruption by Mr Berkhouwer)*

I think, if I may say so, the honourable Member misread my speech.

*(Interruption by Mr Berkhouwer)*

I think that perhaps you misunderstood it, if I may say so.

*(Laughter)*

I have had long parliamentary experience of the phenomenon where people quote from one's speeches without having had a perfect comprehension of them.

*(Laughter and applause)*

I will move on, if I have a little less interruption. Interruptions, as you know, always hold things up. And I make no apology at all and I do not in the least mind if Mr Berkhouwer wishes to call me Mr Doomsday. I would much rather he called me that than called me Mr Complacency, who is not making Europe face the facts. Because I believe that it is out of facing the facts

that we may have a considerable opportunity for further progress.

The discussion was dominated by two economic subjects: energy and unemployment. I think the two are to some extent linked. People say, why do we not put forward a full recipe for dealing with unemployment? That is something which escapes the grasp of all national governments who command resources of up to 40 % of GDP. The Community commands resources of about 1 % of GDP. To suggest that in these circumstances one has the macro-economic impact to deal with unemployment is to have an exaggerated view. We can chart lines forward; we can put forward proposals for providing better training and better mobility. May I say to Mr Arndt, who is not here but who made a very interesting speech, that when one is talking about mobility, one is not necessarily talking about geographical mobility; one is also talking about occupational mobility, although the geographical point was a good and fair point. But it still remains necessary for people, in view of the rapid development which is going on at the present time, to change the nature of their occupation.

Let me say too on this point that I regret that, apart from the speech, which I listened to with great interest, by Mr Beumer, I have found it very difficult to get an echo from this House on what I regard as this crucial question of how Europe faces up to the electronic, to the telematic revolution. We have been asking the House to debate it for a long time, and it is very important to get hold of issues before they go wrong on us. This one will go very wrong on us if, as is likely at the present time, America and Japan leap far ahead of us. We have been trying to move the European Council upon this without much success so far, and I do beg the House to seize this issue and to have a serious debate about it. I would also, on another institutional point, a different point, like the House to debate Spierenburg as we have been asking it to do since October, and I hope that if Parliament is going to give us its advice, which we would like to have, that will be done reasonably soon.

As far as the energy position and the unemployment position are concerned, it is my view that we can take a number of measures in order to try and mitigate the position but that in order to deal with the core of the unemployment problem we need some major stimulus. Now I can see only two real possibilities here, one of which, much publicized in a report published partly in New York and taken up in London and elsewhere, is to bring in the Third World to redress, as it were, the balance of the slackening demand of the industrialized world at the present time. But I also think that we can face up to the manifold problems associated with energy conservation, exploitation of new sources of energy, exploitation of existing sources of energy — properly and constructively through a wide range of measures, from great changes in the form of car design to, perhaps most important of all, the insulation of

## Jenkins

domestic and industrial buildings. There is a vast demand for energy, and therefore a great need for investment. However, our proposal needs money, which is one reason why we put forward the idea of a levy possibly on imports, possibly on production, possibly on both. We will put forward precise ideas so far as this is concerned, at a later date.

I was sorry to note that the response to this was a little nationalist even from so good a European as Mr Berkhouwer, and a little conservative, even from so radical a figure as Mr Spinelli.

*(Laughter)*

Both of them were a little wary of this new idea. It is not, of course, that we want to put a tax on consumers as such, and it may well be desirable to accompany it by a reduction in some other forms of indirect taxation. It may be the relative cost of particular forms of energy which one wants to make more expensive. It is my view, on the whole, that the oil price will over a period find its natural balance between the amount that the producers are willing to take out of the ground and our demand, the demand of us and the rest of the world.

The question is whether that price avoids such a transfer away, both from the industrialized countries and from the poorer non-oil countries, and thereby sterilizes resources and money to such an extent as to have a very dragging down effect upon the whole economy of the world. It is from that macro-economic point of view, as well as the energy-conserving point of view, that I approach this question, on which the Commission will endeavour to make more detailed proposals.

It is indeed the case, as Mr Scott-Hopkins quoted, that I drew attention to the energy dangers a year ago. We have made some progress during that period, we have worked out energy import targets, and broadly, so far, we show signs of sticking to them. We have allocated them between countries, and we did at last unblock the Council of Energy Ministers, so that after doing really nothing for three years — let it not be said that I do not criticize ministers when it is right to do so . . .

*(Laughter)*

. . . they did take a number of decisions — not enough, but a number of decisions — following the meeting of the European Council in Strasbourg, and we got a 1.3 billion EUA onward-going research programme moving which was blocked, and a number of other issues have developed from this point of view.

Mr President, in trying to reply to a long debate, I have already taken a little more than the time available to me. To one or two people who have suggested that this Commission is coming towards the end of its mandate, let me say, it is indeed, but the determination of

this Commission is not to sink into any state of torpor, the determination is to use our remaining 10 months with the greatest sense of cohesion, courage and purpose that we can. We shall depend very much for that upon this House, and I think it is important that Commission and Parliament, both of whom suffer from frustrations in the present state of Europe, should not take those frustrations out on each other, but should endeavour, working constructively together, each to buttress the other, knowing that they are indispensable for the future of Europe.

*(Loud applause)*

**President.** — The joint debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

### 13. *Membership of committees*

**President.** — I have received from the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) a request to appoint

- Mr Zecchino as a member of the Legal Affairs Committee to replace Mr Modiano,
- Mr Modiano as a member of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning to replace Mr Zecchino,
- Mr Helms and Mr Janssen van Raay as members of the Committee on Transport to replace Mr Schnitker and Mr Pflimlin.

Are there any objections?

These appointments are ratified.

### 14. *Agenda for next sitting*

**President.** — In the course of previous sittings Parliament has voted to adopt urgent procedure in respect of a number of items.

Under Rule 14 (3) of the Rules of Procedure, it is for the President to decide when these items will be debated. At a meeting of the enlarged Bureau, in which the chairmen of the political groups took part, it has been decided to enter on the agenda for tomorrow's sitting the items in respect of which Parliament has decided to adopt urgent procedure, the vote to be taken immediately after each debate, followed in the order initially decided on by the items which could not be dealt with during today's sitting and finally those items scheduled to be dealt with on 15 February.

### President

The next sitting will be held therefore on 15 February 1980 at 9 a.m. with the following agenda, on the understanding that items on which the debate has not closed by 1 p.m. will be put back until the next part-session:

- Procedure without report
- Joint debate on the motions for resolutions on Andrei Sakharov and the Moscow Olympic Games, *followed by vote*
- Gillot report on the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea, *followed by vote*
- Joint debate on the motions for resolutions by Mr Debre and Mr Verges on hurricane Hyacinth and the Danker report on the provisional twelfths, *followed by vote*
- Sablé report ACP/EEC relations and the Lomé Convention, *followed by vote*
- Sarre motion for a resolution on the sentence of death passed on Mr Mange, *followed by vote*
- Sarre motion for a resolution on the events in Guatemala, *followed by vote*
- Macciocchi motion for a resolution on Cambodia, *followed by vote*
- Enright report on aid to Palestine refugees, *followed by vote*
- Cronin report on the ERDF
- Squarcialupi report on transboundary air pollution
- Sherlock report on exposure to harmful substances at work
- Catherwood report on the Common Customs Tariff
- Filippi report on small and medium-sized undertakings in Portugal
- Joint debate on two oral questions to the Commission on wine-growing
- Seeler report on relations between the EEC and ASEAN
- Joint debate on the Helms, Quin and B. Nielsen reports on fisheries
- Buchou report on basic products
- Ligios report on fruit and vegetables
- Sablé report on milk fats
- Barbarella report on the modernization of farms (without debate)

1.00 p.m.:

- Voting time

I call Mrs Bonino.

**Mrs Bonino.** — (I) Mr President, you announced that the agenda had been drawn up after consultation with the political groups. I imagine that the presidency only consulted the groups in 'team A' because the technical coordination group, which is evidently in 'team B', was not consulted. There is an obvious need to consult all the groups, and not only those who are particularly favoured.

Having said this I should like to know, Mr President, what the agenda for tomorrow in fact is. The list you have given us is only a sham agenda, since, in tomorrow's sitting, it will be impossible to complete the agenda which you announced, after finishing our work at 1 a.m. I should therefore like to know how far it will be possible to complete tomorrow's agenda in practice.

Moreover, pursuant to Rule 12 of the Rules of Procedure, I should like to propose an amendment to the agenda, to enable the motion for a resolution from Mrs Macciocchi and others on Cambodia to be placed second on the agenda of tomorrow's sitting, immediately after the Sakharov debate.

**President.** — I call Mr Gendebien.

**Mr Gendebien.** — (F) Mr President, I am astounded that the debate on and adoption of the Cronin report on the no-quota section of the ERDF has been put off until the end of the morning, if not indeed until the month of March. This concerns a very important matter. Parliament's resolution on it has been expected for several months. I think that our Parliament will be in very bad odour with the Commission and with the Council if it does not accept its responsibilities tomorrow morning.

By placing the debate on the Cronin report at the end of the day, or at the end of the morning, you are clearly proposing not to discuss this matter properly tomorrow. This is why I formally propose that the Gillot report on the Law of the Sea and the Cronin report change places; the latter would therefore come third on tomorrow morning's agenda.

**President.** — In reply both to the formal proposals made by Mrs Bonino and to the remarks made by Mr Gendebien, I have to point out that the agenda can only be changed if the President so decides. I cannot change it now. I shall inform the President of what you have said, but I cannot make a decision to change it.

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 00.10 a.m.)

## SITTING OF FRIDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 1980

### Contents

1. <i>Approval of the minutes</i> . . . . .	287	9. <i>Aid to Réunion — Provisional twelfths — Motions for resolutions by Mr Debré et al. (Doc. 1-713/79) and Mr Vergès et al. (Doc. 1-751/79) — Report by Mr Dankert on behalf of the Committee on Budgets (Doc. 1-793/79) (debate and vote)</i> . . . . .	306
2. <i>Documents received</i> . . . . .	287	<i>Mr Debré</i> . . . . .	306
3. <i>Reference to committee</i> . . . . .	287	<i>Mr Vergès</i> . . . . .	307
4. <i>Authorization of reports</i> . . . . .	288	<i>Mr Dankert, rapporteur</i> . . . . .	308
5. <i>Agenda</i> <i>Mrs Squarcialupi; Mr Maffre-Baugé; Mr Chambeiron; Mr Ligios; Mr Debré</i> . . . . .	288	<i>Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Sablé (L);</i> . . . . .	308
6. <i>Procedure without report</i> . . . . .	289	<i>Mr Debré</i> . . . . .	309
7. <i>Arrest of Andrei Sakharov — Olympic Games — Motions for resolutions by Mr Ripa di Meana et al. (Doc. 1-778/79/rev.II), Mr Hord et al. (Doc. 1-773/79) and Mr Blumenfeld et al. (Doc. 1-779/79/rev.) (debate and vote)</i> <i>Mr Ripa di Meana</i> . . . . .	290	<i>Explanation of vote: Mr Pannella</i> . . . . .	309
<i>Mr Hord</i> . . . . .	291	<i>Adoption of resolution 1-713/79</i> . . . . .	309
<i>Mr Penders (EPP); Lord Bethell (ED); Mr Galluzzi;</i> . . . . .	292	<i>Adoption of resolution 1-751/79</i> . . . . .	309
<i>Mr Haagerup (L); Mr Petronio; Mr Martin; Mr De Goede;</i> . . . . .	294	<i>Adoption of the resolution contained in the Dankert report (Doc. 1-793/79)</i> . . . . .	309
<i>Mr Fergusson</i> . . . . .	296	10. <i>Arrangements applicable to agricultural products originating in the ACP States or the OCT — Report by Mr Sablé on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation (Doc. 1-732/79) (debate and vote)</i> . . . . .	309
<i>Mr Berkhouwer</i> . . . . .	296	<i>Mr Sablé, rapporteur</i> . . . . .	309
<i>Mr Glinne; Mr Pürsten; Mr Hänsch; Mr Sarre; Mr Cariglia;</i> . . . . .	297	<i>Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission.</i> . . . .	310
<i>Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission</i> . . . . .	300	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	310
<i>Explanations of vote: Mr Rogers; Mr Van Minnen; Mrs Bonino; Mr Seal; Mrs Van den Heuvel; Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul</i> . . . . .	300	11. <i>Death sentence passed on Mr James David Mange — Motion for a resolution by Mr Sarre et al. (Doc. 1-774/79) (debate and vote)</i> <i>Mr Glinne (S); Mr Sarre</i> . . . . .	310
<i>Procedural motion: Mr Herman</i> . . . . .	303	12. <i>Events in Guatemala — Motion for a resolution by Mr Sarre et al. (Doc. 1-775/79) (debate and vote) Mr Sarre</i> . . . . .	311
<i>Miss Flesch; Mr Gabert; Mr Puletti; Mr Pannella; Mr Kirk; Mr Pelikan; Mrs Macciocchi</i> . . . . .	303	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	311
<i>Adoption of the resolution contained in Doc. 1-778/79/rev.II</i> . . . . .	305	13. <i>Situation in Cambodia — Motion for a resolution by Mrs Macciocchi et al. (Doc. 1-784/79) (debate and vote)</i> . . . . .	311
<i>Adoption of the resolution contained in Doc. 1-773/79</i> . . . . .	305	<i>Mrs Macciocchi</i> . . . . .	311
<i>Adoption of the resolution contained in Doc. 1-779/79/rev.</i> . . . . .	305	<i>Mr Habsburg (EPP); Lady Elles (ED); Mr Chambeiron; Mr Haagerup (L)</i> . . . . .	313
<i>Procedural motion: Mr Seal</i> . . . . .	305	<i>Mrs Dienesch (EPD); Mrs Bonino; Mr Glinne (S); Mr Ripa di Meana;</i> . . . . .	314
8. <i>Agenda</i> . . . . .	305		
<i>Mr Chambeiron</i> . . . . .	306		
<i>Mr Gillot, rapporteur</i> . . . . .	306		

<i>Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Haagerup</i> . . . . .	316	18. <i>Regulations on regional development measures — Report by Mr Cronin on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning (Doc. 1-715/79)</i> . . . . .	321
<i>Amendment replacing the entire motion for a resolution:</i> . . . . .	316	<i>Mr von der Vring, deputy rapporteur</i> . . . . .	322
<i>Mr Chambeiron; Mrs Macciocchi</i> . . . . .	317	<i>Mr Ryan (EPP)</i> . . . . .	322
<i>Amendment to first indent of the preamble:</i> . . . . .	317	<i>Procedural motion: Mr Panella</i> . . . . .	323
<i>Mrs Macciocchi</i> . . . . .	317	19. <i>Decision on transboundary air pollution — Report by Mrs Squarcialupi on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection (Doc. 1-635/79) (debate and vote)</i> . . . . .	323
<i>Amendment to third indent of the preamble:</i> . . . . .	317	<i>Procedural motion: Mr Pannella</i> . . . . .	324
<i>Mrs Macciocchi</i> . . . . .	317	<i>Mr Bonaccini, deputy rapporteur; Mr Muntingh (S)</i> . . . . .	324
<i>Amendment to paragraph 1:</i> . . . . .	317	<i>Amendment after Paragraph 6</i> . . . . .	324
<i>Mrs Macciocchi</i> . . . . .	317	<i>Mr Bonaccini</i> . . . . .	324
<i>Amendment to paragraph 3:</i> . . . . .	317	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	324
<i>Mrs Bonino; Mrs Macciocchi</i> . . . . .	317	20. <i>Directive on exposure to harmful substances at work — Report by Mr Sherlock on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection (Doc. 1-641/79) (debate and vote)</i> . . . . .	324
<i>Amendment after paragraph 3:</i> . . . . .	318	<i>Mr Sherlock, rapporteur</i> . . . . .	325
<i>Mrs Macciocchi</i> . . . . .	318	<i>Mrs Weber (S); Mrs Maij-Weggen (EPP)</i> . . . . .	325
<i>Amendment to paragraph 5:</i> . . . . .	318	<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	325
<i>Mrs Macciocchi</i> . . . . .	318	21. <i>Regulations on the Common Customs Tariff — Report by Sir Fred Catherwood on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations (Doc. 1-640/79) Sir Fred Catherwood, rapporteur</i> . . . . .	325
<i>Amendment to paragraph 6:</i> . . . . .	318	<i>Mr Sutra; Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Martin; Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission</i> . . . . .	326
<i>Mrs Macciocchi</i> . . . . .	318	<i>Procedural motion: Mr Maffre-Baugé</i> . . . . .	326
<i>Explanations of vote: Mrs Dekker; Lady Elles (ED); Mr Glinne;</i> . . . . .	318	<i>Sir Fred Catherwood</i> . . . . .	326
<i>Mr Pannella; Mr Chambeiron</i> . . . . .	319	22. <i>Directive on the modernization of farms — Report by Mrs Barbarella on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 1-719/79)</i> . . . . .	327
<i>Mrs Macciocchi</i> . . . . .	319	<i>Procedural motion: Mr Scott-Hopkins</i> . . . . .	327
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	319	23. <i>Dates of the next part-session</i> . . . . .	327
14. <i>Agenda:</i> . . . . .		24. <i>Approval of the minutes</i> . . . . .	327
<i>Sir Fred Catherwood; Mr Pannella</i> . . . . .	319	25. <i>Adjournment of the session</i> . . . . .	327
15. <i>Membership of committees</i> . . . . .	320		
16. <i>Votes</i> . . . . .			
<i>Radoux et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-737/79/rev.II):</i> . . . . .	320		
<i>Relations between the EEC and Yugoslavia:</i> . . . . .			
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	320		
<i>Von Wogau report (Doc. 1-544/79): Community transit:</i> . . . . .	320		
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	320		
17. <i>Supply of sugar to UNRWA — Report by Mr Enright on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation (Doc. 1-754/79) (debate and vote)</i> . . . . .	320		
<i>Mr Enright, rapporteur</i> . . . . .	321		
<i>Mr Patterson; Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission</i> . . . . .	321		
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	321		

IN THE CHAIR: MRS WEIL

*President*

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

**President.** — The sitting is open.

1. *Approval of the minutes*

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

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. *Documents received*

**President.** — I have received:

(a) from the Council, a request for an opinion on:

- the proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation allocating certain catch quotas between Member States for vessels fishing in Canadian waters (Doc. 1-783/79),

which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture;

(b) from the committees, the following reports:

- report by Mr Delmotte, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, on the fourth annual report (1978) by the Commission on the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) (Doc. 1-789/79);
- report by Mr Dankert, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, in application of Article 204 of the EEC Treaty and Article 8 of the Financial Regulation, authorizing further provisional twelfths for Section III (Commission) of the general budget of the European Communities (Doc. 1-793/79);

(c) the following motions for resolutions:

- motion for a resolution by Mr de la Malène and Mr Lalor, on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the European Parliament's contribution to finding a solution to the British share in the Community budget (Doc. 1-785/79),

which has been referred to the Committee on Budgets;

- motion for a resolution by Mr Debré, pursuant to Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure, on the amendment of the Rules of Procedure (Doc. 1-786/79),

which has been referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions;

- motion for a resolution by Mr Seal and Mr Lomas, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the boycott of the Olympic Games (Doc. 1-787/79),

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee;

- motion for a resolution by Mr Dalsass, Mr von Hassel, Mr Bocklet, Mr Goppel, Mr Verroken, Mr I. Friedrich, Mr Pürsten, Mr Helms, Mr Früh, Mr Fuchs, Mr Croux and Mr Luster, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the protection of ethnic groups and linguistic minorities within the European Community, (Doc. 1-790/79)

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee;

- motion for a resolution by Mr Habsburg, Mr von Hassel, Mr Pürsten, Mr Patterson, Mr Moreland, Mr Aigner, Mr Jakobsen, Mr Hahn, Mr I. Friedrich, Mr Wawrzik, Mrs Rabbetghe, Mr von Wogau, Mr Goppel, Mr Blumenfeld, Mr Fischbach, Mr von Bismarck, Mr Spautz, Mr Fergusson, Lady Elles, Mr Christopher Jackson, Mr Cottrell, Mr Normanton and Lord O'Hagan, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the situation in the Western Sahara (Doc. 1-791/79),

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Development and Cooperation for an opinion;

- motion for a resolution by Mr Cardia, Mr Gouthier, Mrs Cinciari Rodano and Mr Papapietro, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the protection of minorities in the Community (Doc. 1-794/79),

which has been referred to the Political Affairs Committee;

- motion for a resolution by Mrs Salisch, pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, on the effects of technological development on employment (Doc. 1-795/79),

which has been referred to the Committee on Energy and Research as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment for an opinion.

3. *Reference to committee*

**President.** — The motion for a resolution by Mrs Bonino and others, on unemployment and energy consumption in the Community (Doc. 1-485/79), has, at the request of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and with the agreement of the Committee on Energy and Research, been referred to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment as the committee responsible and to the Committee on Energy and Research for its opinion, contrary to what was decided at the sitting of 12 November 1979.

At their request and pursuant to Rule 38 (3) of the Rules of Procedure, the following committees have been asked to deliver opinions on the following matters:

**President***Committee on Social Affairs and Employment:*

- motion for a resolution by Mr Hume and others on Community regional policy and Northern Ireland (Doc. 1-517/79) (committee responsible: Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning);
- motion for a resolution by Mr Ceravolo and others on the right of migrant workers to vote and stand for election (Doc. 1-382/79) (committee responsible: Political Affairs Committee);

*Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection:*

- proposal from the Commission for a directive on the weight and certain other characteristics (not including dimensions) of road vehicles intended for the carriage of goods (Doc. 575/78) (committee responsible: Committee on Transport);

*Committee on Development and Cooperation:*

- the chapter on cooperation with developing countries (Chapter 7) and the second part — on the European Development Fund — of the Annual Report by the Court of Auditors for the 1978 financial year (Doc. 1-567/79) (committee responsible: Committee on Budgetary Control).

**4. Authorization of reports**

**President.** — Pursuant to Rule 38 of the Rules of Procedure, I have authorized committees to draw up reports as follows:

*Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport:*

on the future development of the University Institute (European University) in Florence;

*Committee on Development and Cooperation:*

on the interim report of the Commission on the management of the financial and technical aid programme in favour of non-associated developing countries for 1976, 1977 and 1978, and on general guidelines for 1980;

*Committee on Budgetary Control:*

on the financial section and those sections falling within the terms of reference of the Committee on Budgetary Control of the Seventh Report on the activities of the European Social Fund for the financial year 1978 (on this, the Committee on

Social Affairs and Employment and the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning have been asked for their opinions);

on the Seventh Financial Report on the EAGGF for 1977;

on the Eighth Financial Report on the EAGGF (Guarantee Section) for 1978; and

on the Eighth Financial Report on the EAGGF (Guidance Section) for 1978 (on these three reports, the Committee on Agriculture has been asked for its opinion

**5. Agenda**

**President.** — I call Mrs Squarcialupi.

**Mrs Squarcialupi.** — (*I*) Madam President, I think that the drugs issue has beaten all records for indifference and a desire to thwart attempts to tackle this extremely serious problem. Voting on it at 1 p.m., as indicated in the agenda — and presumably even later — will mean plunging further into indifference.

At the close of the debate yesterday afternoon, after — incredible as it may seem — three successive stages of discussion, the President announced that the vote would be taken at 10.30 a.m. today. We should be able to trust the word of the President of this Parliament. I therefore request that the vote be carried forward to 10.30 a.m., and I feel certain that my colleagues will not agree to any further discrimination against this subject, which is currently one of the most serious in our society.

Alternatively, Madam President, I would ask that the vote be deferred to the next part-session. We have three resolutions and 19 amendments which require an informed vote from Parliament.

**President.** — Ladies and gentlemen, it will be very difficult to change the agenda and to take this vote at 10.30, since at that moment we shall be in the middle of discussing urgent resolutions. I therefore think it would be preferable, as you have yourself suggested, to postpone the vote to the next part-session.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I call Mr Maffre-Baugé.

**Mr Maffre-Baugé.** — (*F*) Madam President, I wish to raise a procedural point under Rule 32 of the Rules of Procedure. It seems to me clear that there will be no

**Maffre-Baugé**

time today to deal with my question of problems relating to wine-growing, which has already been deferred once.

This illustrates this Assembly's apparent wish to ignore the major economic subjects affecting entire regions and to which the regions attach great importance, as you are well aware. Would it not be possible, for this discussion to take place immediately after the resolution on the Olympic Games?

**President.** — Mr Maffre-Baugé, it is impossible to draw any distinctions among these various requests for urgent procedure, which have been entered in the order of their adoption. Moreover, once they have been approved, there is no question of deferring the items concerned. I therefore cannot accede to your suggestion.

I call Mr Chambeiron.

**Mr Chambeiron.** — (F) Madam President, I am surprised to see that the agenda includes the report drawn up by Mr Gillot, on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee, on the need for and definition of a common position on problems relating to the law of the sea. When we adopted the agenda on Monday, we were all of the impression that this request, which came from certain chairmen, implied discussion of the subject. I cannot believe that with the Chamber almost empty we are going to deal with such a major item, which has many important implications for all the member countries, without any opportunity to make our views known.

Under these circumstances, Madam President, I would ask the Assembly to withdraw this report from the agenda, because the lack of discussion can do nothing to enhance the prestige of this Assembly, which, unfortunately, over the past few months has declined more and more.

**President.** — Mr Chambeiron, since this item is down on the agenda, I think it can be left there. We can only hope that we shall reach it.

I call Mr Ligios.

**Mr Ligios.** — (I) Madam President, I request that the debate on the question by Mr Maffre-Baugé on wine-growing — a subject of particular importance — be deferred to the March part-session.

**President.** — I note your request.

I call Mr Debré.

**Mr Debré.** — (F) I am surprised, Madam President, at the reply which you have just given to Mr Chambei-

ron. It was understood and, I believe, accepted yesterday that the matters for urgent debate, particularly aid to the hurricane victims on the island of Réunion, would definitely be dealt with today. Once a debate has begun on the law of the sea, it will be impossible to bring it to a close within the period envisaged and there is the risk that it will be impossible to adhere to the agenda as regards the matters for urgent debate. The intention was, it seems to me, that the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Gillot should not be followed by a debate, precisely so that matters for urgent debate could be taken afterwards. I feel that your remark implies a readiness to change the agenda.

**President.** — Mr Debré, in view of the limited speaking-time on the report on the Law of the Sea, you may set your mind at rest.

*6. Procedure without report*

**President.** — On Monday, I announced the titles of those Commission proposals to which it was proposed to apply the *procedure without report* provided for in Rule 27A of the Rules of Procedure.

Since no one has asked to speak and no amendments have been tabled to them, I declare these proposals approved by the European Parliament.

*7. Arrest of Andrei Sakharov — Olympic Games (debate and vote)*

**President.** — The next item is a joint debate on

— the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-778/79/rev.II) tabled by

Mr Ripa di Meana, Mr Pelikan, Mr Glinne, Mrs Gredal, Mr Abens, Mr Albers, Mr Arndt, Mr Cariglia, Mrs Castle, Mr Cohen, Mr Colla, Mr Diddò, Mr Enright, Mr Estier, Mr Fellermaier, Mr Ferri, Mrs Focke, Mrs Fullet, Mr Gabert, Mr Gatto, Mr Gautier, Mr Hänsch, Mr Kavanagh, Mr Klinkenborg, Mrs Krouwel-Vlam, Mr Lezzi, Mr Linde, Mr Linkohr, Mr Loo, Mr Martinet, Mr Van Minnen, Mr Muntingh, Mr Oehler, Mr Orlandi, Mr Peters, Mr Puletti, Miss Quin, Mr Radoux, Mr Ruffolo, Mr K. Schön, Mr Schwartzberg, Mr Seefeld, Mr Seeler, Mrs Seibel-Emmerling, Mr Sieglerschmidt, Mrs Van den Heuvel, Mrs Vayssade, Mrs Viehoff, Mr Walter, Mrs Weber, Mr Wettig, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, Mr Woltjer and Mr Zagari on behalf of the Socialist Group; Mr Blumenfeld, Mr Lecanuet, Mr Penders, Mr Michel, Mr Klepsch, Mr Ryan, Mr Bersani, Mr Pöttering, Mr Diligent, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr Simonnet, Mr von Hassel, Mrs Walz, Mr Antonozzi, Mrs Moreau, Mr Beumer, Mr Henckens, Mr

## President

Aigner, Mr D'Ormesson, Mr Malangré, Mr Jonker, Mr Dalsass, Mr Estgen, Mr de Keersmaecker, Mr Herman, Mr Lückner, Mr Vandewiele, Mr Habsburg, Mr Seitlinger, Mr Pfennig, Mr Notenboom, Mr Fuchs, Mrs Gaiotti De Biase, Mr Janssen van Raay, Mrs Boot, Mr Helms, Mr Früh, Mr Vergeer, Mr Alber, Mr Lenz, Mr Luster, Mr Majonica and Mr Schall on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group); Mr Scott-Hopkins, Lady Elles, Mr Normanton, Mr Prag, Mr Seligman, Lord Bethell, Mr Fergusson, Lord Douro and Mr Møller on behalf of the European Democratic Group; Mr Bangemann, Mr Haagerup, Mr Irmer, Mr Jürgens, Mr Maher, Mr Nord, Mr B. Nielsen, Mr Damseaux, Mrs Pruvot, Mr Rey, Mr Rossi, Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Combe, Mr Pintat, Mrs von Alemann, Mrs Scrivener, Mr Calvez, Mr Delatte and Mr Baudis on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group; Mr de la Malène on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats; Mrs Bonino, Mrs Macciocchi and Mr Pannella on the arrest of the scientist Andrei Sakharov;

— the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-773/79) tabled by

Mr Hord, Mr Harris, Mr Tyrrell, Mr Pfennig, Mr Konrad Schön, Mr von Wogau, Mr Ryan, Mr Sälzer, Mr Langes, Sir Peter Vaneck, Mr Cottrell, Mr J. M. Taylor, Mr J. D. Taylor, Miss Hooper, Miss Brookes, Mr Simmons, Mr Simpson, Mr Patterson, Mr Forth, Mr Normanton, Mr Sherlock, Mr Hutton, Mr Paisley, Mr Kellett-Bowman, Mrs Kellett-Bowman, Lord Harmar-Nicholls, Mr Fergusson, Mr Balfour, Mr Pürsten, Mr Schall, Mrs Rabbethge, Mr Curry, Mr Marshall and Lord Bethell on the action to be taken by the European Community following the invasion of Afghanistan by Russia and the outrageous treatment of Professor Sakharov; and

— the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-779/79/rev.) tabled by

Mr Blumenfeld, Mr Vergeer, Mr Ryan, Mrs Maij-Weggen, Mr Lückner, Mr Alber, Mr Penders, Mr Martens, Mr Habsburg, Mr Zecchino, Mr Aigner, Mr Janssen van Raay, Mr Notenboom, Mrs Walz, Mrs Lenz, Mrs Boot, Mr Majonica, Mr Jonker, Mr Pürsten, Mr Wawrzik, Mr Bocklet, Mrs Rabbethge, Mr Lemmer, Mr Luster, Mr Pfennig, Mr Müller-Hermann, Mr Nordlohne, Mr Hoffmann, Mr van Hassel, Mr Van der Gun, Mr Goppel, Mr Scott-Hopkins, Lady Elles, Mr Prag, Lord Bethell, Lord Douro, Mr Normanton, Mr Møller, Mr Fergusson, Mr Seligman, Mr Berkhouwer, Mr Nord, Mr Haagerup, Mr Irmer, Mr Jürgens, Mr Maher, Mr B. Nielsen, Mrs Pruvot, Mr Rey, Mr Rossi, Mrs Scrivener, Mrs von Alemann, Mr Bangemann, Mr Damseaux, Mr Combe, Mr Calvez, Mrs Chouraqui, Mr Remilly, Mrs Ewing, Mr Gillot and Mr Deleau

on the Moscow Olympic Games.

The original motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Ripa di Meana and others (Doc. 1-749/79) has been withdrawn in the meantime.

I call Mr Ripa di Meana.

**Mr Ripa di Meana.** — (I) Madam President, colleagues, by discussing and voting on this resolution, tabled by 130 Members, on behalf of practically all the political groups, our Parliament is simply carrying out its strict duty in accordance with the signing by the European Community of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe on 1 August 1975.

Today the European Parliament is also assuming the moral responsibility of clearly indicating to everyone that the Sakharov affair has not simply been recorded but is a live issue. I think it is most important to show that this House, which is divided and will continue to be divided on most social, economic and political issues, has through this joint text reached an extremely wide consensus; a consensus which I find deeply moving and which will, I hope, be even wider by the end of this debate; a consensus on fundamental values which form the essence of our common European culture and tradition.

The Sakharov affair presents us with a problem of evaluation and initiative: evaluation of its implications concerning the internal situation in the Soviet Union and of its repercussions at international level. What is most striking is the indisputable fact that Sakharov's forced exile is not the result of any specific new moves by the scientist. The Soviet Government took a sudden decision to switch from bare tolerance to open repression of this Soviet citizen, winner of the Nobel Prize for Peace. What new development led to such a serious turn-about? — Simply the deterioration in the international situation following the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan.

It is therefore becoming increasingly evident not only that dissidents in the Soviet Union are not protected by internal laws but that they are hostages whose fate is cruelly dependent on developments in the Soviet Union's international policy. Furthermore, the fact that measures have been taken against the Soviet scientific community at the highest level shows the extent of the opposition organized by that community, as in the case of its long and courageous solidarity with Sakharov, and in those of the physicists Orlov and Nazarian, the cyberneticians Shcharansky and Bolonkin, the biologist Kovalev and the mathematician Velikanova, all arrested and sentenced to extremely severe penalties. It is therefore clear that the Soviet Government intends to break down the resistance of the scientific community by means of force, which is a disturbing sign of the re-militarization of Soviet society.

From the international point of view, Sakharov's arrest and exile, decided on 8 January 1980, has particularly serious implications, because they constitute open violation of the commitments undertaken by the USSR in Helsinki, which have been so often disregarded that it is clear that the Soviet Government considers them little more than pieces of paper.

di Meana

Is not this an attack on international *détente*?

Since the only alternative to *détente* is catastrophe, since peace must be resolutely pursued and preserved, we must, for these fundamental reasons, strongly condemn those who threaten *détente* and peace through acts of open defiance.

*Détente* is not served by silence or resignation, or a pretence that nothing of consequence has happened between Moscow and the 'closed city' of Gorky. On the contrary, *détente* is served by provoking public moral reaction against such acts, which, otherwise, will get caught in the spiral of aggression. This Parliament therefore has a duty not only to testify and condemn but to promote practical political initiatives designed to obtain the removal of the sanctions imposed on Sakharov.

The first opportunity will arise in Hamburg from 18 February to 4 March during the International Scientific Forum provided for in the Final Act of Helsinki with a view to — and I quote — 'promoting contact, communications and exchanges of information between scientific institutions and scientists'.

However, the most important opportunity will arise in November in Madrid at the conference which is to assess the application by the signatories of the Helsinki agreement. If by that time Sakharov and the other dissidents have not obtained their civil rights, including their right of dissent, the Soviet Union will be made more clearly aware than ever of its exact responsibility.

These are the reasons why it is essential for Parliament to make a clear and unequivocal statement, and it is desirable that the resolution should be supported by those political forces, such as the Italian Communist Members, who, although they have from the beginning adopted a position in many ways similar to that expressed in this resolution, have chosen to keep their position separate.

(Applause)

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Hord.

**Mr Hord.** — Mr President, honourable Members, at the last part-session this House condemned the Russian invasion of Afghanistan. We called for an immediate review of economic and other relations with Russia. We also agreed to provide urgent and immediate aid to the Afghan refugees. Last Wednesday we voted 10.5 million units of account — even though this exceeded our one-twelfth rule — to ensure that this aid

went forthwith to those refugees. Since our last part-session, there has been no withdrawal of Russian tanks and troops from Afghanistan. There are no longer any press reports of actions and activities in Afghanistan. Oppression is total and the free world is faced with a *fait accompli*, Professor Sakharov has since been imprisoned in Gorky.

But in the same month since we last met, Mr President, what has the Commission done? What action has it taken in response to Parliament's January resolution on the Russian invasion? It has agreed not to replace the grain exports now banned by the United States. Some sanction! It has decided not to sell fresh butter in bulk — for the time being. But prepackaged butter, fresh butter, will continue to be sold with a 70 % subsidy! Whoever heard of a more preposterous course of action in response to our resolution? How long is this House going to stomach this incredibly absurd, arrogant, insensitive and inept Commission policy?

We have also been told that the total cost of subsidies freely given by this Community in 1979 to Russia for one commodity alone — butter — amounts to approximately 236 million units of account. This subsidy on one commodity is 22 times as much as we approve for aiding those wretched refugees. What would those poor Afghans feel if they knew that their Russian oppressors were also receiving money — many times more money than they themselves, the refugees, were getting from this Community? But what do our electors and taxpayers feel when they witness their contribution to this European Community being paid out not only to the oppressed but to the oppressors as well, many times over? I can tell you what they feel. They feel angry and have bitter contempt for this institution. It is outrageous and totally unacceptable that such sales of subsidized goods continue to be sold to the USSR. Unlike so many other issues debated here, Mr President, this is one in which it is within the competence of Parliament, as joint budgetary authority, to act. I submit that we can and must act quickly. We must cease forthwith to sustain the Russian invaders and oppressors. It is highly hypocritical to aid the refugees whilst such trade with Russia continues.

Time is running out for millions of law-abiding and freedom-loving citizens, in the same way as time is running out for the credibility of this Parliament. Failure to approve this resolution, failure to take economic action against the Russian aggressors will not only destroy our credibility once and for all but will make each one of us a target for ridicule, both at home and on the other side of the Iron Curtain. I earnestly beg you all to support this motion.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Penders to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group).

**Mr Penders.** — (NL) Mr President, I would like to begin by expressing my satisfaction at the arguments advanced by Mr Ripa di Meana, who was the first of 118 Members to sign the motion for a resolution now under discussion. Frequently, there are considerable differences of opinion and divergencies between the main political groups, which we should not always try to avoid. On the other hand, it is extremely gratifying when, on such an important issue, cooperation between the main political groups is shown to be possible. The European Parliament is clearly able to arrive at a common policy concerning fundamental issues, of which human rights is certainly one. This is important both now and for the future, since we shall constantly be faced with such issues. Whenever the European Parliament is able to speak with one voice in such matters, this will constitute a gain, not only for the cause in question, but also for Parliament.

Mr President, there are of course those who question the value of adopting yet another resolution on the violation of human rights: at almost every meeting, similar resolutions are included in the agenda. In my opinion, such an attitude is mistaken. In the event of a serious violation of human rights, we in Parliament must make our voices heard and make it clear that we attach great importance to the Final Act of Helsinki. In this connection, I will quote a brief passage from my party programme: The European People's Party considers the implementation of the provisions on human rights in the Final Act to be an important step towards more human living conditions for the peoples of Eastern Europe. We realize that they are counting on our solidarity.

On the other hand, there are those who say that care is necessary in making such statements if *détente* is not to be endangered. Indeed, this must be avoided. What, however, is the value of *détente*, Mr President, when we see how human rights are so frequently treated? A scrupulous and correct implementation of human rights is essential to the process of *détente*, and it is in this spirit that we should go to the Conference of Madrid this autumn. I am convinced that my group will make a positive contribution to this conference and will measure its result against these criteria.

In the motion for a resolution, initially tabled by a member of my group, Mr Alber, mention was made of the sad plight of Mr Duchko and Mr Yakunin, members of the Committee for the Protection of the Interests of Christians in the Soviet Union. When the draft text was drawn up, this reference was deleted, which in itself is not too serious. I would, however, like to take advantage of this opportunity to mention the plight of these two members of the committee. In this type of debate, we often refer to Marxist reformers who are working in a good cause and whom we wholeheartedly support, but I must emphasize that in East European countries and in the Soviet Union Christian believers are persecuted because of their religion, and this is what we are denouncing.

Officially, Dr Sakharov has been exiled, but the word exile is a euphemism. All those visiting him are immediately interrogated by the authorities. To speak of Dr Sakharov's exile is inaccurate: rather we should refer to his house arrest. The time at which these measures are being taken is particularly scandalous. The fact that Moscow has dared to take such extreme measures, having angered the entire world by invading Afghanistan, demonstrates the utter contempt felt there for the letter and the spirit of the Final Act of Helsinki. The very timing of these measures adds to their effect.

We must not forget that the support of the European Parliament is important for the dissidents, who are in a difficult situation. Their telephones are tapped and communications between them are hindered. Nevertheless, according to press reports, they continue to visit each other and try to support each other. There can be no doubt that they come to hear of resolutions such as this. They know that we are discussing these issues and that we are adopting such resolutions. This will encourage them in their courageous attitude.

Finally, Mr President, I think it is essential that we in the European Parliament forward our resolution to the national parliaments of the Nine. This will encourage the peoples of Europe to speak out with one voice on issues concerning human rights. We may have differences of opinion, or a different approach concerning security measures, economic measures, grain exports and technology, but when we discuss issues concerning human rights in the strict sense of the word, there cannot be many differences. Therefore, I consider it important that we forward this resolution to the national parliaments of our Member States.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Lord Bethell to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Lord Bethell.** — Mr President, it has until recently been an axiom of free societies that the freedom of the individual should not be interfered with, and that as far as possible politics should be kept out of sport. It is this principle which has guided many individuals in the International Olympic Movement who have insisted that the Olympic Games should take place, in spite of pressure from a growing number of governments to the effect that the Games ought to be postponed, cancelled or moved to somewhere else.

I would like to draw your attention, Mr President, and that of my colleagues to how this matter is being viewed in the Soviet Union and to remind the House of some of the words that are being used in Moscow and some of the ideas that are being put forward among active Communist Party members in documents and in papers that are being distributed among

### Lord Bethell

the population in preparation for the Games that will take place in July.

A copy of a document entitled *The Activist's Handbook* has recently come to the West. The language used in this document makes it clear exactly how the Soviet people are invited to view the possible holding of the Olympic Games in their country. It reads in part:

'The decision to give the honour of holding the Olympic Games to the capital of the world's first Socialist State bears convincing witness to the universal acceptance of our country's historic importance and correct foreign policy, of the great services rendered by the Soviet Union to peace.'

This is what the Soviet people are being told. They are being told that this is why our athletes will be going to Moscow: to demonstrate our conviction of the correctness of Soviet foreign policy. Later on in this document it is made quite clear that one of the purposes of the Olympic Games, from the Soviet point of view, is to sharpen the struggle between what they call the forces of progress and the forces of reaction. And in this same document the so-called forces of reaction are criticized for using the Olympic movement in the interests of the exploiting classes for purposes of commerce and business, as a means of propaganda for the bourgeois way of life and the capitalist system and as an attempt to distract young people from the class struggle.

So let there be no doubt about it. We see the Olympic movement in one way; those who are organizing the Olympic Games in Moscow see it in another way. I have the greatest sympathy for those athletes in our nine countries who have been preparing for these games. They want to go to Moscow. They don't want to condone aggression in Afghanistan. They don't want to support the arrest of Academician Sakharov. But I am sorry to have to say this: if they do go, they will be unwillingly, unwittingly giving support to these ideas at least in the eyes of the Soviet people. This is what will be seen by the Soviet people: our athletes, our people are going there to support Soviet foreign policy, Soviet aggression and Soviet arrests of dissidents. And so I say to our National Olympic Committees and to our individual athletes: think again, we sympathize with you; you don't mean to condone those oppressions, but if you go this is what you will be doing. I therefore urge the House to pass this resolution by a large majority and send the message out loud and clear to our Olympic committees and our athletes that this is what will happen if the Moscow Games take place in July.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Galluzzi.

**Mr Galluzzi.** — (I) Mr President, colleagues, in a motion for a resolution with request for urgent procedure, the Italian Communists and Allies have clearly expressed a strong condemnation of the repressive measures taken by the Soviet authorities against the physicist Andrei Sakharov, measures which we considered and still consider extremely serious, since they represent a violation of those rights and fundamental freedoms which should be respected everywhere.

Moreover, we do not confine ourselves in that motion to strong condemnation; we also put forward a request for the sentence to be revoked, a request which, precisely because presented in an official document by the representatives of a party such as ours, which is the largest Communist party in the capitalist West, assumed and assumes now — since we are re-proposing and confirming the position here — an importance and a political significance of which no one, I think, can be unaware. We decided to table a separate resolution and, therefore, not to join in the resolution tabled by the majority of the political groups in the Assembly, because we felt, as we still do, Mr President and colleagues, that the problem of freedom for Sakharov and the more general problem of respect for freedom and human dignity can only be approached in an atmosphere of *détente*, dialogue and peaceful cooperation among peoples.

It is not by chance that the defence and assertion of human rights, viewed as an essential part of the process of *détente* and peaceful co-existence, are closely linked with the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference and directly governed by it. We consider this link to be essential at a time when — to use the Pope's words — 'suspicion and distrust are beginning to replace cooperation between peoples and States and are once more leading to the adoption of defensive positions, reprisals and withdrawal'.

We feel, therefore, that an Assembly such as ours, representing a Community which has much to lose from a return to the dark gloomy years of a divided Europe and the Cold War and which in recent years has succeeded in eliminating tension and re-opening dialogue and collaboration with all the States and peoples of Europe, cannot confine itself to condemnation and a request for reform but should also stress — as Willy Brandt rightly said — its willingness to do everything necessary to maintain the situation of stability and *détente* in Europe and extend it to other parts of the world. The vote of a section of this Parliament, a section of those same groups which tabled the motion on which a vote is now to be taken, prevented our motion from being debated by this Assembly and put to the vote.

We do not know, Mr President and colleagues, whether this is the result of bad conscience or old habits of discrimination, or an attempt to isolate us, to minimize our independence, and to make it seem as if the Italian Communists do not rise to the occasion

**Galluzzi**

when specific political responsibilities must be assumed with courage. What we do know is that these are petty and mistaken calculations which are turned against those who make them because they show a sectarian rigidity, political short-sightedness, and fear of open, honest confrontation, all of which have inevitably caused embarrassment, unease and the dissociation of a section of the press, many Members and various political representatives of this Parliament. For our part, we shall pursue the course we have taken up to now, we shall continue to assert ourselves, not for propaganda purposes or to cause disruption, but to promote agreement, collaboration and understanding among all the forces who believe in peace and genuinely and sincerely wish to work to defend in an atmosphere of peace all the fundamental rights of men and peoples.

For these reasons, Mr President, we shall abstain from voting as a matter of principle, in order to highlight what we consider to be a serious political shortcoming of the motion before us and to condemn an act of discrimination which is not only pointless but harmful to this Parliament because it prevents it from expressing, even with respect for the different positions and judgements, that wide, uniform will which is essential if it is to have real political weight and exercise an effective political influence for peace in Europe and the world.

*(Applause)*

**President** — I call Mr Haagerup to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mr Haagerup** — *(DK)* Mr President, I would like on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group to express my wholehearted support for the motion for a resolution on the scientist Sakharov. We feel that the Soviet authorities' treatment of Mr Sakharov is outrageous and contrary both to the spirit and the letter of the Helsinki Declaration.

As a participant from the Liberal and Democratic Group in the concluding negotiations on the content of this motion, I would like to voice my appreciation — in line with what was said by Mr Penders — of the constructive spirit and the cooperativeness which pervaded these negotiations and the attitude of all those taking part. When adopting such a resolution, it is very important that it should be backed by a large majority. Given the broad spectrum of political views represented in this Parliament, unanimous resolutions are, as is well known, a rarity. However, if unanimity is not reflected in the vote on this matter, it will at all events emerge clearly who in this House opposes this unequivocal condemnation of the Soviet authorities' growing oppression of all those working to ensure respect for, and the defence of, human rights in the Soviet Union.

**President** — I call Mr Petronio.

**Mr Petronio**. — *(I)* Mr President, we join in the condemnation of Soviet Russia for its brutal intervention in Afghanistan and the measures taken against Professor Sakharov. We do so without reservations but would nevertheless like to add a few comments.

We feel that the debate on the Moscow Olympic Games has to some extent departed from its proper course. Various attempts have been made to have the debate revolve around two main themes: on the one hand, exaltation of the purity and independence of the sporting spirit — which the International Olympic Committee considers justification for competing in Moscow — and, on the other hand, the view that it would be immoral to take part in the Games when they are being organized by a State which has broken the basic rules of international society by using military aggression against another State.

Our position is quite clear. We feel that sport should be free from any kind of political interference but we also acknowledge the equally important connection between sport and a moral order which involves the entire sphere of public spirit. In view of this, we consider that the debate should be brought back to its proper level, which is sport. We have already made this point on several occasions and in several quarters.

We now turn to the representatives of the highest international sporting authority, which seems to be adopting an attitude of indignation over the injured reputation of the Olympics, and we say to them: 'Gentlemen of the IOC, since we must discuss this issue in a purely sporting context, have you not noticed, sensitive as you are about this matter, that for years a large number of the sportsmen from the so-called Socialist States do not meet the requirements for competing in the Olympics since they are not amateurs but full professionals? Sport in the Eastern bloc — this is the reality of the situation — is a compulsory business with factories for turning out champions, laboratories for the production of stimulants, and sportsmen paid by the régime. For years the world press has condemned this glaring abuse, and even sportsmen from those countries have testified to it. Were you gentlemen of the IOC not aware of all this? Were you not aware of the basic contradiction within your own Olympic organization, which, instead of defending athletic freedom and the essential attributes of this freedom based on honest training and the competitive ability of the athlete, has left unchallenged the biochemical training of athletes and competition between States instead of athletes?'

This is why we feel it is ridiculous that just now when exceptional events are taking place in the world, such as Afghanistan and the Sakharov affair, events with extremely serious implications because the illegitimate acts of the Soviets are no longer affecting just the pol-

**Petronio**

itical but also the civil sphere, the International Olympic Committee should start pointing to the non-political nature of the Games, when the same Olympic Committee has been unable, in these past years, to defend and to guarantee in line with its obligations and responsibilities the principle of athletic freedom and the independence of individuals in competitive sport.

In our view, therefore, the very decision to hold the Olympics in Moscow was an inadmissible act of surrender on the part of the Olympic authorities. If other unfortunate events have now made a large section of public opinion aware of the situation, so much the better. But the real problem remains as it was before.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Martin.

**Mr Martin.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and Gentlemen, everything which needed to be said about Mr Sakharov has already been said. The position of the French Communist Party is well known and has already been broadly stated in unequivocal terms.

As we are prevented from expressing our views properly by the time limits imposed by the majority of this Assembly, I shall keep my comments short.

I simply wish to say how much it would be appreciated if the virtuous indignation manifested, for example, by Mr Ripa di Meana, Lord Bethell and the other speakers on human rights, were to find equally forceful expression on the subject of the 'Berufsverbot' and all the other assaults on liberty and human rights in the European Community, in this famous free world of yours where seven million men and women are free to be unemployed.

As far as the Olympic Games are concerned, I would remind you of two points: first, there are the completely improper and intolerable remarks made in Washington by Mrs Veil, which led to my withdrawal from the delegation to the United States. As President of the European Assembly, Mrs Veil, regardless of what her personal opinions might be, should have respected the need for proper discretion . . .

**President.** — I cannot allow you to speak in that way: the President's statements were in conformity with the position taken by a majority of this House.

**Mr Martin.** — *(F)* Mr President, you are here to preside and not to interpret my comments!

As a Frenchwoman abroad, Mrs Veil should have remembered that it is not her function, even if she is in

Washington, to decide on the conduct of our country's policies. In the face of growing criticism, the President of our Assembly sought to justify herself here on Monday. Mrs Gredal endeavoured to fly to her rescue. Well, we can only say that it has misfired. No about-face, however acrobatically performed, can efface the oath of allegiance to Carter, delivered before an invited audience at the National Press Club in Washington, nor the unfortunate impression made on a number of those present.

Secondly, I wish to convey, on behalf of the French group of Communists and Allies, my best wishes, to the participants in the Winter Games at Lake Placid and wish them every success for the 22nd Olympiad. This can and must represent an important occasion, it can and must allow the Olympic Games to show that they are the supreme sporting event, continuing a tradition which has only been interrupted by the two world wars. This is why we consider it of the utmost importance that the Olympic year, which began yesterday, should continue to the very end as planned by the International Olympic Committee and that the Winter Games in the United States should be followed by the Summer Games in the Soviet Union.

We regard physical and sporting activities as an essential element in the progress of mankind and as an aspect of culture. As the common language of the human race, sport is an important means of communication and understanding between nations. Cooperation and exchanges in the field of sport correspond to the nations' desire for friendship, peace and universal brotherhood.

These are the fundamental reasons why we believe that the Olympic Committees and the IOC, which has just expressed its firm intention to honour the Olympic agreement concluded with the Soviet Union and is thus true to its commitments, are the only bodies qualified to decide the conditions under which the Games are to be held every four years.

We therefore feel the greatest indignation at Carter's hysterical threats and attempts at blackmail. Disregarding the autonomy of sport, Jimmy Carter seeks to weigh the Olympic Games against his ambitions and paltry self-interests which Pierre de Coubertin in his day condemned by describing them as commercial and electoral. It is intolerable that governments should be trying to hold sport hostage. Anyone who claims to be seeking peace, friendship and universal brotherhood must resist all pressure to cancel, postpone or transfer the Games. This is the reasoning behind the amendment which I have tabled on behalf of the French Group of Communists and Allies and which, if adopted, would be a credit to our Assembly.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, long live the Olympic Games!

**President.** — I call Mr De Goede.

**Mr De Goede.** — (NL) Mr President, dear colleagues, our opinion on the three motions for resolutions before us is as follows.

Firstly, we wholeheartedly condemn both the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the exile of Dr Sakharov to Gorky. The first is a flagrant violation by the Soviet Union of international law, while the exile of Dr Sakharov is a violation of human rights running counter to the agreements of Helsinki.

My second comment relates to *détente*, which is now under severe pressure but which must not be totally abandoned. This is not because we are insufficiently repelled by events, but because the only alternative to *détente* is a return to the Cold War. The inherent risk of an escalation of disputes to the point of using atomic weapons is so great as to be totally unacceptable. It is a case of one world or none, and therefore our renewed efforts towards *détente* must increase rather than slacken.

My third comment relates to the sanctions. We and others must certainly consider a boycott of the Olympic Games and a reduction or total stoppage of exports of grain and technology; but great care is necessary in view of what I have just said about *détente*. For this reason, the extent of the sanctions and the dates on which they are to come into force must be very carefully considered in order to give the Soviet Union the opportunity to take the necessary measures, thus enabling us to remove or reduce the sanctions.

Mr President, with this in mind we will vote in favour of the resolution tabled by Mr Ripa di Meana and others, but we shall abstain on the resolutions tabled by Mr Hord and Mr Blumenfeld.

**President** — I call Mr Fergusson.

**Mr Fergusson.** — Mr President, I will intrude on the patience of the House for a few moments only. The resolutions before us now on the Moscow Olympics, on the price the Soviet Government must pay for what it has done in Afghanistan and on the arrest and banishment of Andrei Sakharov, a winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, have rightly been considered together here this morning.

The motion for a resolution on the Olympic Games flows directly from the warning resolution passed here a month ago. It is a consequence of the growing presence of the Soviet forces on the territory of a people who did not threaten them, did not invite them in and wish only to be rid of them. The treatment of Professor Sakharov, a man who, because he chose to speak the truth, has literally been ostracized, is a new development, but no more acceptable and no less brutish. We approach these matters together because the Afghan invasion, the victimization of Sakharov, the

future of the Moscow Olympics and the survival of *détente* are intimately related with each other. Professor Sakharov, as we know, has been the closest associate of the monitors of the Soviet Unions's observance, or I should say, its betrayal, of the terms of the Final Act of Helsinki. When considering his elimination without trial from the Moscow scene and the arrest and imprisonment of his fellow dissidents, together with the displacement of racial minorities, notably Jews and including children, from the vicinity of the Olympic site, what are we to make of this odious business of tainting up the image of the Soviet State for public exhibition? What are we to make of the absence of Andrei Sakharov, of his wife, Yelena Bonner, and of Yuri Orlov from next week's meeting of international scientists, to be held in Hamburg under the aegis of the Helsinki Agreement? Is it the Kremlin's view that *détente* is divisible, not only geographically, as Afghanistan has shown, but economically and culturally as well? Why is it that the eyes now cast by Moscow on Yugoslavia today appear to us not as the eyes of an anxious friend, but the eyes of a circling vulture? There are two reasons: firstly, Afghanistan and secondly Sakharov. There, Mr President, we have the two hideous faces of the Soviet system paraded side by side: aggression without and oppression within. Of the connection between Sakharov and the Olympics we have only this to say to Mr Martin: the one contribution which the Soviet Government has made towards keeping politics out of sport has been to remove Andrei Sakharov and his brave friends from where the Games were to be. I have said enough to explain our vote this morning and there is no more time, but how much more need anyone say here to condemn the Soviet Government when that government, with this one ferocious, frightened gesture, has itself already said so much?

(Applause)

**President** — I call Mr Berkhouwer.

**Mr Berkhouwer** — (NL) Mr President, in the absence of Mr Blumenfeld and Mr Scott-Hopkins, it falls to me to present the resolution concerning the Olympic Games, already mentioned by a number of speakers in connection with the resolution on the arrest of Dr Sakharov.

My initial comment is that we realize only too well that we can live in one world or no world and that there is no alternative to *détente*. But with this in mind, we also realize who is at present responsible for endangering *détente*.

Concerning the Olympic Games themselves, I do not consider it correct to refer to a boycott. There is no question of boycotting the Olympic Games as such. In our opinion — and I am glad that, after a great effort, this Parliament has finally reached agreement con-

## Berkhouwer

cerning both Dr Sakharov and the Olympic Games — as things now stand the Games cannot be held in Moscow. That is the view we are defending. We, as politicians from the free Western world, do not use athletes as pawns or political hostages, as is the case with dictatorships, where athletes are reared in batteries by the state and for the greater glory of the state. We appeal to the athletes themselves, the free athletes from the free world, and to their own sense of responsibility as citizens of their countries and as citizens of this world, and we urge them not to go to a country which is at war.

The Olympic Games are a symbol of peace. In answer to the cynicism with which a French Member quoted Pierre de Coubertin, in ancient Greece no city at war with another city in Greece could go to Olympia to participate in the Olympic Games.

In view of this custom, I consider that there is all the more reason not to go to a country which is openly at war, engaged in a war of aggression with a neighbouring country despite the latter's adherence to the same political camp and the same political doctrine.

In these circumstances, we considered it expedient and appropriate to refer in our joint motion to the proposal made by President Karamanlis to depoliticize the Olympic Games and to establish a permanent site for them, which could be declared neutral territory by virtue of international law. One possibility, to which we would have no objection, is Olympia itself.

Mr President, we are forced to disregard the fine-sounding words uttered by the French Communist Member and the fraternity to which he referred. Unfortunately, there is no question of fraternity. If only there were! The Olympic Games of 1980 in Moscow would glorify this régime just as the Olympic Games of 1936 glorified the tyrannical Hitlerite régime, thanks to which the Olympic Games of 1940 could not be held. This was a personal experience for me, since between 1936 and 1940 I was training to represent the Netherlands in the 1940 Olympic Games. Therefore I know from experience the feeling of overwhelming frustration on learning that years of training have all been for nothing, and I can certainly understand the disappointment of athletes who will be unable to go to Moscow.

But to return to what I said about pawns and hostages, these athletes are also citizens with their own sense of responsibility, to which we now appeal. For this reason, the resolution tabled by us does not attempt to force countries and federations into line. Next week, our ministers will once more be meeting. We are not asking them to use force. We are requesting them to urge the Olympic Games organizations of their respective countries to ask their athletes to consider once more whether or not they wish to go to Moscow.

Unfortunately, there can be no question of fraternity. The Soviet Government's view of these games has

already been mentioned. It has been openly admitted in so many words that the Games are to contribute to the glorification of the Soviet Communist régime.

The heads of the secret services, including, I believe, Mr Andropov, have already received orders to remove dissidents from Moscow, and other religious minorities also appear to have been forced to leave Moscow for the duration of the Olympic Games. Young people are being sent to the countryside in order to avoid at all costs contamination by contact with people from the free Western world and with their ideas.

Finally, one may ask why a sanction should be imposed at this moment, and why this advice is being given to our governments and athletes. Mr President, unfortunately, if no butter is sent to the Soviet Union the authorities will probably conceal this from the people. The man in the street in the Soviet Union will notice very little, since he already receives insufficient bread and grain and must queue for hours for a little fruit. Thus, such measures will go almost unnoticed by the man in the street or the housewife.

But as we now see, a number of important countries will be absent from the Games — for example, America, Germany and Kenya, an African country of great importance in the field of athletics, having first-class athletes and always likely to win a few medals. In fact, the Games are doomed to failure, all the more so since many Arab countries are also staying away.

And what will be the outcome? If the Olympic Games are called off, the Soviet authorities will have to provide some explanation to their people, since they will be unable to conceal the fact. If this glorious event does not take place, they will be accountable to their people. Therefore, the initiators of this resolution, on which such broad agreement has been reached, hope that its formulation, *fortiter in re, sed suaviter in modo*, will meet with the approval of as many fellow Members of Parliament as possible.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Glinne.

**Mr Glinne.** — (B) Mr President and colleagues, by now a large number of countries have announced that they will not be participating in the Olympic Games in Moscow. Clearly, therefore, the Games have lost their essential features of universality and fraternal competition without which the Olympic spirit cannot exist.

The question before us today, therefore, is no longer if one is 'for' or 'against' the boycott of the Moscow Games. The problem can no longer be seen in terms of whether to participate or not, thus aligning oneself with one or other of the two opposing camps. The Olympic Games, which we have seen degraded since

Glinne

1936, are dead for 1980 in Moscow, for 1984 in Los Angeles and for the foreseeable future. The main need now is to suggest a new conception of the Olympic ideal, free from the taints of profiteering, over-commercialization, nationalism and chauvinism. The sportsmen alone should determine the form which a new competition should take and which would be held every four years at a permanent site in a country which can provide the necessary infrastructures. The site for the new Games should be permanent so as to be largely preserved from the extraordinary and inauspicious disputes about prestige which, under the present arrangements, place the states' *amour propre* and their ideological and political pretensions before the true values of sport itself.

This is the spirit in which I personally shall vote against all the resolutions before this Assembly on the Moscow Games.

**President.** — I call Mr Pürsten.

**Mr Pürsten.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, While Mr Glinne was speaking I thought towards the end that he would now be forced to draw the logical conclusion from what he had said, and I regret that he is unwilling or unable to draw this logical conclusion.

Ladies and gentlemen, those who tabled this motion are in no doubt whatsoever as to the prestige and importance of the Olympic Games, particularly for young people throughout the world. On the contrary, it is precisely our love of sport and enthusiasm for the Olympic Games which leads us to try to prevent these being abused and degraded, because this would certainly be the end of the Olympic ideal, ladies and gentlemen.

(Applause)

It is simply an illusion to assume that a distinction can be made between sport, the Olympic Games and political events, as though sport or the Olympic Games were taking place in a vacuum. Ladies and gentlemen, the Olympic Games have always been a show-piece and a source of prestige for the host country. The clearest illustration of this was, of course, in my own country when people said, now he has been recognized by the world. And because this is so, I believe we must today issue a warning to protect our sportsmen from becoming, as Mr Berkhouwer said, puppets of one particular system.

(Applause)

Unfortunately, ladies and gentlemen, success in the field of sport is becoming more and more permeated with ideology and perverted to represent the success of a particular political or ideological system. It is no

longer a particular man or woman who triumphs, but the social system, the social order. Could the Olympic ideal have become any more perverted?

When we talk boycotting, we should note that it is precisely the Soviet Union, in which the Olympic Games are taking place, that has boycotted so many sporting events. In the last 15 years, the Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc have boycotted 10 world championships; they did not go to Argentina, Berlin or Madrid because they disapproved of the prevailing system or of political events which were taking place. This should not be forgotten . . .

(Applause)

. . . Now it is proposed to hold the Olympic Games for the first time in a country which has invaded another country and occupied it. I ask you in all seriousness: can we really expect the world's young sportsmen and women to take part in Olympic Games in a country which has violated the most fundamental obligation under the Olympic ideal namely, to maintain peace in the world? Hence our appeal, our recommendation to the Soviet Union to withdraw its troops so as to give the world and the young people in the world a chance to meet together again in peace. This appeal must come from the House as a whole.

Mr Berkhouwer has mentioned the bitter disappointment for sportsmen who have made sacrifices for many years and given up a great deal in order to be able to take part in these games. To them we can say only one thing: there are more important tasks and overriding values namely, the values of peace and humanity which must take priority even over the aims which they have set themselves.

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr Glinne rightly said that the Olympic ideal had become perverted to a very great extent. It has become a show, it has in part become chauvinist and, ladies and gentlemen, commercial interests are dominating sport more and more. Here we need to think again. Next year our colleagues from Greece, representing the mother country of the Olympic Games, will be sitting amongst us. Should not this newly-emerging Europe also take up this idea anew and consider together with our Greek colleagues — on this point, Mr Glinne, I agree with you entirely — whether a new beginning could not be made in cooperation with representatives from the world of sport? We can only operate in a helping capacity. But if we as a Parliament, as a unified Europe, made this offer to venture a new beginning down there, in the mother country of the Olympic Games, on a more modest scale so that smaller countries too could participate, excluding commercial interests and solely guided by Coubertin's idea, then this would be a genuine contribution on our part to the Olympic Games.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Hänsch.

**Mr Hänsch.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Berkhouwer has claimed that we are not dealing with a boycott but that we are debating and passing a resolution that the Olympic Games should not be held in Moscow this summer. In my opinion this argument will not hold water. It is based on flimsy pretexts and misleading statements.

On behalf of my German colleagues in the Socialist Group, I should like to summarize the three basic arguments put forward in the debate until now: the moral argument, the punishment argument and the argument that sanctions must be taken against the Soviet Union, the aggressor in Afghanistan, whose actions in this country we condemn just as we condemn the exiling of Sakharov. The moral argument, ladies and gentlemen, is cant. When the decision was taken in 1974 to hold the Olympic Games in Moscow, it was clear to everyone, the Olympic committees and all the governments, in what country these Olympic Games were to be held. Even then human rights were being violated in the Soviet Union. Nothing has changed since then, and those who put forward moral arguments today should reflect on what they did six years ago.

(Cries from Mr Bangemann)

Mr Bangemann, six years before 1974 the Soviet Union had marched into Czechoslovakia. Your moral arguments are basically only arguments for a certain period after which one can afford to forget. In a year's time, you will notice that we are in the process of destroying the instruments for a better, sensible co-existence with the nations of Eastern Europe which it has taken a decade to create. We shall live to regret this.

The second argument, ladies and gentleman, the punishment argument, is dangerous because it will have the opposite effect to that intended. In fact you will forge even closer links between the East European states and the Soviet Union, and instead of freeing the mass of the Soviet population from its régime, you will engender a feeling of solidarity, which is precisely what we do not want.

Finally, there is the argument about the need for sanctions. We are not prepared to do anything that would harm our business transactions with the Soviet Union; and obviously we cannot afford to do so: it is the sportmen who now are to bear the brunt. But everyone knows, ladies and gentlemen, that a boycott of the Olympic Games will not make the Soviet Union withdraw its troops from Afghanistan; a boycott of the Olympic Games will not make the Soviet Union recall Sakharov from exile. Nothing useful will be achieved by this boycott; instead, we shall be killing the Olympic Games not only for 1980 but in all probability for ever. Let us put this debate in its proper perspective.

Let us say the Olympic Games are finished. Fair enough; it is not the end of the world, the world will go on even without the Olympic Games. But we wish to say to the sportsmen that as long as it is at all possible, we wish to see the Games continue to take place. If today you wish to kill off the Olympic Games, so be it. But then take care that you do this for reasons which will still be accepted by the world 10 or 20 years hence.

**President.** — I call Mr Sarre.

**Mr Sarre.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Olympic Games cannot be used as a political weapon. This would not represent a responsible approach to politics. In the present situation, it is incumbent upon us to do everything in our power to maintain *détente* and to refuse to toe the line slavishly.

To my knowledge, participation in the Olympic Games has never constituted an evaluation, and far less approval of the political systems in the host states. Although we clearly and unequivocally condemn military intervention, either, as now, in Afghanistan or, as was previously the case, in Vietnam, we know that a return to the cold war can only increase tension and danger, particularly in Europe.

We must prevent this happening.

For the time being, it is a question of preserving this opportunity for sportsmen from all over the world to meet. We should not accept that athletes are forbidden to meet in Moscow while daily exchanges are taking place with visits by industrialists and financiers. Such incredible hypocrisy can only serve to gull and mislead the public. Let us, ladies and gentlemen, not be duped by a manoeuvre the implications of which, will doubtless be revealed before very long!

**President.** — I call Mr Cariglia.

**Mr Cariglia.** — (I) Mr President, I think that no one in this Assembly can be unaware of the fact that the invasion of Afghanistan was and is a threat to world peace. As our colleague Willy Brandt pointed out at a meeting of this Assembly's Political Affairs Committee, this has been the greatest threat to world peace since the end of the war. We are therefore facing an extremely serious situation.

I now ask this Assembly to recognize that the seriousness of the world political situation is not compatible with the objectives of the Olympic Games. This incompatibility is therefore a fact which is acknowledged by world public opinion.

The second point on which I would like the Assembly to reflect is that the Games are now jeopardized and

**Cariglia**

that the countries which do not wish to boycott the Games run the risk of being used by the Soviet Union against those countries which have boycotted the Games.

Now I think it must be quite obvious that no one wants to use or be used. We must therefore realize that these events have taken place and that countries where freedom of opinion and the fundamental freedoms do not exist can take the liberty — without being accountable to anyone — of invading another country and doubting its independence. These, unfortunately, are indisputable facts. Although we can only take note of them, we must not in any way associate ourselves with the policy being pursued by the Soviet Union in the world today.

I have made this brief declaration, Mr President, on behalf of other colleagues also: Ripa di Meana, Puletti, Ferri, Orlandi and Pelikan, of the Socialist Group.

**President.** — I call Mr Haferkamp.

**Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (D) Mr President, the debate in Parliament on 16 January showed that while it is not particularly difficult to arrive at agreement on basic issues, it is more difficult when it is a question of establishing what definite steps can and should be taken. The Commission is again today completely in agreement with Parliament on the basic issues which have been discussed — namely, the condemnation of aggression and the violation of human rights.

As regards what positive action can be taken, the Commission must act within the limits of Community policy and the instruments available to the Community. On 16 January, we explained how the range of possibilities varied according to different sectors of Community activities.

Since then the Community has deployed the instruments available within the limits of Community policy; it has improved them and made them keener. This applies to agricultural policy within the Community, as explained on 16 January and also later to the Political Affairs Committee, particularly by the President, Mr Jenkins. It also applies to export credits: on 5 February, the Member States decided to accept a proposal from the Commission not to make use of the possibilities under the OECD agreement on credits to make exceptions in favour of the Soviet Union.

In its resolution of 16 January, Parliament demanded that all economic relations with the Soviet Union be re-examined and a report submitted to the Council. I can inform you that this re-examination is currently taking place.

I have referred to Community policy, the instruments available to the Community and the need for the Commission to adhere to these. Clearly the subject of the Olympic Games, which is being discussed here today, does not belong in this category. I can, therefore, not comment on this on behalf of the Commission. But perhaps you will allow me to make a personal comment on this issue, which is of such concern to us and so many people in Europe. The year 1936 has been mentioned. At that time I was a schoolboy, but after 1945 I met many older people who had belonged to the resistance during the Nazi régime and who had been persecuted, imprisoned and who had emigrated. They told me after 1945 that for years after 1933 they had still harboured hopes in the battle against dictatorship and for freedom. But they also told me that their hopes had largely been dashed when in 1936 the world went to Berlin.

*(Loud applause)*

**President.** — The debate is closed. Before passing to the vote, we shall now hear the explanations of vote.

I call Mr Rogers.

**Mr Rogers.** — Mr President, I shall support the resolutions that approve sending a team to the Olympic Games on very specific grounds.

The first one is that very recently some of my colleagues, who seem to be applying double standards, very warmly welcomed China back into the Olympic movement without forgetting that the country next to Afghanistan, Tibet, is still occupied by a Chinese army without the invitation of the Tibetan people, many of whom have fled to India. And, indeed, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom very recently welcomed the President of China. Let us remember that.

Secondly, I shall support sending a team because during the Vietnam war, which every one, I presume, here abhorred, every country in Europe maintained sporting relations with the United States. Therefore, I do not believe we ought to apply double standards here.

Thirdly, countries in Europe such as Switzerland and Italy, where Stanley Adams languished in jail without trial for exposing the activities of multinational companies, which one of the leaders of our colleagues on the other side of the House called the ugly face of capitalism . . .

*(Protests)*

Fourthly, I would not like to deprive our heavily sponsored 'free' athletes from fulfilling their ambitions.

*(Protests)*

**Rogers**

I accept that political double standards operate at all levels. But let us not extend them to our young athletes, who have been training very hard. Yes, I certainly accept that they are citizens and have the right to exercise their rights as well, and if they do not wish to go then they should not go. I am very proud indeed that, when the British Lions toured South Africa, the only person who had the courage, after being selected, to stand up and say he would not support a régime like South Africa was John Taylor, a Welshman.

Search your consciences! If you are happy with Chinese troops in Tibet, if you are happy with Vietnam, if you are happy with what the Swiss and Italian legal systems are doing to Stanley Adams, then apply your double standards. I am not going to apply them on your behalf.

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

**Mr van Minnen.** — (NL) Mr President, explanations of vote are often superfluous, since the vote itself is sufficiently clear. Nevertheless, now that we have become involved in a black-and-white situation, an explanation of vote is in my opinion necessary, since the reasons for our vote may be wrongly interpreted.

I would oppose the immediate declaration of a boycott, because I absolutely refuse to allow myself to be used in the 'Carter for President' campaign. I also refuse to allow myself to be dragged along in the wake of a political reaction which would totally destroy *détente* and whose objectives I cannot accept. An explanation is required since simply voting against the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Blumenfeld would not make matters clear. Equally, I do not wish to be identified with the reprehensible attitude of certain members of the IOC and similar organizations, with those who still maintain that sport and politics can remain separate in their Olympic jubilee, with those who, moreover, continue to demonstrate that their political views are even further to the right than those of the right wing of this Parliament, themselves extreme in this case. Such people do not care, and have never cared, whether or not they organize festivities in stadiums in which political prisoners have been kept. They cannot see any further than their own reception halls; they only care about banquets and, given the chance, would have organized the 1944 Olympic Games in Dachau. I do not wish my vote against the boycott to be in any way interpreted as even a shimmer of trust in such hypocrisy as that displayed by certain sports officials.

Mr President, the problem is not whether or not we are to hold the 1980 Olympic Games in Moscow. The problem is, I must confess, the possibility that we may become incurably corrupted by Olympic Games such as these.

**President.** — I call Mrs Bonino.

**Mrs Bonino.** — (I) Mr President, colleagues, I shall vote in favour of the resolution tabled by Mr Blumenfeld and others on the Olympic Games.

(*Applause from certain quarters on the right*)

I shall vote in favour because I am against violence, and the best means of non-violent resistance and combat is refusal to collaborate: refusal to collaborate with the perpetrators of violence, refusal to collaborate with invaders. It is true that today I shall probably find myself voting with many colleagues who adopted a different attitude when there was question of boycotting the final of the Davis Cup in Chile; but that simply shows your inconsistency, since we have always adopted a coherent policy of non-violence. We wanted a boycott of the Davis Cup in Chile just as we now want a boycott of the Olympic Games in Moscow.

Mr President, I should be grateful if you would allow me to continue. The fact that not all those who now want a boycott of the Games in the USSR protested then against the Pinochet dictatorship shows an inconsistency on their part which is certainly not in their favour, but that is their problem, not ours. I am not worried either by the accusation that I am supporting Carter's policy: we are so far from having anything in common with him that any apparent point of agreement does not bother us in the least.

I wish to state here again the view of the Soviet dissidents Bukhovskiy and Ginzburg, who, as early as 1976, asked for a boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games, not of course in connection with Afghanistan but with the violation of civil rights in the Soviet Union. I think it is important that their view should be expressed here, as it has been confirmed to me in the past few days. The Olympics are not a question of sport, and I agree with Mr Glinne that the whole matter should be redefined and that it would be better to have a permanent venue for the Games. However, in the meantime, as things stand, I think a boycott of the Moscow Games is necessary, because refusal to collaborate with the perpetrators of violence, refusal to collaborate with invaders, is the only course open to us.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — I call Mr Seal.

**Mr Seal.** — Mr President, one of the most dangerous situations you can arrive at is one of mutual incomprehension, and that is a state that we often reach in this Chamber. It is because of this that we need to maintain all possible links with the Russians — in culture, science and sport. We must pursue *détente* with the Russians. And it is no good the other side of the House

## Seal

booing and shouting, because surely we have always known how bad the Russian system is. We have always known what the Russians are like. It has not suddenly dawned on us now, as it seems to have suddenly dawned upon Jimmy Carter. And why should we support Jimmy Carter in his election campaign? Even in the USA, people are acknowledging that he is only taking a tough stand over the Olympic Games because of the pressure he is coming under from Kennedy over his weak attitude to the Russians in Cuba. And so he is having to react.

I am going to support the amendment, Mr President, which says we should continue with the Olympic Games in Moscow, and I am going to vote to reject the motion.

Some people here have mentioned South Africa. And some of the Conservatives have said that sport and politics do not mix. What absolute nonsense! Sport and politics do mix, but the difference between the situation in South Africa and this situation is that in South Africa race is built into sport. That is not the case with the Russians.

It is no new thing to have to deal with dictatorships: two-thirds of the world happens to be ruled by dictatorships at the moment. I did not hear any of the Conservatives or any one else opposing the World Cup when that was held in Argentina — held under a most repressive régime at that particular time.

I feel, Mr President, that we in this House must react in a balanced way. We must pursue *détente*, we must hold the Olympic Games in Moscow.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the left)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Van den Heuvel.

**Mrs Van den Heuvel.** — *(NL)* Mr President, I have repeatedly expressed my views in this Chamber on the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. After that invasion, I spoke in favour of taking part in the Olympic Games because I considered that at all costs we should avoid any action likely to endanger *détente* and that politics and sport are closely interlinked. Anyone maintaining the contrary is simply using this fiction as an alibi to defend his own position.

I have always maintained — in my opinion, consistently — that every opportunity should be taken to support those who suffer from the violation of human rights in dictatorial countries. I have been more consistent than the large majority of this Parliament, which now suddenly realizes what must be done concerning the Olympic Games in Moscow but which, on numerous other occasions, has shown a complete lack of interest.

In view of Dr Sakharov's exile and the measures taken against those who act according to their consciences and not according to the dictates of the State, I must say that I have considerable doubts as to the purpose of taking part in the Moscow Olympic Games, since the object to which I have always aspired can no longer be attained. However, I wish to reserve my final judgement for as long as possible, thus allowing for a response to any change of heart by the Soviet Union. I am not very optimistic in this respect, but wish to allow for the possibility.

As things now stand, I shall vote against all resolutions and their amendments concerning the Olympic Games.

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

**Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul.** — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall vote against the motion tabled by Mr Blumenfeld and others calling for a boycott of the Olympic Games. But I also do not wish to support the position expressed here by Mr Martin. I believe that in both cases double standards are being applied, with which I do not wish to be associated. In my opinion, the only person who so far has produced credible moral arguments on the subject of a boycott of the Olympic Games, is Mrs Bonino. I am quite prepared to believe that she is sincere on this issue, but if one demands a boycott of the games, as proposed by the Christian Democrats and Conservatives, while having remained silent on other occasions, then I find that it is impossible to adopt a convincing moral position and it is apparent that human rights are simply being used as a tactical device in the political arena. I believe that this detracts from their importance and moral necessity. Before all these events took place, I personally supported a Dutch committee which had advocated taking part in the Olympic Games and then making representations on behalf of dissidents on the spot in Moscow.

*(Laughter)*

I supported this proposal and was also in favour of not boycotting the World Cup but of attending and protesting against dictatorial régimes which trample on human rights and torture their opponents. Where were you, the right-wing Members of this Parliament, when the question of a boycott or a protest in Argentina, where a right-wing régime is in power, arose? Where were you, I should like to know?

*(Sporadic applause from the left)*

Anyone who adopts such a partisan attitude deprives his arguments in favour of human rights of all validity. In the case of some Conservatives and Christian Democrats — and I stress, some — they are simply concerned to exploit the present situation to prevent a

**Wieczorek-Zeul**

dialogue between East and West. God knows, I am no supporter of the ideal of these Olympic Games, because it has been sufficiently degraded, but I am of the opinion that opportunities for contact and discussions should not be rejected out of hand, because contact between Eastern and Western Europe is absolutely essential for us Western Europeans.

We shall be the ones to suffer if the cold-war climate intensifies. As Western Europeans, we must adopt an independent attitude and not allow ourselves to be guided by the domestic political affairs of others. It is these issues of principle relating to human rights and the need to keep the options for *détente* open which will lead me to vote against the proposal from the Christian Democrats and Conservatives. At the same time, I do not wish to be associated with the position formulated by a French Communist. His position is, of course, equally unacceptable. Because what position have the French Communists adopted in relation to Afghanistan? In their assessment of Afghanistan, they have taken over wholesale the official ideology of the Soviet Union, and that is a position which I expressly reject and condemn.

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

**Mr Herman.** — (F) Mr President, the majority of speakers are clearly abusing the provisions of Rule 26 (3) of the Rules of Procedure. The entire debate is being repeated.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the right)*

The explanations of vote allow at least a hundred people three minutes each, and we have just seen that this period of time may be extended, so that the entire function of the explanation of vote is perverted and our proceedings completely disrupted.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the right)*

Mr President, as the person responsible for the orderly conduct of business, I would ask that you no longer accept explanations of vote which exceed the limits allowed by the Rules of Procedure.

**President.** — Mr Herman, I always value your advice. Nevertheless, I think I have adhered strictly to the Rules. One may, of course, regret the fact that the Rules allow an unlimited number of explanations of vote, but they do impose a time-limit of three minutes, which none of the speakers so far has exceeded. As for imposing a censorship on the content of speeches, I have no intention of doing so.

*(Sporadic applause)*

I call Miss Flesch.

**Miss Flesch.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, as a Member of this Parliament who has taken part in three Olympic Games as an athlete and two Olympic Games as an official and who now is active in politics, I should like to explain why I shall be voting in favour of the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Blumenfeld and others: Mr President, from this day forth the spirit of the Olympic Games is dead.

*(Loud applause from the centre and right)*

**President.** — I call Mr Gabert.

**Mr Gabert.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I regret very much that the gratifying unanimity which prevailed in the discussion of the scandalous treatment meted out to Mr Sakharov by the Soviet Government, which is important for this Parliament, has given way to a discussion of this kind. I was one of the signatories to the Sakharov motion because, as one of those persecuted by the National Socialists, I would never hesitate to protest against violations of human rights anywhere, regardless of the type of régime involved. I shall, therefore, do so passionately at every opportunity.

As far as the Olympic Games are concerned, I should like to say that it is extremely difficult for a parliament to take a decision on this matter. I have followed all the arguments very closely. I shall abstain from voting on the Blumenfeld motion. I believe that in this case we should leave the decision in the first instance to the sportsmen themselves and in particular the International Olympic Committee. I feel that this issue goes beyond Parliament's competence, and we have heard opinions enough. I shall, as I said, abstain from voting on this issue.

**President.** — I call Mr Puletti.

**Mr Puletti.** — (I) Mr President, for the very same reasons that Sakharov, from his exile in Gorky, requested the free peoples of the West not to participate in the Games, I shall vote in favour of the Blumenfeld resolution against participation in the Olympic Games. Sport and politics are inseparable and those who claim that sport is independent forget that at a serious time like this, measures such as those normally adopted by the Soviet Union against its dissidents cannot be ignored.

I should also like to explain why I interrupted my friend and colleague, Mr Rogers. He referred to Italy as a country which exercises repression and mentioned the Adams case. As the chairman of my group will confirm, we received Adams just a month ago; he is free, has never been in prison in Italy and has received regular assistance from the movement to which I

**Puletti**

belong. Anyone who describes Italy as repressive is only spurring on the terrorist forces we have to fight.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* Mr President, I do not know if my friend and colleague Mr Puletti was very active at the time to achieve a boycott of the sporting events organized in Latin America. We were, and have not changed our position today.

*(Loud cries from certain quarters)*

Mr President, we have always opposed any ostensibly sporting event in any totalitarian situation or where human rights are not respected. At 50, I am old enough to be able to say that, as a radical, it is the approach which I have had the opportunity to follow since the time when, as some of you here have witnessed, I was Italian student president in 1953 until the present day.

No alibi for an ideal which has been pronounced dead and which has never been what it was supposed to be! The realities of race, class and money have always been in the background of this so-called Olympic ideal. Does Olympia have the same meaning for someone who lives in sub-proletarian poverty in Africa, Asia or Bangladesh as for someone who lives in Moscow, Rome or elsewhere? You will discover the old contradictions!

It is even said that science is not entirely neutral with regard to politics and class. How can you expect the organization of sport to be so? The Italian radicals and pacifists believe that freedom is like life itself. Either one respects it in every case or one is never credible when one claims to be respecting it after the event. Mr President, a parliament and politicians who seem indifferent to a holocaust which consumes 40 million people a year are not credible when they proclaim to terrorist murderers that life is sacred. If the life of Italian politicians is sacred, then also the lives of the 18 million children who are murdered by depriving them of bread is sacred. Freedom is like life, Mr President: I believe that those who fought against imperialism and against the actions of the United States in Vietnam were qualified to take part in this march.

**President.** — I call Mr Kirk.

**Mr Kirk.** — *(DK)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I wish to say that I intend to vote for the motion for a resolution for the following reasons: the Soviet Union has shown — and we have known it for many years — that it does not respect human rights. It has shown this, for example, by banishing Sakharov to

Gorky. However, the Soviet Union also demonstrated over Christmas that it does not respect the rights of nations either. I feel that this is just as serious as the failure to respect the rights of individual human beings. Their lack of respect for the rights of nations means that we are confronted with a threat to the Western world.

I am convinced that the Soviet Union will not refrain from mixing politics and sport if the Olympic Games are held in Moscow. Precisely in view of the prospect that politics will be mixed with sport, I feel that the Western world must show that it refuses to participate and thereby be a party to the Soviet Union's continuing violation of the rights of individuals and of the sovereignty of individual countries.

*(Applause from various quarters in the European Democratic Group)*

**President.** — I call Mr Pelikan.

**Mr Pelikan.** — *(I)* Mr President, I did not intend to speak, but I must explain my vote in favour of a boycott of the Olympic Games, since other colleagues — including some from my own group — have expressed different views, which I respect.

I want to appeal to all of you European Members not to think of the leaders or groups of leaders of these countries when you are taking decisions like this. You should think of the peoples, because they too are European, and it is not true that they always identify with their leaders. I was personally in favour of going to the Olympic Games in order to raise the human rights issue there. However, after the expulsion of Sakharov and the arrest of hundreds of other dissidents who are fighting for application of the Helsinki Agreements, I feel there is very little scope for dialogue in Moscow, particularly since a large number of countries have announced that they will not take part and since participation with which is regarded by the Soviet leaders as support for their policy, has become a political referendum.

I therefore ask you to imagine the feelings of Yuri Orlov, who was condemned to seven years in prison simply because he asked for respect of the Helsinki Agreements and who received two further sentences after he had been imprisoned, When he sees on television — if they force him to look at it — the flags of so many people on parade. The same applies to hundreds and thousands of political prisoners in the Soviet Union. Even Sakharov will be forced to watch these Olympic Games from his forced exile in the closed city of Gorky. I should like to repeat what Mr Haferkamp very courageously said: if there is such a thing as hope, let us hope that a price will be paid for every act of aggression and every violation of human rights.

**Pelikan**

To those who say that the boycott poses a threat to *détente*, I must reply that it definitely does not, because I am in favour of *détente* and the Olympic Games are not the only instrument of international policy: there are many fields in which we can continue the dialogue. What I am saying is that the price of *détente* should not be silence on injustices and acts of aggression.

(Applause)

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

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — (I) Mr President, I am in favour of this resolution, that is, I am against holding the Olympic Games in Moscow.

In addition to this briefstatement, I should like to point out that some of us in this Parliament had the courage to adopt a similar position at the sitting of 11-12 January and did not allow ourselves to be influenced by political groups or factions. I think we are now living at a time when the individual and therefore — here — the European deputy, is able to react to dramatic events, violence and bloodshed in accordance with his own morals and ethics rather than those of right or left-wing groups, which, as we have seen from the speakers of this Parliament's Socialist Group and parties of the left, can no longer be regarded in the old orthodox way. Voices have been raised in disagreement, voices of deputies who had difficulty in adopting a certain line; voices of deputies — such as Mr Pelikan — who have reminded us that today's decision concerns the feelings of the Soviet people before the array of flags of all nations which will be seen on Soviet television by all those who are suffering in concentration camps and who, like Sakharov, are condemned to exile and imprisonment.

*Détente* will be threatened by those who, by adopting an attitude of impotence and ideological and moral weakness, in a passive, cowardly way accept the acts of aggression perpetrated by the Soviet Union against Afghanistan and Sakharov; it is pure hypocrisy for Europe's left to talk of human rights if it adopts such an attitude. And if the only course open to us — empty-handed as we are — is condemnation, at least let it be realized that all those who say 'No' to the Olympic Games in Moscow will be supporting peace and *détente* by saying to the Soviet Union that we are committed people determined to fight for freedom and human rights in a genuine rather than a hypocritical way.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

**President.** — We now proceed to the vote.

I put to the vote the *Ripa di Meana et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-778/79/rev.II): Arrest of the scientist Andrei Sakharov.*

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

I put to the vote the *Hord et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-773/79): Invasion of Afghanistan by Russia and the outrageous treatment of Professor Sakharov.*

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

We proceed to the *Blumenfeld et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-779/79/rev.): Moscow Olympic Games.*

I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Martin, replacing the whole of the motion for a resolution with the following new text:

- considering the Olympic Games as a major demonstration of peace and friendship between the nations, young people and athletes of the whole world.
- considering the fact that, except during the two World Wars, their organization has never been called into question.
- considering the International Olympic Committee's sovereign decision to confirm the City of Moscow as the venue of the 1980 Games.
  1. Considers that no argument should be allowed to jeopardize the holding of the Moscow Olympic Games;
  2. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and Commission and to the authorities of the Member States.

I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is rejected.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

I call Mr Seal on a point of order.

**Mr Seal.** — Mr President, my point of order relates to the system used in this House for notifying Members that a vote is about to take place. Would it not be possible to ring the bells early enough to enable Members outside the Chamber to return to their seats in time to vote? It seems pointless ringing the bells during or after the vote.

## 8. Agenda

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

<sup>1</sup> OTC ....

**Mr Chambeiron.** — (*F*) Mr President, I apologize to the Assembly for my persistence, but I said this morning that I was concerned to find such an important report as that by Mr Gillot on the Law of the Sea (Doc. 1-725/79) on the agenda. It is now 11.15 a.m., and we began the first item at 9 a.m. If we embark upon a debate on the Gillot report, I do not know when we are going to finish. The agenda for this Assembly, Mr President, also includes a discussion of the motions on emergency aid and planned and coordinated aid from the EEC to the island of Réunion.

Perhaps you will allow me to point out briefly that the problem of the Conference on the Law of the Sea is one which has been with us for years, while the hurricane has caused devastation and suffering for which relief must be provided immediately. I therefore believe it would be sensible if this Assembly were to put off discussion of this report to that it may be dealt with in worthy fashion and considered thoroughly, and to begin immediately the debate on the problem of the hurricane on the island of Réunion.

**President.** — I call Mr Gillot.

**Mr Gillot, rapporteur.** — (*F*) Mr President and colleagues, in view of the fact that the ninth session of the third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea is due to begin soon and that the subjects dealt with are extremely important, our Assembly must, I think, immediately make its position clear on the major points requiring its attention before the Conference begins. On the other hand, I am sure that it will be necessary to return to this crucial matter during the Conference, possibly on a number of occasions.

**President.** — I put to the vote Mr Chambeiron's proposal on the deferment of the Gillot report.

The proposal is adopted. The Gillot report is therefore deferred.

#### 9. Aid to Réunion — Provisional twelfths (debate and vote)

**President.** — The next item is a joint debate on:

- Motion for a resolution by Mr Debré, Mr Gendebien, Mrs Spaak, Mr Ansquer, Mr Buchou, Mr Chirac, Mrs Chouraqui, Mr Deleau, Mr Druon, Mrs Dienesch, Mr Gillot, Mr Labbé, Mr Messmer, Mr Poncelet, Mr Remilly, Mrs Weiss, Mr de la Malène, Mr Cronin, Mr Davern, Mr Flanagan, Mr Lalor, Mr Nyborg, Mrs Ewing and Miss de Valera on aid to the disaster-stricken overseas department of Réunion (Doc. 1-713/79);
- Motion for a resolution by Mr Vergés, Mr Gremetz, Mr Piquet, Mr Woltjer, Mr Denis, Mr Poniatowski,

Mr Cohen, Mr Lomas, Mr Fich, Mr Lezzi, Mr Kuhn, Mr Schmitt, Mr Pearce, Mr Simmonds, Mr Sablé, Mr Moreau, Mr Ferrero, Mr Jaquet, Mr Estier, Mrs Focke, Mrs Poirier on emergency aid and planned and coordinated aid from the EEC to the island of Réunion, which has been devastated by hurricane Hyacinth (Doc. 1-751/79); and

- Report by Mr Dankert, on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, in application of Article 204 of the EEC Treaty and Article 8 of the Financial Regulation, authorizing further provisional twelfths for Section III (Commission) of the general budget of the European Communities (Doc. 1-793/79).

I call Mr Debré.

**Mr Debré.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, this island of Réunion is a department of the French Republic situated in the Indian Ocean and thus belongs to the Common Market. I would add that, as a department of the French Republic, the island of Réunion stands, geographically speaking, at the crossroads of Africa and Asia like a proud sentinel of the Western world, but as a result it has become the subject of much jealousy and cupidity.

The island of Réunion was hit by an exceptional tropical depression, followed by a hurricane. As the only Member of this Assembly present during those long days of depression and those long hours of the hurricane, I can vouch for the serious effects they had. People have died or disappeared in Réunion, especially as a result of subsidence; fortunately, the rigour of the evacuation orders, which were respected and carried out in time, kept the number of victims down.

But many people in Réunion have been hit, some because their houses have been carried away by the rivers in flood and others because the fact that water and electricity supplies were interrupted and roads cut, particularly in the mountains, isolated them for varying lengths of time from the rest of the island.

Réunion has also suffered serious damage to its agriculture, to its stock-raising, its cereals and market gardening, to its aromatic plants, in other words, to all its efforts to diversify its agriculture. Sugarcane alone, as a vital source of agricultural income, has suffered relatively little.

Finally, Réunion has sustained very serious damage to its infrastructure. It is the fate of a land which is well set up in roads, dykes for its rivers, and port and industrial installations to suffer more than lands which are less well equipped.

**Debré**

Mr President, while asking, as a Member of this Assembly, for a vote in favour of the Community authorities giving consideration to the request for assistance by the Government of the French Republic, I feel I should point out the degree of solidarity shown by the inhabitants of the island, who helped each other and agreed to make an extra financial effort while all those who were affected in both the town and the countryside were getting back to work.

I feel I should also point out the solidarity of the French nation, shown in particular by the very generous decisions taken yesterday by the Government of the French Republic. But Réunion, a little part of France — and, as such, a little part of Europe and the West — gratefully accepted the participation of the European Economic Community in the emergency aid which immediately arrived from outside. It is looking forward, with the same feelings, to an additional sign of solidarity from the Common Market as a whole to help it with its reconstruction. I bring you in advance, together with the assurance that these funds will be properly used to rebuild homes, to save crops and to replace infrastructures, the thanks of a population which is distressed but courageous, hard-working and, in any case, conscious of the debt it will owe for the solidarity shown towards it.

**President.** — I call Mr Vergès.

**Mr Vergès.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to start by thanking the Assembly for putting on the agenda of its debates the problem of aid for the island of Réunion following its devastation by Hurricane Hyacinth, and I should also like to thank the Bureau for maintaining it on the agenda despite the large number of questions to be debated today and the fact that several of them have been taken off today's agenda.

There is no glory in having been or not having been in Réunion during the hurricane. I must, however, put the facts straight, after what our colleague said earlier, by pointing out that I too, unfortunately, was in Réunion at the time and that, though I was not seen on television as often as he, I was among the stricken population.

Three weeks ago, ten days of torrential rain followed by the passage close to the island of a deep tropical depression caused a real disaster: 37 people killed or disappeared, 7 700 made homeless, considerable damage to the thousands of makeshift dwellings in the shanty-towns flooded by mud and water, houses carried off, a road network and the telecommunications, water and sewage networks seriously damaged, crops totally or partially destroyed, cattle decimated — such is the toll of the disaster.

A first official estimate puts the damage at 730 million francs, or nearly 125 million EUA. This represents

more than 10 % of Réunion's GDP. It is necessary to bring help rapidly to the stricken population and also to help reconstitute the island's agricultural potential, repair its infrastructure and rehouse the population of the makeshift and unhealthy urban shanty-towns and of the country areas.

In the last few months, the devastating Hurricanes David and Frederick have hit the Caribbean islands of Dominica, Martinique, Guadeloupe, Haiti, etc., and Hurricanes Claudette and Hyacinth have hit Mauritius and Réunion in the South-West Indian Ocean. Our Assembly is therefore creating a real tradition of solidarity with the hard-hit peoples of tropical countries which are part of the Community or are associated with it.

I should make it clear that the motion for a resolution which I am presenting to you has, in fact, been tabled on behalf of all our colleagues present at the last meeting of the Committee on Development in Brussels, both those whose signatures appear on the text and those who were materially unable to sign it at the end of the meeting. Similarly, we should note the fact that the Commission has decided very quickly to send, as an emergency measure, the maximum possible amount under the present system of provisional twelfths, 300 000 EUA, and that it will supplement this with a second instalment of 1 million EUA. It is thanks to the extremely understanding attitude of the Committee on Budgets, to whom thanks are due on this occasion, in view of the exceptional conditions stressed in its report, that we shall be able to see this decision applied after our vote in a few moments' time.

This emergency aid must, as its name suggests, be distributed as a matter of urgency. He who gives rapidly gives twice, as one of our colleagues said during the debate on the West Indies. But the urgent distribution of large sums also implies the need to control them by involving the elected representatives and the professional organizations in all the schemes. This is what our Assembly called for during the debates at the end of 1979 and in January 1980. But it has not happened in the West Indies, where both elected representatives and professional organizations are protesting.

In Réunion too, it seems that the same thing is happening, as I have seen for myself. And at the present time, the Prefecture of the island seems to have no news of the first instalment of 300 000 EUA sent off by the Commission more than a fortnight ago. This is a serious problem.

But the most important part remains to be done. In the effort to reconstitute the Réunion economy, the EAGGF, the European Regional Development Fund and the European Social Fund must participate, in the sectors with which they are concerned, in the elaboration and financing of the planned programmes of the French Government. The participation of two Commission representatives in the recent inter-Ministerial

## Vergès

mission sent to the island by the French Government should facilitate this. We hope there will be a debate on this shortly, but we should at this stage learn from our mistakes, which have had such tragic consequences, and make sure they are not repeated.

Réunion is a mountainous tropical country. There is a permanent risk of erosion, and any land improvement schemes, particularly in mountainous regions, must bear this in mind. Similarly, the water-flow is extremely variable, changing, in the space of a few days, from the volume of a mere stream to that of a major European river in flood. It is therefore necessary to protect areas which are already inhabited and to avoid establishing new settlements in threatened areas. The vote we are about to take — which will, I hope, be unanimous — will give a clear indication of our intentions as regards the needed solidarity and in all other respects.

## IN THE CHAIR: MR ROGERS

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Dankert.

**Mr Dankert, rapporteur.** — (F) Today's debate is proof of the speed of the provisional-twelfths system.

I believe European procedures have never moved so fast as in the present case, where we are having a debate on aid for Réunion and at the same time on a proposal by the Committee on Budgets for the provision of that aid from today.

Mr President, the irony of this affair lies in the fact that these motions should come from two Members who recently voted against rejection of the budget but now need to have recourse to the provisional-twelfths to help their constituencies.

The Committee on Budgets, Mr Debré, accordingly proposes to grant you under the provisional-twelfths system, 823,000 EUA as commitment appropriations — representing two twelfths — and 1,600,000 EUA as payment appropriations — representing four twelfths. Despite the absence of documents, despite disagreement between certain documents — the Commission's twelfths differed from the Council's twelfths — the Committee on Budgets has finally agreed on the Council's position and therefore asks you to accept these proposals. It should, however, be added that in view of the procedural difficulties that have emerged, we shall not in future be able to take a decision on a problem of this kind unless the documents are available at the time.

Mr President, in order to keep the debate short, I have also been speaking on behalf of the Socialist Group, and I should like you to know that the Socialist Group supports these proposals.

**President.** — I call Mr Haferkamp.

**Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (D) Only two points, Mr President. First, I believe that the contradictions and lack of clarity can be explained by the lack of time and the fact that the delegation sent to investigate matters on the spot has only been back a few days. Secondly, the Commission is extremely glad that it was possible to take a decision despite these difficulties and within such a short space of time, as Mr Dankert has explained. All three institutions of the Community — Parliament, Council and Commission — were involved in this decision. The fact that it was possible to reach a decision within five working days will, I hope, set a good example for future occasions. The Commission is particularly pleased that this enables us to demonstrate our solidarity by providing assistance to a section of the population which has been dealt an extremely hard blow by fate.

**President.** — I call Mr Sablé to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mr Sablé.** — (F) Mr President, colleagues, the extreme gravity of the catastrophe which has struck the island of Réunion fully justifies our holding this urgent debate, and the Committee on Development and Cooperation has adopted the proposals concerned without hesitation and unanimously. In my capacity as Member for the West Indies, which were struck by a similar hurricane barely six months ago, I should like to express my wholehearted sympathy for the people of the Indian Ocean who have been affected by the disaster, and I am authorized to express the full support of the Liberal and Democratic Group. Full information has already been provided on the scale of this disaster, and the documents made available to us are dear enough to show us the nature of the problem and the needs which must be met as a matter of priority.

Our colleagues have just described the full extent of this disaster. I simply want to point out that as early as 30 January the French Government allocated funds amounting to 15 million francs for emergency aid and a further amount of 10 million francs for development sites. I would add that the Councils-General of Martinique and Guadeloupe have, as a gesture of solidarity, allocated aid of 300,000 francs, to which, of course, the 300,000 EUA from the Brussels Commission must be added. The latest news, following an expert assessment, is that a total of nearly 730 million francs will be made available to the Department of Réunion. It would be appropriate to apply the procedure adopted

**Sablé**

when compensating for the damage caused by Hurricane David in the West Indies. The European Fund — EAGGF, ERDF and the Social Fund — should help to restore normal working conditions in a very short space of time.

In conclusion, I should like to say that while the funds made available in this way must be used as emergency aid to repair the damage to the production system, it would be a good idea to take the opportunity provided by this disaster to correct the structural imbalances, or errors of assessment, which have been revealed by social and economic development work over the years in these tropical and underprivileged regions of the Community.

**President.** — I call Mr Debré.

**Mr Debré.** — (*F*) Mr President, I should like to make a very brief comment. First I should like to thank Mr Dankert and the Committee on Budgets, as also the Commission, for having acted with such speed. In these cases, of course, the speed of aid is at least as important as its size. The way in which this aid has been decided on in the shortest possible time, despite the procedure of provisional twelfths, is certainly a credit to the operation of the budget any procedure.

Secondly, I should like to assure Members of this Assembly, and Members of the Commission, that these funds will be put to good use. Those who direct the affairs of the island of Réunion, whether they be administrators or members of parliament, are fully aware of the responsibility that they bear for the use of the funds, whether those funds come from the Government of France, or from the European Economic Community. In addition to emergency aid, the replanting of crops, the replacement of machinery and restoration of the environment will be the main and virtually the only uses to which the funds made available to the island of Réunion will be put. I can therefore provide assurances on this point and, insofar as I am able, I shall personally see that they are fulfilled.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella for an explanation of vote.

**Mr Pannella.** — (*I*) Mr President, I shall of course vote in favour of aid for the victims of this natural disaster. However, I should like to point out that we do so while fully aware that the victims of natural disasters are often also victims of a political structure. A certain kind of wind and rain becomes a cyclone when the class and political system reduces the structures of a country to colonial structures. In places where the buildings, the geology and the townplanning are different, such a cyclone is merely wind and rain.

Mr President, as I have already said on another occasion in connection with my country's Mezzogiorno

and Sicily, I am in favour of such aid. We must not forget, however, that the real national disaster of the Italian Mezzogiorno is its ruling class.

Let me say that, while I shall vote in favour of these measures, I am convinced that in addition to the cyclone disaster, Réunion is afflicted by a certain colonialism which, in various legal forms, continues to place a dangerous burden on these peoples.

**President.** — The joint debate is closed. I put to the vote the motion for a resolution by Mr Debré and others (Doc. 1-713/79): Aid to the department of Réunion.

The resolution is adopted.

I now put to the vote the motion for a resolution by Mr Vergès and others (Doc. 1-751/79): Emergency aid for the island of Réunion.

The resolution is adopted.

I now put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the Dankert report (Doc. 1-793/79): Additional twelfths.

The resolution is adopted.

#### 10. *Arrangements applicable to agricultural products originating in the ACP States or the OCT*

**President.** — The next item is the report by Mr Sablé (Doc. 1-732/79), on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the

proposals from the Commission to the Council for:

- I. a regulation concerning the arrangements applicable to agricultural products and certain goods resulting from the processing of agricultural products originating in the African, Caribbean and Pacific States or overseas countries and territories (Doc. 1-637/79), and
- II. a regulation concerning the application of Decision 1/80 of the ACP-EEC Committee of Ambassadors applying transitional measures until the entry into force of the Second Convention of Lomé (Doc. 1-728/79).

I call Mr Sablé.

**Mr Sablé, rapporteur.** — (*F*) Mr President, colleagues, the two proposed regulations which we are to consider are intended to prevent a legal vacuum occurring between 1 March this year, the date on which the first Lomé Convention expires, and the entry into force of the second, signed on 31 October

## Sablé

last year and currently being ratified by the national parliaments.

The proposed measures concern, firstly, the arrangements applicable to agricultural products and certain goods resulting from the processing of agricultural products originating in the African, Caribbean and Pacific States or in the Overseas Countries and Territories and, secondly, the decision taken by the Committee of Ambassadors applying transitional measures under Lomé I, supplemented by the improvements contained in the second Lomé Convention.

All these measures are fully consistent with the special agreements binding the high contracting parties. Their main purpose is to enable the European Economic Community's partners to enjoy the negotiated advantages immediately, without having to wait for ratification to be completed.

These measures do not simply prolong the provisions of the first Convention beyond 1 March; they also take into account the new concessions obtained during negotiations on the second. The list of products benefiting from favourable arrangements, which is annexed to my report, is now longer and includes beef and veal, **fruit and vegetables, fruit juice, guava, passion fruit and arrowroot starch**. It also includes certain trading facilities between the ACP and the Overseas Countries and Territories and therefore calls for a more detailed study in the latter area.

The precise nature and scope of the agreed changes will be set out in a report which the Committee on Development and Cooperation will be drawing up on the definitive second Lomé Convention. What can be said now is that these measures are obviously beneficial to the countries concerned and will not seriously affect the common agricultural policy; they are simply a further stage in the progress along the same road.

On the second point, the decision by the Committee of Ambassadors concerns certain measures on trade cooperation, STABEX, industrial cooperation, provisions concerning the handling payment and movement of capital, the functioning of the institutions and the agreement relating to coal and steel products. The Committee on Development and Cooperation have also unhesitatingly delivered a favourable opinion, as this decision only provides for the prolongation of Lomé I until the entry into force of Lomé II. I therefore ask the House to adopt the measures proposed.

**President.** — I call Mr Brunner.

**Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission.** — (D) Mr President, we would like to thank the committees involved. As the rapporteur has said, it is a question of ensuring that there is no hiatus in the legislation. The Lomé agreement expires at the end of the month. The

new agreement has still to be ratified by the parliaments of the Member States. We wish, however, to grant our partners in the Lomé agreement access to the market in the interim. This can be done by adopting this proposal.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

#### 11. *Death sentence passed on Mr James David Mange*

**President.** — The next item is the motion for a resolution by Mr Sarre, Mrs Roudy, Mrs Vayssade, Mrs Salisch, Mr von der Vring, Mr Vernimmen, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, Mr Oehler, Miss Quinn, Mr Linde, Mrs Cresson, Mr Walter, Mr Gautier, Mrs Weber, Mr Motchane, Mr Schwartzberg, Mrs Clwyd, Mr Pelikan, Mr Muntingh, Mr Van Minnen, Mrs Fullet, Mr Caborn and Mr Boyes (Doc. 1-774/79), on the sentence of death passed on Mr James David Mange.

I call Mr Glinne to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Glinne.** — (F) Mr President, colleagues, I should like to point out that at the meeting of the enlarged Bureau yesterday, and in accordance with the guidelines adopted at last Monday's meeting of the enlarged Bureau, the President and all the chairmen of the political groups — I repeat, all the chairmen — agreed to forward to the President of the Republic of South Africa a letter explicitly drawing attention to the political considerations as well as humanitarian reasons and asking that as the person concerned had appealed, the appeal verdict should not be given in the conditions of secrecy surrounding the initial verdict, but that it should be in public and the presence of international legal representatives should be guaranteed.

I personally believe that in these conditions a political consensus was reached in the best possible way in this Parliament. I should like to add that this rather unusual procedure, consisting of sending a letter on behalf of the political group chairmen and on the responsibility of the President of Parliament, was devised on Monday because it was felt at that moment that the person concerned, Mr Mange, might not only be condemned to death but actually executed within a few hours. For this reason, the procedure was considered preferable to a debate in plenary sitting, and I am glad that this consensus was reached yesterday.

**President.** — I have now received a copy of the letter sent by the President of Parliament to the President of

**President**

the Republic of South Africa, Mr Marais Viljoen, and can confirm what Mr Glinne said. In view of this, Mr Sarre, it might well be appropriate to withdraw your motion.

**Mr Sarre.** — (F) I am very willing to accede to your request and I should like to ask that the text of the letter which Mrs Veil has sent to the President of the Republic of South Africa on behalf of Parliament be distributed to all the Members of this House.

**President.** — This will be done, Mr Sarre.

**12. Events in Guatemala**

**President.** — The next item is the motion for a resolution by Mr Sarre, Mr Jaquet, Mrs Roudy, Mr Enright, Mr Albers, Mr Caborn, Mr Griffiths, Mr Loo, Mrs Cresson, Mr Oehler, Mr Motchane, Mr Ruffolo, Mrs Lizin, Mr Orlandi, Mr Van Minnen, Mr Pelikan, Mr Estier, Mr Didd, Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, Mr Gerhard Schmid, Mrs Salisch, Mrs Buchan and Mr Wetting (Doc. 1-775/79), on the events in Guatemala.

I call Mr Sarre.

**Mr Sarre.** — (F) Mr President, the events that have occurred in Guatemala reveal the nature of the regime in this Central American State.

This is a case of open repression by force. The peasants who had taken refuge in the Spanish Embassy were drawing attention to the fact that the entire Indian population is living in almost continual misery, subject to military harassment, arbitrary arrest or even death now that the revolt, which has for too long been covered up, is coming out into the open.

The only response by the régime to this distress has been the despoiling of land and violent repression. Thus it was that intervention by the police, on the premises of the Spanish Embassy, led to the sacking and fire of the diplomatic premises and caused 39 deaths.

The Spanish Ambassador has had to take refuge in another embassy to ensure his safety. This is in addition to the massacres, abductions, and death squads which I described yesterday morning.

We do not, of course, wish to condone the occupation of an embassy, whatever the reason; but our Assembly, by adopting the resolution before it and condemning these crimes, would make it clear that this cynical and constant violation of human rights in this part of the American continent is solemnly condemned, for we cannot remain deaf or indifferent to the political awakening of the peoples in this part of the world. In

the neighbouring state of Salvador, the revolt against the injustice and violence of the ruling military junta is further evidence of the same phenomenon. In response, the United States have chosen to send the Salvador junta military support and training units for anti-riot troops. They have chosen dictatorship against the people.

The attitude of Europe must be exactly the reverse. Let us try to draw attention in this upheaval to the emergence of a popular desire for liberty and democracy, liberated from servitude and exploitation! If these people are met by the indifference of Europe, what support can they count on for their exemplary conduct?

We have given a first example by supporting the emerging democracy in Nicaragua and providing it with substantial aid — emergency food aid and aid for the reconstruction of that country.

The resolution before you aims to take the same path. It calls on the governments of the Member States to restrict their diplomatic representation in Guatemala as a mark of their disapproval of the bloody repression in which the regime is engaged. That is why, even with its necessarily limited means, the text of this resolution intends to do more than appeal to a spirit of generosity and proposes that the opportunities for the future should be taken now.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

**13. Situation in Cambodia**

**President.** — The next item is the motion for a resolution by Mrs Macciocchi, Mr Donnez, Mrs Bonino, Mr Arfè, Mr Bangemann, Mr Berkhouwer, Mrs Buchan, Mr Calvez, Mr Cariglia, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mrs Chouraqui, Mr Combe, Mr Coppieters, Mrs Cresson, Mr de la Malène, Mr Delatte, Mr Delorozoy, Mr Estier, Mr Ferri, Mr Galland, Mrs Gaiotti de Biase, Mr Irmer, Mr Lezzi, Mr Linde, Mr Martinet, Mr Pannella, Mr Pelikan, Mr Percheron, Mr Poniatowski, Mrs Pruvot, Miss Quin, Mr Ripa di Meana, Mrs Roudy, Mr Sablé, Mr Schmid, Mr Schwarzenberg, Mrs Scrivener, Mr Seal, Mrs Weber, Mr Wettig and Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul, on the tragic situation and threat of starvation in Cambodia (Doc. 1-784/79).

I call Mrs Macciocchi.

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — (I) In explaining our resolution, I must point out, in view of the controversies which

### Macciocchi

have arisen in this House, that our position is not based on preconceived ideas but on a desire to ascertain on the spot the extent of the disaster which has befallen the Cambodian people. Some of us have been on a real journey into hell, to the frontier between Thailand and Cambodia, where we found 700 000 people, the first of the Khmer refugees.

Our aims were, firstly, to break through the 'Iron Curtain' which has been drawn around the borders of Cambodia and, secondly, to break the silence of complicity hanging over Europe. In other words, we wanted to make public the fact that genocide is being committed on a people which once counted seven million inhabitants but now has only two or three million survivors of several periods of destruction: the era of Long-Nhor, in which the Americans were also implicated, then the bloody massacres under Pol Pot and finally the violent and cynical occupation by the Vietnamese.

We spent whole days talking and discussing with these refugees, and we undertook to convey their message to Parliament. They asked us to tell you that the European Parliament and those free countries which value democracy and peace are needed to help the Khmer people to liberate and return to their own country. We were among those who undertook to convey this message, and today we are fulfilling that undertaking. Ours was not a pleasure-trip but a traumatic one. It was not, as has been slanderously claimed, financed by the CIA. Each of us paid his own expenses. Three European Members went — myself, Emma Bonino and Mr Donnez. So, for the information of Communist speakers, we have returned not only with our hands clean but proud to have marched alongside Americans such as Joan Baez and others, who campaigned against the American war in Vietnam but who now consider it their moral obligation to make clear that there is a strict dividing-line between their former passionate determination to help the Vietnamese and their attitude to what is an act of invasion against other south-east Asian people. Our march was thus in support of the survival of Cambodia, a march which took us through starving refugees, through 11 000 orphans, through another multitude of desperate and despairing people whose appeal to you, to us, to all those who still have some degree of human sensitivity, is that we should not only send them humanitarian assistance but also take steps to ensure that they have a political future.

On the bridge of Aryanaprath, we held up a white banner bearing the words, 'Help us to help the Cambodian people!' On the other side of the bridge, watching us through binoculars, were seven or eight Vietnamese soldiers, people for whom in the past we felt so much affection and to whom we devoted so much of our lives to free them from their American aggressors. But access has been blocked, the aid has been rejected and the doctors have been sent away.

There is a rumour, which has been facetiously taken up in the Assembly, that we were a group of '*agents provocateurs*' under orders from the CIA. Our message of peace and our willingness to help were answered by hatred and provocation. That is why, on our return, we made every effort to ensure that this resolution could be submitted to Parliament. We wanted to make clear that people who want to find out the truth and to lend assistance are not trouble-makers, people who explore the depths of horror are not behaving ignominiously, as was suggested here yesterday and as was claimed by '*L'Humanité*'. The people who acted in this way are all men and women of good faith who transcended their political alignments and together tried to bring the tragedy of the Cambodian people to the attention of the world!

We totally reject the new motion for a resolution tabled by the Communist and Allies Group. It bears too close a resemblance to the communiqué issued by *Pravda* two days ago, which stated, following the meeting between Brezhnev and Heng Samrin — the new head of the Cambodian Government installed by the Vietnamese — that the Vietnamese aggression was in fact an historic victory in January 1979 for the revolutionary and patriotic forces of Kampuchea. It stated that the USSR shows full solidarity with the Vietnamese people and fully supports it in its efforts to ensure security and peace in south-east Asia. We are witnessing yet another partitioning of zones of influence in the tragic area of south-east Asia. Through the Vietnamese, the Russians are seizing power in Cambodia as they did in Laos, and it is an irreversible process.

Our purpose in this resolution is to request the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia. We urge those who have occupied Cambodia to return to their own country. They have been waging war for so many years; it is time for them to lay down their arms, to return to cultivate their own land and to eat their own produce, to leave other peoples their meagre resources and to abandon what was until very recently the granary of Asia and has now been devastated by an invading army . . .

*(The President pressed the speaker to conclude)*

In our resolution we are calling for the withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops from Cambodia, for sovereignty to be restored to the Khmer people, for the powers concerned to be allowed to intervene and establish a neutral zone under the control of the United Nations. We are calling for a conference on Cambodia, just as there was a conference on Vietnam in 1954. We would like the committee of enquiry, which we hope the European Parliament will set up, to visit Cambodia to verify whether it is true that life is flourishing again there, whether it is true that men are not fleeing from the horrors of war, concentration camps and famine. We shall testify to this, and I would conclude by saying that the resolution . . .

**President.** — You have exceeded your time.

I call Mr Habsburg to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group).

**Mr Habsburg.** — (D) Mr President, I have the honour on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, the Christian Democrats, to express our full support for the motion tabled by Mrs Macciocchi. At the same time, we wish to express our approval and gratitude to those who had the courage to join this march to the Cambodian border and assure them that we too condemn those agents of foreign powers who have denounced their selfless march as a CIA stunt.

I should like to make a few brief points in relation to this resolution. There have been those who were of the opinion that it would have been better if this resolution had come *via* the Political Affairs Committee. Technically, this might have been correct perhaps, but it does not affect our basic support for this resolution.

I would like to make two further points. We support wholeheartedly the supplementary amendment which has been tabled. I should emphasize that we also wish to express sympathy for the problems facing Thailand. Thailand is in an extremely difficult position, and I should like it to be clearly understood that our support for this resolution is not so much intended as a criticism of the Government of Thailand as of the inertia on our side, on the part of UNO and other international organizations.

Secondly, we wholeheartedly support your idea, Mrs Macciocchi, of sending a parliamentary delegation to Cambodia. I only hope that all of us, including those in the Political Affairs Committee, will continue to press for this delegation to be nominated as soon as possible and that it will demand to be sent to Cambodia at the earliest possible date. Whether it will ever get there is another matter. But to send a delegation from the European Parliament would be a clear expression of the solidarity of Europe with the people of Cambodia against the invaders and show that the moment of truth had come for those who constantly maintain that they are defending the principles of decency, because the refusal, which is bound to come, will then show yet again which spirit is guiding the masters in Phnom Penh.

**President.** — I call Lady Elles to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Lady Elles.** — Mr President, earlier this morning we were talking about the healthy youth of the world exercising their political choice for freedom. We are now turning an hour later to the question of dying children with no choice but only the hope that the free world will come to their aid to keep them alive. What

a heavy burden of guilt once more lies on the shoulders of the government of the Soviet Union, and all those parties, including those represented in this Parliament, which have the affrontery to support them, those parties which talk about human rights and yet have consistently for the last sixty-two years denied and violated human rights twenty-four hours a day and seven days a week! And yet one of these parties in an amendment has the hubris, the irony and again the affrontery to call on Western Europe, a free democratic Europe, to provide food aid for the people **suffering and being destroyed by their friends.** It would be better if the amendment put down by that particular party had never seen the light of day.

I certainly applaud, and I know my colleagues in the European Democratic Group support and applaud, the efforts of Mrs Bonino and Mrs Macciocchi in their visit to the border of Cambodia. Indeed, I think the way in which the urgency of this debate was presented yesterday showed the feelings and emotions which were aroused when that subject was considered, and so we go along very much with the broad principles that are contained in Mrs Macciocchi's resolution.

We have, however, tabled some amendments together with other colleagues in this Parliament. I am given to understand that Mrs Macciocchi and her colleagues will accept most of these amendments, and I very much hope that the House as a whole will do so.

We condemn the way in which the Vietnamese Government and the Vietnamese army have been comporting themselves in Cambodia. People have been allowed to die despite the aid which has gone from Europe. We can understand, if there is no aid, there can be situations where you can do nothing. Yet these people in Cambodia had the aid on their doorsteps and they refused to distribute the aid that was freely given with no political strings attached. Every effort must be made to encourage and induce the authorities in Phnom Penh, regardless of policy, to distribute this food which comes with the spirit of freedom from the West to those who are dying in the fields of Cambodia, and we hope very much that the Commission and the Council of Ministers will take cognisance of the fact that we in this Parliament are not only surveying the quantities that are going but are endeavouring to ensure that the supplies are actually reaching the people who need them. I personally asked twice in the colloquies between the Political Affairs Committee and the last President-in-Office whether the food was getting to the people who needed it, but we were fobbed off, perhaps unwillingly or unwittingly, with unsatisfactory answers. We shall come back to this question later in other part-sessions of this Parliament and demand to know precisely what has been happening, how many people have been saved from this crime of genocide — an international legal definition of which was introduced in the United Nations in the Sixties by the Soviet Union, the very country which is now guilty of that self-same crime. We therefore sup-

Lady Elles

port the principle and the feelings expressed in this resolution and hope that our amendments will be adopted in order that we too in Parliament can play a role, through our appropriate committees, by supporting the action of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and those voluntary organizations whose help is needed on a practical basis in order that those who are dying shall be fed.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the right)*

**President.** — I call Mr Chambeiron.

**Mr Chambeiron.** — *(F)* Mr President, there are events in the history of nations which sometimes call for discretion, I might even say decency. I have listened with interest to what the speakers before me have said and I have no intention of polemicizing. I simply wish to say that my friends and I do not require advice from anybody on which amendments we table. This is in reply to the speaker immediately before me.

I followed the debate on Wednesday closely and gained the impression that many of those who supported the need for urgent debate were simply concerned with providing aid to the Cambodian people on humanitarian grounds. This is precisely the aim of the amendment which I tabled. I believe that this amendment is clear, both in its preamble and in its concrete proposals. It is so clear that there is no need for me to comment at length. I would even say that, because of its spirit of compromise, it offers the only way for this Assembly to bring this debate to a conclusion, which unfortunately has been too often marked by outbursts of passions — and everyone knows that it is generally better not to be guided by passion.

If I have understood correctly the main concern of the speakers since Wednesday, it is a humanitarian concern, a desire to come to the aid of the Cambodian people. Let there be no mistake: my friends and I share this concern. If you read the amendment which we have tabled carefully, you will of necessity recognize that it is acceptable to each one of us. This is why I believe, and I say this with no false ingenuousness, that this amendment will receive the unanimous approval of our Assembly. If this does not happen, public opinion, which is aware of the difficulties which the Cambodian people is successfully struggling to overcome with international aid, will be led to think that those who have voted against are indifferent to the sufferings of the Cambodian people and the search for ways of effectively alleviating these and that they simply intend yet again to indulge in political machinations. Public opinion would regard such machinations as the ultimate in despicability.

**President.** — I call Mr Haagerup to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mr Haagerup.** — *(DK)* Mr President, despite yesterday's contested vote on urgent procedure, there was and is in this House an overwhelming majority in favour of the spirit of the resolution tabled by Mrs Macciocchi and others. After negotiations yesterday, we also agreed on the letter of the resolution after agreement had been reached between Mr Fergusson and myself, on the one hand, and representatives of the authors of the motion, Mrs Macciocchi and Mrs Bonino, on the other. I would like to express my appreciation of the cooperativeness shown by the authors of the motion during these negotiations.

I can therefore unreservedly recommend that the House vote for the resolution and for Amendments Nos 1—7, which do not run counter to the primary object of the original motion but improve on it and spell it out more clearly. The only remaining disagreement concerns a specific political point, i.e., the original resolution's call for a conference to be convened with a view to the neutralization of the whole of Cambodia. This purely political proposal needs must — in my opinion as rapporteur for the Political Affairs Committee — be considered by the appropriate committee of Parliament — that is the Political Affairs Committee — and this will be the case if the seven amendments Nos 1—7 tabled by Mr Fergusson and myself are adopted, which is the course that I commend to the House.

**President.** — I call Mrs Dienesch to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

**Mrs Dienesch.** — *(F)* Mr President, since our first part-session in July, some 30 or 40 speakers have dealt with the problem of refugees in the camps in South-East Asia. In October, I tabled a motion for a resolution calling for international action in view of the inability of the individual nations to intervene.

Today we cannot do otherwise than support the motion from Mrs Macciocchi calling for a solution. It is here that our work becomes difficult. As a well-known public figure has said, it is not enough to be content with sporadic and useless outbursts of indignation. We must achieve something concrete. No nation which upholds freedom and the rights of man can accept the genocide of another nation.

It is also clear that our Assembly cannot act directly. We can state the case. We can, as we are doing today, call the attention of this party or the other to the fact that the situation is becoming worse instead of better. We agree that better ways must be sought to defuse the political struggle in Cambodia. As Mrs Louise Weiss said in a debate on hunger, the political issues are extremely complicated. At the same time, responsibility at the present time is clear, which does not mean that it is not shared. But there is also a need from time

**Dienesch**

to time to give voice to what we have all become aware of. This is why we support this resolution.

I also wish we would direct our appeal not only towards our own assembly. Obviously we can decide on food aid, credits, supplies of wheat, cereals and all the other necessities; but clearly, at the political level, we must also direct our appeal to our governments. We must call on our Heads of Government to find a solution, which must of necessity be international, which can provide a glimmer of hope for this unfortunate nation, for the suffering children whose health and lives may be ruined for ever.

This was our aim today, Mr President, and we are pleased that such a large majority in this Assembly is joining in this appeal. But, we repeat, it is results, action, that is needed. We earnestly entreat the Assembly and its President to call on our governments to take action.

**President.** — I call Mrs Bonino.

**Mrs Bonino.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, after the debate yesterday on the question of urgent procedure and following the speech by my colleague, there is little left for me to add.

I should like to make two points clear. First, we must, of course, continue to provide all the financial and food aid we can and, secondly, in my view it is equally important to find a diplomatic and political solution to the problem. Community aid has so far been of vital importance in saving the lives of refugees. However, 700 000 people cannot remain indefinitely in prison-camps on the Thai borders, since I believe there is every reason for fearing the danger of the emergence of a new Palestine in these camps and of the consequent political terrorism. That is why we insist on paragraph 6 of our resolution.

We have agreed with our colleagues on the amendments and are prepared to accept all of them, including the amendment to paragraph 6 of the resolution, which calls for a public hearing or for testimony to be given by the United Nations High Commissioner. What we cannot accept is that this amendment should replace the political request for the governments to call a conference on peace and on the neutralization of Cambodia along the lines of the Geneva Conference in 1954.

As regards procedural matters, I would ask the authors of the amendment to paragraph 6 to agree to its being added to, rather than replacing, this paragraph. This would enable us to vote in favour of the request for further information to be provided by the United Nations High Commissioner in Cambodia to the appropriate committees of the European Parliament.

I insist on the right to put our text to the vote, so that we can then vote in favour of your amendment. I think this is important, since many colleagues agree both with our proposal and with your amendment. In this way we could vote on both points, to be adopted or rejected by the Assembly.

**President.** — I call Mr Glinne to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Glinne.** — (F) Mr President, the Socialist Group would have preferred to see this document referred immediately to the appropriate parliamentary committees under Rule 25. I stress that both I and my colleagues are in complete agreement with the political and humanitarian ideas behind this motion, which, moreover, has been signed by a number of members of my group. We also approve of the intention to provide the aid of which the Cambodian people are in such great need.

But we must be realistic, given the situation in which this Parliament finds itself. We are operating with a system of provisional twelfths, and we do not know exactly how Parliament is going to finance delegations which have to be formal and well organized. I therefore have great doubts about the justification for paragraph 3, which calls for a committee of enquiry consisting of Members of Parliament to be sent to the country.

Secondly, I should have liked both the Committee on Cooperation and Development and the Committee on Political Affairs to deal with this matter in the near future. I do not believe that this is solely a matter for the Political Affairs Committee.

Finally, it seems to me that there is a contradiction between calling, on the one hand, for a parliamentary committee of enquiry to be sent and, on the other, for committee hearings, possibly before several committees meeting jointly, of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and perhaps other people who are well informed on the situation, as demanded in an amendment to paragraph 6. I am convinced that the second procedure — a public hearing of the High Commissioner and other well-informed public figures — would be sufficient for Parliament to arrive at a political judgement. I thus have serious doubts as to the advisability of paragraph 3. I fear that Parliament will adopt a resolution which will prove unworkable.

I should therefore prefer that we adopt the amendment to paragraph 6 and organize these important hearings before the appropriate committees, beginning with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Various doctors and journalists have gone to the country, and it hardly seems necessary to add to all this by sending a parliamentary delegation, an action which will certainly be misunderstood by the public.

**President.** — I call Mr Ripa di Meana.

**Mr Ripa di Meana.** — (I) Mr President, I am extremely sorry to have to disagree with the views expressed by the leader of the Socialist Group, Mr Glinne. Speaking as a signatory of the motion for a resolution which we are currently discussing and which we shall shortly be voting on, I find his argument that a European Parliament delegation should not be sent to Cambodia because we are operating the provisional-twelfth system, takes no account of the importance of this initiative and, on the practical level, does not hold water, for if there should be insurmountable financial difficulties, I am certain that Members of the European Parliament would be prepared to pay themselves the costs of a fact-finding visit.

As regards the amendments, I agree with the reasons given by Mrs Macciocchi for rejecting the amendment tabled by Mr Chambeiron. I also fully agree with the points just made by Mrs Bonino in connection with the Haagerup and Fergusson amendments — which seem to me entirely acceptable — including her final, supplementary proposal to vote on the original text of paragraph 6 as well as the amendment tabled to it.

**President.** — I call Mr Haferkamp.

**Mr Haferkamp,** — *Vice-President of the Commission.* (D) Mr President, this is the second time this week that Parliament has discussed the fate of the Cambodian refugees. I believe this is necessary, because what we have heard in the debate today, particularly from those people who have visited the country, has made the tragedy of the situation clear.

I do not wish to go into detail. We have all considered what action we can take to help. At Question Time this week, my colleague Mr Cheysson explained in some detail the action we are taking and our plans for the future. We have noted, thank God, that food distribution has improved over the last few weeks; but we have also seen that such improvements as there have been are far from sufficient. We must do everything we can to ensure that this process continues. A number of ways in which this can be done have been mentioned during this debate. You may rest assured that the Commission will continue to make every effort to achieve the aim expressed in the debate here — namely, to provide real assistance, not only by delivering food to those who need it but also by seeking to bring about a political solution.

I should like at this point to stress the importance of the cooperation between ourselves and international organizations, with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and with the governments in this part of the world, particularly the Government of

Thailand. I mention this because I would ask the authors of the motion for a resolution to consider whether the critical comments on the High Commissioner and Government of Thailand in the second and third recitals of the motion for a resolution are really justified. We are of the opinion, as has also been suggested here during the debate, that in view of the difficult task facing the international organizations and governments in these countries, we should try to help them to improve the situation rather than criticize, since this diverts attention from the fact that the real guilty parties are on the other side.

**President.** — I call Mr Haagerup.

**Mr Haagerup.** — Mr President, the authors of the motion for a resolution asked whether the authors of the amendments would be willing to change the voting in order to enable Amendment No 2 to be an addition instead of an amendment. Mr President, I am sorry we cannot do that. We think we have to insist on a vote on all these amendments as they stand. May I assure Mrs Bonino and Mrs Macciocchi that this does not mean that we are rejecting the conference proposal. We are simply referring it to the Political Affairs Committee, where it will be discussed and considered. That is why we would like to have the vote this way.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

We now proceed to the vote.

First of all, I have Amendment No 8, tabled by Mr Gremetz, Mr Chambeiron, Mr Denis and the other French members of the Communist and Allies Group, seeking to replace the text of the motion by the following text:

- whereas Cambodia today is beginning to show signs of economic and social recovery from the heavy toll exacted during the years of dictatorship and terror imposed on the Cambodian people by the Khmer Rouges,
- whereas evidence of this recovery is to be seen in the gradual revival of trade, the circulation of money, the resumption of ordinary family life and of education and health services, as attested by numerous organizations, including the International Red Cross, Unicef, Catholic Aid, the Secours Populaire Français, the French medical aid committee, Oxfam and numerous reliable witnesses,
- considering the need for the Member States of the Community to help the Cambodian people to continue along this path,
- considering the tremendous needs of the Cambodian people, which must be satisfied before the scars made by years of terror and suffering can heal entirely, and which necessitate the utmost international solidarity.

**President**

1. Hopes that the Member States of the European Community will resume or intensify their bilateral aid, particularly food and medical aid, to the Cambodian people;
2. Appeals to the Community itself substantially to increase the amount of aid it provides;
3. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and Commission and to the Governments of the Member States.

If this amendment is adopted, then all the other amendments will fall.

I call Mr Chambeiron.

**Mr Chambeiron.** — (*F*) Mr President, a short while ago I said that, in view of the humanitarian nature of this amendment, I hoped it would receive the votes of the entire Assembly. Its adoption would also allow us to gain valuable time.

**President.** — What is the rapporteur's view?

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — (*I*) I am opposed to this amendment.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 8 to the vote.

Amendment No 8 is rejected.

On the first indent of the preamble, I have Amendment No 5, tabled by Mr Haagerup and Mr Fergusson, seeking to delete the second half of this indent beginning with the words 'which reached Phnom Penh...'

What is the rapporteur's view?

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — (*I*) I am in favour of this amendment.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 5 to the vote.

Amendment No 5 is adopted.

I put the second indent to the vote.

The second indent is adopted.

On the third indent, I have Amendment 6, tabled by Mr Haagerup and Mr Fergusson, seeking to replace this indent by the following new text:

- outraged by the abandonment of 11 000 Cambodian children in the horror of the Cambodian camps in Thailand, all in danger of death and many of them orphans who might be adopted.

What is the rapporteur's view?

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — (*I*) I am in favour of this amendment.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 6 to the vote.

Amendment No 6 is adopted.

On paragraph 1, I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Haagerup and Mr Fergusson, seeking to replace this paragraph with the following text:

1. Condemns the action of the occupying Vietnamese forces in closing Cambodia's frontiers to doctors and nurses from Western countries who wish to give desperately-needed medical aid to a nation devastated by war.

What is the rapporteur's view?

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — (*I*) I am in favour of this amendment.

**President.** — — I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is adopted.

I put paragraph 2 to the vote.

Paragraph 2 is adopted.

On paragraph 3, I have Amendment No 7, by Mr Haagerup and Mr Fergusson, seeking to replace this paragraph with the following text:

3. Instructs its Political Affairs Committee urgently to consider the setting up of a committee of Members of Parliament to ascertain in Cambodia the people's vital needs and to check that Community aid of all kinds is being properly distributed.

I call Mrs Bonino.

**Mrs Bonino.** — (*I*) Mr President, in the Italian text of this amendment there are two words missing which are contained in both the English and the French texts.

I merely wish to point out the need to insert these words in order to coordinate the texts. The words 'in Cambodia' are missing where it states:

Instructs its Political Affairs Committee urgently to consider the setting up of a committee of Members of Parliament to ascertain *in Cambodia* the people's vital needs, etc.

These two words are contained in both the French and English texts.

**President.** — We shall put the complete text to the vote.

What is the rapporteur's view?

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — (*I*) I am in favour of this amendment.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 7 to the vote.

Amendment No 7 is adopted.

After paragraph 3, I have Amendment No 4, by Mr Haagerup and Mr Fergusson, seeking to insert a new paragraph:

- 3 a. Denounces the fact that barely one-tenth of the 10 000 tons of essential supplies already sent by the Community has hitherto been duly distributed.

What is the rapporteur's view?

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — (*I*) I am in favour of this amendment.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 4 to the vote.

Amendment No 4 is adopted.

I put paragraph 4 to the vote.

Paragraph 4 is adopted.

On paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 3, by Mr Haagerup and Mr Fergusson, seeking to amend this paragraph as follows:

5. Appeals to the United Nations and the powers involved — in particular to the USSR, USA and China — to take political and diplomatic action ... (rest unchanged).

What is the rapporteur's view?

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — (*I*) I am in favour of this amendment.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 3 to the vote.

Amendment No 3 is adopted.

I now put to the vote paragraph 5 as amended. Paragraph 5, as amended, is adopted.

On paragraph 6, I have Amendment No 2, by Mr Haagerup and Mr Fergusson, seeking to replace this paragraph by a new text:

6. Instructs its President personally to invite the UN High Commissioner for Refugees to appear before

a joint meeting of the relevant parliamentary committees in order to ascertain how the European Community can best bring aid to the affected people both inside and outside Cambodia.

What is the rapporteur's view?

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — (*I*) I cannot accept this wording.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 2 to the vote.

Amendment No 2 is adopted.

Before putting the resolution as a whole to the vote, I shall call Members who wish to give an explanation of vote.

I call Mrs Dekker.

**Mrs Dekker.** — (*NL*) Mr President, in our opinion the motion for a resolution concerning the tragedy in Cambodia, both in spirit and in letter, fully reflects what must be our view of this terrible situation. Mr De Goede and I wish to make this clear. I do not wish to say anything further about the content, but would like to make a few additional comments. We are very gratified that the resolution has been tabled by representatives of practically all the political groups in this Parliament. In view of the almost unimaginable scale of this tragedy, we must, despite our political differences, do everything possible to alleviate the situation and to find solutions. I also hope that, when voting, as many Members as possible will rally in support of this resolution and carefully follow future developments so that the necessary measures may be taken.

Further to what was said by Mr Glinne, this, in my opinion, is a matter of such absolute priority that in view of our temporarily straitened financial circumstances we must draw on funds set aside for other items. Finally, I consider that the proposal by Mrs Macciocchi and Mrs Bonino that the afflicted area be visited in order to see at first hand what is happening deserves the admiration and esteem of all present.

**President.** — I call Lady Elles.

**Lady Elles.** — Mr President, I wish merely to say that while recognizing the legal difficulties, expressed in the second indent of the preamble, concerning the position of the Thai Government, we certainly wish to associate ourselves with the views expressed by Mr Haferkamp on the enormous work that the Thai Government has done to cope with this overwhelming problem of Cambodian refugees. We would not like this resolution to leave this House without an acknowledgement of the tremendous difficulties that have faced that government and that country and the support that those peoples have given to their neighbours.

Lady Elles

**President.** — I call Mr Glinne.

**Mr Glinne.** — (B) Mr President, I expressed my objections to paragraph 3 a while ago. It goes without saying that I could not do otherwise than wholeheartedly approve of Members going to Cambodia at their own expense. But if this were not to be the case, I must point out that, in accordance with the statement made recently to the enlarged Bureau of Parliament, I should be opposed to any journey undertaken at Parliament's expense.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Mr President, I shall be extremely pleased to vote in favour of this motion for a resolution, even in its modified form, since I believe that this political gesture by Parliament has provided one of the few occasions on which we have been able really to sound our beliefs as parliamentarians and as supporters of democracy and to some extent to set aside factional and purely tactical concerns.

Personally, I would, of course, have preferred the motion for a resolution to refer positively and fully to the need to find a way of restoring peace through the organization of a peace conference, a proposal which we put forward and which we are interested to see prompted a positive reaction even from the EPP.

So, Mr President, although our point of view has not been accepted, I would repeat, as a radical and as a Member of Parliament, that I wholeheartedly welcome the political gesture we are making.

**President.** — I call Mr Chambeiron.

**Mr Chambeiron.** — (F) Mr President, the nature of the spectacle which we have just witnessed is very clear. When I spoke, I presented my proposal as a humanitarian measure. The majority of this Assembly, from the most reactionary Conservatives to, unfortunately, our Socialist colleagues, wishes to conduct this debate at a political level. You were not interested in humanitarian aid for the people of Cambodia, you were interested in a political manoeuvre which, I repeat, public opinion in our countries will judge despicable.

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

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — (I) Mr Chairman, before a vote is taken on the resolution as a whole, I should like to ask those colleagues who voted paragraph by paragraph not to delete paragraph 6, instructing the President to play an active part in forwarding the wishes of Parliament to the Council of Ministers of the Community.

I should like to remind you that on the one hand we wish to render humanitarian and specific aid, but that on the other hand it is important to introduce a political perspective in view of the tragic situation of the people of Cambodia.

Within the Political Affairs Committee a consensus must be reached which is acceptable to all those in the committee, in particular the rapporteur, of course, and myself. For our part we can assure you that we will do everything in our power to arrive at such an agreement. But I should like the motion for a resolution as a whole to be adopted without the deletion of paragraph 6.

**President.** — I am allowing no more explanations of vote: if every Member exercised this privilege, it would be impossible to proceed.

I put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

#### 14. Agenda

**President.** — The report by Sir Fred Catherwood (Doc. 1-532/79), which is on today's agenda, will be taken as the last item.

I call Sir Fred.

**Sir Fred Catherwood.** — I am quite content to be put down at the end of the agenda. I would also like to say that I am deputizing for Mr Filippi and I would like that item to be kept on the agenda.

I do protest most vigorously on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations about the way in which the ordinary business of Parliament, matters on which we have been asked advice from the Commission, and matters on which our relations with other countries in the world depend, have been completely squeezed out until the end of the day.

(Applause)

We have Mr Seeler waiting to make a report on ASEAN, which is a group of nations as big as we are: it is an absolutely vital engagement of the Commission, we have done everything we can to get it on the agenda for today, and it is being squeezed right out at the end of the business. Mr Radoux's report on Yugoslavia, which is also very important, was dumped in the middle of President Jenkins's report, and I do protest on behalf of my committee on the way in which the ordinary committee business of the House is being messed around by all kinds of things which are coming from everywhere else.

Catherwood

**President.** — I regret it as much as you do, but the voting is due to begin in a few minutes' time.

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (*I*) Mr President, we cannot continue working under these conditions.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, the decision as to whether we proceed with the business is the decision of the President.

As an individual, you have had more time speaking in this House than the largest group. I did say last time that part of democracy is listening to other people; so please sit down, I am not giving you the floor.

(*Applause*)

#### 15. *Membership of committees*

**President.** — I have received from the European Democratic Group a request for the appointment of the following Members to committees:

- Political Affairs Committee:  
Mr Jakobsen in place of Mr Møller;
- Committee on Transport:  
Miss Roberts in place of Mr Jakobsen;
- Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport:  
Mr Spicer in place of Miss Roberts.

Are there any objections?

These appointments are ratified.

#### 16. *Votes*

**President.** — The next item comprises the votes on motions for resolutions on which the debate is closed.

I put to the vote the Radoux et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-737/79/rev. II): Relations between the EEC and Yugoslavia.

The resolution is adopted.

**President.** — We proceed to the *von Wogau report* (Doc. 1-544/79): *Community transit*.

I put the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 10 to the vote.

The preamble and paragraphs 1 to 10 are adopted.

After paragraph 10, I have three amendments tabled by Mr Aigner on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control and seeking to add three new paragraphs:

— Amendment No 1:

- 10 a. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to centralize more effectively the fight against fraudulent practices;

— Amendment No 2:

- 10 b. Stresses the importance of introducing special controls for goods which are particularly open to fraud, and laying down a minimum percentage for consignments necessitating a physical check;

— Amendment No 3:

- 10 c. Calls for more comprehensive information to be supplied to all control bodies responsible for monitoring the individual provisions of agricultural regulations.

I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

I put Amendment No 2 to the vote.

Amendment No 2 is adopted.

I put Amendment No 3 to the vote.

Amendment No 3 is adopted.

I put paragraph 11 to the vote.

Paragraph 11 is adopted.

I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole, incorporating the amendments which have been adopted.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

#### 17. *Supply of sugar to UNRWA*

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-754/79) by Mr Enright, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation,

on the proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-702/79) for:

- I. a decision concluding the Convention between the European Economic Community and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA) on aid to refugees in the countries of the Near East; and
- II. a regulation on the supply of sugar to UNRWA as food aid.

<sup>1</sup> et No....

**President**

I call Mr Enright.

**Mr Enright, rapporteur.** — Mr President, may I first reiterate Sir Fred Catherwood's earlier comments. If he were on the Committee for Development and Cooperation he would find that the situation is even worse than on the Committee on External Economic Relations.

Before beginning my report, Mr President, I would also like to thank the person who arranged — possibly as a result of my complaint on the Friday of our last part-session — that the staff should have the opportunity to have a meal. I think it is time for us to take account of the human rights of our staff.

(Applause)

**President.** — May I say that it also applies to the President and those who are sitting here as well.

**Mr Enright, rapporteur.** — May I begin by thanking this House as a whole for supporting the request for urgent debate.

In the previous debate, we considered the plight of the Cambodians and the difficulties we are encountering in ensuring that food reaches them. In the case of the Palestinian refugees, despite the aid given by us *via* the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, half-a-million children are starving because they are not included on the list of recipients. It is therefore crucial that the Council approve as speedily as possible the funds which have until now been withheld.

In examining this report, I must express my deep gratitude to the Commission. On requesting information concerning all allocation of funds and accounting procedures, I found that, even concerning confidential details, the Commission was completely frank and open. While I as much as anyone am prepared to accuse the Commission of obstruction, on this occasion I must congratulate and thank them.

It seems rather strange that we are now approving a convention which is already more than a year old. However, the reason for this is to be found in the disquiet expressed in this House, and in the Court of Auditors, as to the allocation of aid and the spending of funds.

I am quite satisfied now that this is being done very efficiently. Certainly one-hundred-per-cent efficiency is never possible in troubled areas such as the Lebanon, but it does seem to us that in this respect the United Nations Relief and Works Agency is doing a splendid job, to which we should contribute. This would be one practical way of preventing starvation and ensuring that the Palestinian refugees are given

more than just existence without hope. I therefore strongly urge the House to support this resolution so that we can speedily release the funds needed by the United Nations.

**President.** — I call Mr Patterson.

**Mr Patterson.** — Before I vote either for or against or abstain on this matter, I would like an answer from the Commission on one point. It refers to the competence of the Court of Auditors to investigate the spending of these monies. I am quite ready to accept the assurance of Mr Enright that the Commission has been extremely helpful in this matter, but the Commission is not the budgetary authority and it is certainly not the auditing authority, which is this Parliament and the Court of Auditors.

Can we have an assurance from the Commission that the convention which they have now negotiated will allow these funds to be properly audited?

**President.** — I call Mr Haferkamp.

**Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (D) Mr President, the Commission has attached great importance to the need to improve the scope for controls in this entire area. I would draw your attention to the new Article 7 of the agreement, which in particular provides us with the opportunity to carry out a check on the distribution and use of the various types of aid provided on the spot and at any time we feel that this is necessary. Obviously the Court of Auditors will also have full powers of control. Allow me to make one last point: the Commission would like to thank the rapporteur and the entire committee for their cooperation, without which this result would not have been possible.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

#### 18. *Regulations on regional development measures*

**President.** — The next item is a report (Doc. 1-715/79) by Mr Cronin, on behalf of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, on the

proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-451/79) for regulations on specific Community regional development measures based on Article 13 of the ERDF regulation.

### President

I call Mr von der Vring.

**Mr von der Vring, deputy rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, the Chairman of the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, Mr De Pasquale, has asked me to introduce this report briefly, as neither he nor Mr Cronin can be here today. This is also not the moment for a debate on this issue. The debate on regional policy will take place in spring this year on the rapport by Mr Delmotte.

At the same time, it must be emphasized that the resources in question are totally inadequate, so that this entire package of regulations cannot be regarded from the quantitative point of view. If the entire Regional Fund is too small to eliminate discrepancies within the Community, the same is certainly true of this 5 %. The five regulations proposed here by the Commission account for approximately 60 % of the envisaged non-quota resources available for the period 1980 to 1984. These proposals therefore relate to that part of European regional policy which in its essential features is based on Community criteria. In other words, they are a symbol of what the European Parliament in the past has understood by Community regional policy. The sum of 220 million units of account is to be spent over five years on all the poor regions of Europe as a whole, and this can only be understood as a gesture. For this reason the committee, and I would ask that this be noted, has reached a gentleman's agreement on the regions which are to receive funds and the amounts in question — namely, not to table any amendments to these proposals on principle. Therefore, Mr President, we recommend that Amendments No 1, by Mr Cecovini, and Nos 12 and 14, by Mr Gendebien, be withdrawn.

Taken as a whole, we welcome these proposals from the Commission as a noteworthy example of Community regional policy. Not least the attempt to provide economic assistance to small undertakings merits especial attention.

I should like to emphasize in particular that it is in accordance with the decisions of this Parliament that some of the measures envisaged are designed to anticipate the negative effects on certain regions which will result from the enlargement of the Community. There has been some opposition to this; however, this is not in line with decisions taken by this Parliament or its predecessors.

We wish to protest most strongly against the Council's action to block these proposals. Quite apart from the fact that the objections made in the Council are absurd, given the negligible financial impact of these regulations, it would be the end of a truly European regional policy if decisions were taken unanimously. The mis-management which is bound to result from a policy of unanimity in the Council is shown by the

agricultural policy, whose Augean stables we now have the job of cleaning out.

Finally, we attach great importance to making the offers, scope and activities of regional policy better known among the population of the Community. We would also like greater cooperation with the Community regions involved, and we know that the Commission shares this view.

Finally, Mr President, let me deal with the amendments. We recommend that Amendments Nos 2 to 6 and 7 to 11, by Mr Orlandi on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, be accepted because they would improve the proposals, and I should like to comment on the procedure to be followed: as the amendments deal in each case with five regulations having the same text, we are of the opinion that these should be taken together in each case. We recommend that Amendments Nos 16 to 20, 21 to 25, 26 to 30, by Mr Gendebien, be withdrawn or rejected, because they are legally unsound even if we accept the intention behind them.

We wish to issue no recommendation on Amendments Nos 13 and 15, by Mr Gendebien. I have already recommended that Amendments Nos 1, 12 and 14 be rejected or withdrawn.

Finally, I should like to comment again on procedure; I would ask that a vote be taken first on the resolution, as the amendments to the text form part of paragraph 31 of the resolution, and that the amendments to the text be taken at the end of the amendments to the resolution, followed by a vote on the motion for a resolution as a whole.

**President** — I call Mr Ryan to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group).

**Mr Ryan** — Mr President and colleagues, without for one moment wanting to minimize the importance of subjects that we have discussed during this part-session, ranging from Kampuchea to Afghanistan, I would respectfully suggest that in future the European Assembly give priority to European affairs and matters of acknowledged competence.

(Applause)

It seems to me unacceptable that a vital matter affecting some 10 or 15 million impoverished people in Europe should be relegated to the last few minutes of this part-session.

Regional policy is one of Europe's greatest failures. It is almost a total flop. If the success or failure of a pro-

Ryan

gramme is to be judged by the extent to which its objectives have been achieved, it is obvious that, as operates to date, regional policy has been an abject failure. The purpose of setting up the Regional Fund was to transfer such resources from the better-off to the less-well-off regions of Europe that the gap between the rich and poor would not widen. Indeed, it was recognized that the objective of the Rome Treaty to equalize living standards throughout Europe could not be achieved unless the richer parts of Europe transferred money to the poorer regions. But since the Regional Fund came into operation five years ago, the gap between the rich parts of Europe and the poorest has widened by 160 %.

Now, Mr President, I do not like laying blame, I prefer to be constructive, but we must recognize what is one of the principal reasons for failures of the Regional Fund. Ironically enough, carelessness in management of the agricultural budget by the Council of Ministers has been matched by an equal readiness on their part to stifle progress in the Regional Fund by hamstringing regional proposals by means of a whole plethora of regulations, many of which are encouraged by selfish national interests.

The Council of Ministers is primarily responsible for the state of affairs in relation to regional improvement. Its lack of good faith is clearly proved by its refusal to accept the Commission's proposals that in allocating Regional Funds account should be taken — and I would ask my colleagues to note this — account should be taken of the incomes of people of the area concerned, the rate of unemployment and emigration, the degree of social distress caused by declining industries and the proportion of the population engaged in uneconomic farming. If these proper criteria are ignored, as they have been by the Council of Ministers, what rules, except selfish interests, govern the allocation of Regional Funds? Further proof of the lack of sympathy on the part of some national governments is that it has taken three years to approve a quite inadequate package by unanimous vote.

I particularly welcome, however, the Commission's proposals to spend 24 million units of account on the improvement of tourism and transport facilities in the deprived frontier region between the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland, and that both areas should benefit by the distribution of money.

Equally welcome is the proposal to provide Community funds to finance mini-turbines and other small aids to increase energy supply. I am disappointed that for the time being this is confined to the region of Southern Italy. I would like to see this extended to Ireland, where we have a surplus of water, most of it unfortunately moving in the wrong direction towards the water-logged centre. Nevertheless, while the Irish Electricity Authority has efficiently harnessed every commercial possibility in the hydro-electrical field, there still remain, not only in Ireland but, I am sure,

throughout other parts of Europe, innumerable small rivers and streams which could be harnessed to service local communities and industries and to supplement the national energy supply.

I particularly welcome in the proposals from the Commission, which I am sure Parliament will endorse, are the suggestions that in future there should be more direct contact with local communities and with potential beneficiaries in order that we can convince the people of Europe, which we have not succeeded in doing to date, that the Regional Fund is there to benefit the people and that the people, if they make their wants known, will find assistance coming from Europe.

**President** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Mr President, I shall say what I tried to say earlier.

I move that the debate be adjourned, pursuant to Rule 32 (1) (d) of the Rules of Procedure. Mr President, if I may, I would add that the last speaker also protested at the fact that a matter which concerns 15 000 000 Europeans is being discussed by only a handful of Members.

I personally feel that his protest is rather pointless, since the EPP has only eight Members present in the House. He should have the good taste to keep quiet. There are only three radical Members, but at least we are all here!

We feel it is unreasonable to continue the debate under these conditions, and the vote is unlikely to bear any relation to the views of the electorate. Mr President, I cannot ask for a roll-call, because I cannot support my request with the necessary number of signatures; but it would be very desirable to establish who is present. I myself have asked for careful photos to be taken in the House to show the circumstances under which this debate is being held. I propose that we vote on the adjournment of the debate.

**President** — I put to the vote Mr Pannella's motion to adjourn the debate.

The motion is adopted.

#### 19. *Decision on transboundary air pollution*

**President** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-635/79) by Mrs Squarzialupi, on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer

**President**

Protection, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-353/79) for a decision on the conclusion of the Convention on long-range transboundary air pollution.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Mr President, I propose that this debate also be adjourned.

**President** — I put to the vote Mr Pannella's motion to adjourn the debate.

The motion is rejected.

I call Mr Bonaccini.

**Mr Bonaccini, deputy rapporteur.** — (I) Mr President, I should just like to say briefly that with regard to this motion for a resolution, which the committee adopted unanimously, the rapporteur, who is absent, would refer to the written report which has been submitted.

**President** — I call Mr Muntingh to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Muntingh.** — (NL) Mr President, what I wished to say can be stated as two points. Firstly, the Socialist Group agrees with the report by Mrs Squarcialupi. Secondly, we would like the resolution to specify that the Convention as it now stands must be implemented.

According to my information, this will not be very easy, because the Environment and Consumer Protection Service responsible for implementing the Convention within the Community has insufficient staff and financial resources to fulfil this task adequately. This applies not only to this Convention but also to many other issues. Parliament has pointed out many times that this service must be extended. For this reason I have tabled on behalf of the Socialist Group an amendment calling on the Commission to allocate to this Service the funds and staff it requires to carry out its task.

**President** — The debate is closed.

We shall now consider the motion for a resolution.

I put the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 6 to the vote.

The preamble and paragraphs 1 to 6 are adopted.

After paragraph 6 I have Amendment No 1, by Mr Muntingh, seeking to insert the following new paragraph:

6 a. Asks the Council and Commission to provide the Environment and Consumer Protection Service with sufficient staff and financial resources to enable it effectively to assume the tasks devolving upon the European Communities as a result of this Convention.

What is the rapporteur's view?

**Mr Bonaccini, deputy rapporteur.** — (I) I am in favour of this amendment.

**President.** — I put Amendment No 1 to the vote.

Amendment No 1 is adopted.

I put paragraph 7 to the vote.

Paragraph 7 is adopted.

I put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

#### 20. *Directive on exposure to harmful substances at work*

**President.** — The next item is the report by Mr Sherlock (Doc. 1-641/79), on behalf of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 13/79) for a directive on the protection of workers from harmful exposure to chemical, physical and biological agents at work.

I call Mr Sherlock.

**Mr Sherlock, rapporteur.** — Mr President, the entire issue is quite self-evident and self-explanatory. This morning we have been dragged through the vale of tears so frequently that I do not intend to repeat the procedure. There is, however, one addition which has become a fashion this morning, and which I have also been asked to make. This is a request that we should once more be given additional staff to assist in the implementation of this report, the first of a series, each of which is to cover specific and more detailed aspects of the protection of men and women at work from exposure to chemical, physical and biological agents. I formally move that this matter be considered in its entirety and put to the vote as soon as possible.

**President.** — I call Mrs Weber to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mrs Weber.** — (D) Mr President, the Socialist Group naturally supports this directive wholeheartedly. We also welcome Mr Sherlock's report. The protection of working people at their place of work represents a particularly practical aspect of environmental policy. We should just like to point out again — and this is a point which we could include in the report that — it is necessary to avoid dangers generally and when these are inevitable, protective measures must be comprehensive enough to ensure that workers are not placed at risk.

A further point to which we attach importance, and to which particular attention should be paid again in the Commission's implementing provisions, is that it must be possible so to improve the scope for dialogue between employers, workers and medical officers that optimal protection is provided for all workers.

**President.** — I call Mrs Maij-Weggen to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group).

**Mrs Maij-Weggen.** — (NL) Mr President, in view of the hour I will limit myself to one or two comments. It is regrettable that such an important report must be discussed in the space of a few minutes.

My group is extremely gratified at the steps taken by the Commission to transform the programme of action on the protection of safety and health at work into a practical directive. We must, however, realize that this is a framework directive establishing general principles, and we would urge that it be completed as speedily as possible with separate and specific directives. It is extremely important for the workers concerned that their safety and health be protected, particularly when working with such dangerous substances as cadmium, asbestos and mercury. We hope that the Industrial Medicine and Hygiene Committee referred to in Article 9 will follow up this directive energetically.

Mr President, the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection has proposed four amendments to the Commission's proposal for a directive. My group can agree to these amendments, which are not amendments of substance but of a complementary nature. I attach particular importance to one of these amendments, that relating to Article 4, on obligatory information for workers concerning the substances and the dangers associated with them. The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection proposes that workers be informed not only of the potential risks to which they themselves are exposed but also of the potential risks to members of their households and families. We consider this addition to be extremely important, because we know from experience that not only employees but also workers may be negligent in this respect. Failure to take a shower and change one's clothes after work

may result in great danger to members of the worker's household and family. While working in hospitals, I have experienced a number of particularly unpleasant cases. We are as much concerned with protecting workers's families, particularly their children, as with protecting the workers themselves.

Mr President, I would like to end by complimenting the rapporteur. I sincerely hope that this report will be followed by many others. Given the nature of the present report, we have the utmost confidence that this will be the case.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.

#### 21. *Regulations on the Common Customs Tariff*

**President.** — The next item is the report by Sir Fred Catherwood (Doc. 1-640/79), on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, on the

proposals from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-532/79) for

- I. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 805/68 on the common organization of the market in beef and veal;
- II. a regulation opening a Community tariff quota for high-quality fresh, chilled and frozen beef and veal with subheadings 02.01 A II a) and 02.01 A II b) of the Common Customs Tariff;
- III. a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 950/68 on the Common Customs Tariff; and
- IV. a regulation amending certain rates of customs duties for agricultural products and amending Regulation (EEC) No 516/77 on the common organization of the market in products processed from fruit and vegetables.

I call Sir Fred Catherwood.

**Sir Fred Catherwood, rapporteur.** — Mr President, the four proposals under consideration in my report arise directly from the GATT multilateral trade negotiations, which we approved last December. These proposals are purely technical, and I have no hesitation in commending them to the House. The proposals have, in fact, all been enacted, since the Council has seen fit to withdraw any mention of Article 43, under which Parliament must be consulted, and has enacted them under Article 113, under which our opinion is not required. The Committee on External Economic Relations considers that the rights of the House are being grossly abused and its time wasted if we are

## Catherwood

asked by the Council at ludicrously short notice to give our opinions on proposals only to discover afterwards that the Council has decided to act irrespective of Parliament's opinion. I trust that the Legal Affairs Committee will add my complaint today to the matters which it is at present considering. With that warning shot I commend these four proposals to the House.

**President.** — I call Mr Sutra.

**Mr Sutra.** — (F) Mr President, to my knowledge no opinion was requested from the Committee on Agriculture on this report, which refers to imports of beef and veal. This is extremely surprising, particularly in view of the fact that this report, as its author says, only confirms regulations which have been in force for some time. But regulations which have been in force for some time are not necessarily perfect. For example, imports of beef and veal into the European Community include what are known as 'the Hilton cuts' — some tens of thousands of tonnes of imported meat which are exempt from all Community protective measures and from the normal regulations. Certain quotas under the GATT agreement on beef and veal are undoubtedly subject to heavily one-sided agreements which favour the United States of America *vis-à-vis* the European Community. There are GATT agreements to which we object and which we do not accept. Personally, I shall vote against these agreements. It seems to me that a matter such as this should have been referred to our Committee on Agriculture for an opinion. I therefore move, under Rule 32 (1 b) of the Rules of Procedure, that the vote be postponed and the matter referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

**President.** — I call Sir Fred Catherwood.

**Sir Fred Catherwood, rapporteur.** — I have the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture in front of me. Sir Henry Plumb has said to me that the Committee on Agriculture feels that the Community must fulfil its international commitments.

**President.** — I put the request for adjournment to the vote.

The request is rejected.

I call Mr Martin.

**Mr Martin.** — (F) Mr President and colleagues, Mr Pranchère has already explained at this part-session, in his remarks on beef and veal, dairy products and the GATT negotiations, why we oppose the Commission's proposals.

The Commission is not entitled to negotiate on behalf of the States. We insist that the farmers' interests be represented and demand to be associated in the GATT negotiations. I do not wish at this advanced hour to repeat the explanations given by Mr Pranchère. I simply wish to point out that the French Communists and Allies will vote against Sir Fred Catherwood's report.

**President.** — I call Mr Haferkampf.

**Mr Haferkamp, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (D) Mr President, I feel obliged to inform the last speaker that the Community as such has acted in these matters in accordance with the Treaties. These international commitments have been approved in accordance with the Treaties by the Council of Ministers. They were also approved following an exhaustive debate here in Parliament. The Commission will naturally do everything it can to fulfil the Community's international commitments.

**President.** — I call Mr Maffre-Baugé.

**Mr Maffre-Baugé.** — (F) Mr President, is it wise or even admissible to call for a vote on such a matter now that there is no longer a quorum? Under these circumstances, we no longer have the right to pass an opinion on this subject. I would ask you to establish whether a quorum exists under Rule 33 (3) of the Rules of Procedure.

**President.** — This request has to be made by 10 Members. Will those Members please stand who request the establishment of a quorum?

Ten Members have indeed requested that it be established whether a quorum is present. I note that there is no quorum. We therefore cannot vote on this report and it is deferred to the beginning of the next part-session.

I call Sir Fred.

**Sir Fred Catherwood, rapporteur.** — All this underlines the protest I made on behalf of my committee earlier on.

## 22. Directive on the modernization of farms

**President.** — The next item is, without debate, the report (Doc. 1-719/79) by Mrs Barbarella, on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-628/79) for a directive amending Directive 72/159/EEC on the modernization of farms.

**President**

I have no speakers on my list.

*(Cries of 'Quorum!')*

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins on a point of order.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — On all the remaining items I intend to ask whether a quorum exists.

**President.** — Then Members have asked me to establish whether there is a quorum. I note that this is not the case. The vote on the Barbarella report is accordingly deferred to the next sitting.

### 23. *Dates of the next part-session*

**President.** — Under these circumstances no more items can be taken.

I thank the representatives of both Council and Commission for their contributions to our debates.

The enlarged Bureau has proposed that the next part-session be held from 10 to 14 March 1980, in Strasbourg.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

### 24. *Approval of the minutes*

**President.** — Rule 17 (2) of the Rules of Procedure requires me to lay before Parliament, for its approval, the minutes of proceedings of this sitting, which were written during the debates.

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

### 25. *Adjournment of the session*

**President.** — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 1.55 p.m.)*





## Price

	United Kingdom and Ireland	Belgium and Luxembourg	Denmark	Germany	France	Italy	Netherlands	Other countries
	UKL	BFR/LFR	DKR	DM	FF	LIT	HFL	BFR
Annual subscription 1979—1980	19.70	1 200,—	210,—	76,—	169,50	32 100	83,—	1 200,—
Single copies :								
up to 32 pages	0.60	35,—	5,70	2,25	4,70	830	2,40	35,—
up to 80 pages	1.20	70,—	11,40	4,50	9,40	1 660	4,80	70,—

more than 80 pages : price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

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

- report of proceedings,
- annual indexes.

## Sales

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February.

Orders may be placed with the Secretariat of the European Parliament or the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

### Secretariat of the European Parliament

Centre européen

Plateau du Kirchberg

Boîte postale 1601 — Luxembourg

### Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

Boîte postale 1003 — Luxembourg  
and 5, rue du Commerce — Luxembourg

Postal cheque account : 19 190-81

Bank current account : B.I.L. 8-109/6003/300

Price : UKL 6.60



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS  
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

ISSN 0378-5041

Boîte postale 1003 — Luxembourg

Catalogue number : AX-AA-79-014-EN-C